



**Planning Board Meeting**  
Monday, January 27, 2014  
Council Chambers, City Hall at 7:00 pm

**Minutes**  
**Approved 2/24/2014**

**I. Roll Call**

**Present:** Peter Guillette, William Greenrose, Richard Wahrlich, Bruce Kolenda, Rusty Fowler, James Nielsen IV, Victor Bergeron, James Short (alt) sitting in for the Open Seat

**Absent:**

**City Staff:** Michael McCrory, Interim City Planner; Louanne Lewit, Minute Taker; Nancy Merrill, Director, Planning & Development

- a) Before the Agenda was discussed there was a discussion of the reorganization of the board, something that is required at the first meeting of the year.
- Mr. Guillette noted that he and wife have sold their home in Claremont and have purchased a home in Grantham, NH. He will continue to be on the Planning Board until he moves in May. He further stated that while they have loved living in Claremont that they are moving to Grantham because his wife has a long term commitment with the Grantham School district. Everyone congratulated him and expressed their sadness at seeing him leave the board.
- Minute taker, Louanne Lewit asked for nominations to chair the Planning Board .
- Bruce Kolenda suggested that the board retain Mr. Guillette until such time in April or May when Mr. Guillette moves. Rusty Fowler concurred, stating that this meeting should be held with Mr. Guillette as Chairman with the same slate of officers and hold the election next month, giving someone on this board time to think about whether they could take on that responsibility. Mr. Guillette asked Michael McCrory about rules. Mr. Kolenda agrees with Mr. Fowler that they give someone a month to consider. Mr. McCrory stated that if the Planning Board went by the rules of "Acting Chair", in the absence of a Chair, someone could be appointed at every meeting by popular vote until one was voted in permanently. Peter Guillette could be voted in at every meeting until someone was elected permanently.
- Mr. Nielsen was under the impression that the Mayor could appoint the Chairperson. Mr. McCrory stated that per the Bylaws, officers are elected at the first regular meeting in January. Further stating that there was nothing about the Mayor appointing the Chair. McCrory stated from the bylaws that in the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair that the board members would elect one of the regular members to act as Chair. He did recommend that the planning board elect a chair tonight however. To Mr. Fowler's question about the Vice Chair automatically assuming Mr. Guillette's position, if he was elected tonight and left the board, Mr. McCrory stated that was a reasonable assumption. If Mr. Guillette is elected as Chair, the Vice Chair should understand that

in the absence of the Chair, Vice Chair steps up at that meeting. Mr. Guillette read that any part of these bylaws could be suspended for a specific purpose with a unanimous vote from its members present. Mr. Guillette further stated to Mr. Neilsen that the Mayor appoints the members but the members elect the Chair. Representative to the City Council is a volunteer from the Board. Mr. Greenrose questioned if the Vice Chair assumes position of the Chair, does the board then have to appoint a Vice Chair each meeting? Mr. McCrory stated that the board could unanimously vote to have another election when Mr. Guillette resigns.

- Mr. Wahrlich stated that it was his understanding that the board could elect Mr. Guillette and have a new election upon his resignation. Mr. McCrory noted that there would need to be a unanimous vote for that action. Mr. Kolenda stated that he would not guarantee running for Vice Chair again but would keep his position until May.
- After a back and forth discussion it was noted that there is a lot of latitude for self-direction in the bylaws and that with a unanimous vote they could vote to keep Mr. Guillette in this position and elect a Chair and Vice Chair upon Mr. Guillette's resignation.

**Motion:**

To keep the board intact until such time as we need to change it, when Mr. Guillette leaves Claremont and at that time the board will elect a Chair and vice chair.

**Made By:** Richard Wahrlich      **Second By:** William Greenrose      **Vote:** Unanimous

Mr. McCrory stated that this was a temporary amendment to the bylaws for this specific case. Mr. Guillette reiterated from the bylaws that any of the bylaws could be suspended with unanimous vote of all members and that all members were at the meeting and voted unanimously.

**II. Review of Minutes December 23, 2013**

**Motion:** to approve minutes from December 23, 2013

**Made By:** William Greenrose      **Second By:** Mr. James Short      **Vote:** Unanimous

Mr. Guillette stated that Mr. Short is filling in for the open seat at this meeting as a voting member.

**Motion:** to accept the minutes as a complete document from December 23, 2013

**Discussion:**

James Short noted that the minutes stated that he stood in for alternate seat, stating that he could not stand up for himself, an alternate. He was standing in for an open seat. Mr. Guillette said that could be easily changed.

**Made by:** Mr. Short      **Second By:** Mr. Greenrose      **Vote:** Unanimous

**III. Old Business**

- **Zoning Updates** - Review of corrections to the recently adopted City Center Project zoning amendments.
  - Michael McCrory stated that the zoning amendments are currently under legal review and "site plan regs" are under process and will need to be tabled for tonight.

- **Draft Site Plan Regulations** - Discussion of draft amendments to the Site Plan Regulations.

#### IV. New Business

- **Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Review**

- Mr. McCrory stated that Nancy Merrill was here tonight to make the Capital Improvement Plan presentation. Mr. McCrory will give an overview of the master plan. CIP is one of the planning functions of the planning board. They were not asking the Planning Board to take any action on the CIP tonight. Copies of the general overview plan were handed out to members. He stated that this CIP document is from the last round and is intended as a financial planning effort, the fiscal implantation of the master plan. Everything in the CIP is consistent with the Master Plan and moving it forward. It helps to set up the fiscal plan for the city. It is adopted by the planning board by state statute and recommended to the city council. It is presented to the Planning Board for analysis and feedback. Since this is a functional part of the Master Plan, Nancy Merrill felt that it was important to take a look at the master plan that was adopted in 2011 and reflect on the interesting progressions since then.
- Mr. McCrory stated that they'd like to walk through the CIP with the Board and look at its current structure and then ask the Board to take it home, digest it and discuss it at the next meeting when Director of Finance, Mary Walter will be present.
- Nancy Merrill gave a short projected presentation of an implementation update of the Master Plan which was also received in member's packets. She stated that the CIP is supposed to be tied to master plan. She took the opportunity to review items in the Master Plan that had been implemented so that the Board could keep these in mind when reviewing the CIP. Chapters making recommendations were Housing, Economic Development, Historic Resources, Community Facilities, Recreation, Natural Resources, Transportation, and Land Use. Some of the recommendations were made by multiple chapters.
  - **Some of those recommendations that were implemented:**
- Existing building codes in the regulatory framework (Housing, Economic Development, Historic Resources recommendation) Ms. Merrill stated that it has occurred in the building code and the fire code. The NFPA also has section relative to codes. It was an issue with the older, existing buildings to make them safe.
- Conversions/Multi/Traditional compact development; historic landscape; zoning consolidation-City Center Zoning were all recommendations in the City Center Project. All of these were recommended by Housing, Historic Resources with a strong recommendation from the Land Use chapter.
- The internet access audit, a goal of Housing and Economic Development chapters, has been completed. State and Regional Planning Commission have completed the audit and Ms. Merrill has been told that Claremont is a one Gigabyte city, unique to this area with only Lebanon and Washington with that kind of download speed. It is not across the whole city but a substantial part of it and will increase with the new NH fast road lines that are coming through that access will be even more available.

- Mixed Use and Shared Parking recommended by Economic Development, Transportation, and Land Use was accomplished as part of the City Center Zoning.
- The Web site updated with the new linkages for business retention and recruitment, recommended by Economic Development has been completed.
- The Energy Audit of municipal buildings recommended by Economic Development has been completed.
- Design guidelines adoption recommended by Historic Resources was completed as part of City Center Zoning.
- Business Corridor Project reviewing B-2 Zones; stream bank district regulations & signage recommended by the Land Use Chapter is currently ongoing and should be to the Planning Board in June or July.
- Safe Routes to Schools grant for sidewalk Maintenance recommended by Transportation received a grant that was applied for by the city.
- Washington Street Safety Audit and Washington Street access study recommended by Transportation were both completed.
- Natural Resource Inventory and Forestry management plan implementation were two of the three recommendations in the Natural Resource Chapter. NRI is finished. Forest Management implementation is ongoing This was also recommended by the Recreation Chapter in the Master Plan
- Draper's Corner, also a recommendation from Transportation Chapter, will be completed in the Spring.
- Rail Trail Master Plan recommended by Natural Resources is not completed but is underway.
- New Community Center recommended by Recreation Chapter is finished.
- North and Main Intersection of Main Street recommended by the Transportation Chapter, as well as Main Street to Elm Street bridge are both in the engineering stages.
- Nancy Merrill stated that the city has made pretty good progress in a short period of time from the Master plan approved in June of 2011 The plan should be updated every 5 years. In 2015 they will be coming back to the planning board to do a public process
- Under community facilities on page 64 of the Master Plan is a list of municipal projects in 2011 that were noted as important by different department heads. The list is comprised of some done, some not done and some in planning. For purposes of CIP, even if not funded, it's helpful in grant terms to have it show up. Nancy stated that when the CIP goes to the City Council it helps to say that it was recognized by the Planning Board in the CIP.

- Mr. Fowler asked how close they were to having bids go out or applying for grants on the Bowen Street intersection. Nancy Merrill stated that it is currently being engineered and they are waiting for a final report. The grant is part of the highway safety funds grant. Michael McCrory stated that the intersection is currently under a feasibility study which is trying to figure out whether that concept, putting another leg on that Bowen Intersection, can be constructed. A report is expected late winter, or spring with expected construction to begin in 2015. Mr. Fowler expressed frustration with the length of time (three years) taken on the project.
- Mr. Guillette emphasized that while they sometimes look at it as wish list, without putting something in CIP it makes it difficult for city to receive the grant. The project may never be funded but it should be included to allow the city planning office to apply for grants. He further noted that many city projects have been funded by grants and that they have to look at priorities.
- The CIP was identified for board review. Mr. McCrory noted that there may be changes between now and final presentation. He asked for questions about the overall structure of it. The time frame covered 2014 through 2020, looking out over a six year term.
- For the benefit of the viewing audience and a reminder to those present, Mr. Guillette asked Mr. McCrory for clarification and review of the priority ranking system, defining the difference between the CIC Rank and the Department Rank. Some projects are funded by taxpayers and some by grants and Mr. Guillette felt it was important to understand how that worked.
- Nancy said that they met a few months ago for recommendations for the CIP from the Department heads and they rank on their priorities. The other ranking is from Nancy Merrill, herself, and the Chairman of Planning Board and City Finance Director. Their system uses ranks: URGENT, CANNOT BE DELAYED, NEEDED FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY, COMMITTED, PART OF AN EXISTING CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT OR OTHERWISE REQUIRED, NECESSARY...NEEDED TO MAINTAIN EXISTING LEVEL AND QUALITY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE, DEFERRABLE...CAN BE PLACED ON HOLD UNTIL AFTER SIX YEAR PERIOD BUT SUPPORTS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS, RESEARCH PENDING RESULTS OF ONGOING RESEARH, INCONSISTENT, CONFLICTS WITH ALTERNATIVE PROJECT.
- She noted that there was one where they didn't own the land and it was a Brownfieldsite but is still included because it's a department recommendation.
- Mr .Guillette further explained that each department head has to submit their requests or needs. He showed a binder of detail of what they requested and why. The Committee goes through it with a fine tooth comb multiple times.
- Mr. McCrory noted that the table has all the different departments and goes on for number pages (14 pages of tables). They do set out specific requests and time frame for how they may play out what the likely funding sources are. Mr. McCrory asked for questions on table structure.

- Mr. Fowler asked what the Department rank of Zero meant. Mr. Guillette considered it to be a completed project. Completed projects are put in to show completion, show progress.
- Mr. Fowler noted that Washington Street / Bowen Street project shows zeros. Mr. Guillette stated that it could be because it is only funded 10% by the city and should be finished by 2016/2017. He thought that it was likely that it was 90% federally funded by the State on NH and Mr. Fowler said that he had heard that as well. The ranking of zero is because they do not know what the final numbers will be. Nancy Merrill stated that the reason for the zero is because the department didn't rank it and it was added in.
- Mr. Neilsen asked for clarification about the funding for the outdoor pool. He wondered if it was removed because there was no outdoor pool planned. Mr. Guillette stated that the existing pool will be taken out. It is here in the plan because it was here in the past, Once the City Council makes the final decision it will be removed from here. Mr. Neilsen stated that the Council has voted to remove the pool.
- Mr. Greenrose wondered if a comments section would help the process. Mr. Guillette stated that they should look at the project description and ask questions. Another column may not be feasible. The outdoor pool will be removed from the projects.
- Mr. Short asked what does CIC mean and what is the relevance? Mr. Guillette stated that the CIC is really the committee. Nancy Merrill, Peter Guillette, and Mary Walter discuss the funding. Mary Walter knows if money is there or money has been put money aside for the future.
- Mr. Fowler wondered why a Department would rank a project as a six and the CIC rank as a two. Mr. Bergeron stated that it could be an affordability issue. They look and say this dollar amount is affordable this year so we're going to move it up and get it taken care of. Mr. Greenrose said that you have to look at what two means, which is Part of an Existing Contract or Otherwise Legally Required. It does not mean that it is more important, not a hierarchical ranking, just an explanatory ranking. They rank on how much they need it, then the outside CIC department ranks on funding. They don't rank in importance, just to clarify. It may conflict with something else he wants to do. Other projects take precedence.
- Ms. Merrill stated that it's not numerically ranked. There was a discussion about using letters instead of numbers for ranking in the future. Ms. Merrill asked the Planning Board to bring specific questions and she would bring them back to the Department heads and get answers. She stated that Mary Walter, Finance Director, would be at the next meeting. Short wondered what the numbers were beyond six. It was stated that they are just putting their wish list in order.
- Dept heads are only looking at their department projects. Numbers do not correlate to CIP numbers.
- Mr. McCrory invited them to email questions to him individually.

- Mr. Bergeron suggested that it would be helpful on Department ranking if they had a 1 to 5 scale. Is there a way to measure within a 1 to 5 scale so that Planning Board knows how important the project is.
- Mr. Short suggested that they use a single formula for each department because currently no one looks at the same thing the same way.

## V. Reports from Boards and Commissions

- Mr. Bergeron said that the Claremont 250<sup>th</sup> license plates were available for \$25 and could be purchased at Central Collections in City Hall. They can take the place of front plate for the year. He cautioned that the regular plate should be kept in the vehicle to show that you are properly registered.
- A discussion ensued about a monument celebrating the 250<sup>th</sup> that would be crafted by Mr. Montenegro and would reside at the end of the pedestrian bridge. Nancy Merrill gave further details. Ernie Montenegro, sculptor, will have model at next City Council meeting. Her understanding is that it is a forty foot high steel sculpture, titled *Hands That Built Claremont*. Hands on the steel sculpture are created out of metal. She understands that there will be mill workers on the pedestal underneath the piece. Local businesses are supporting the project. It will be presented Wednesday night where they expect to more what Claremont 250<sup>th</sup> needs to make it happen.

- Mr. Guillette stated that the next meeting will be February 10.

## VI. Other

## VII. Correspondence

## VIII. Adjournment

**Motion:** to Adjourn

**Made By:** Mr. Greenrose. **Second By:** Mr. Short.

**Vote:** Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 8:00PM

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Louanne Lewit