

PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, New Hampshire

Minutes of August 9, 2010

The Peterborough Planning Board held its regular monthly meeting on Monday, August 9, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. in the Selectmen's Meeting Room of the Town House.

Members Present: Vice Chairman David Enos, Richard Freitas, Michael Henry, Barbara Miller, Rick Monahan, Carl Wagner and Ivy Vann.

Staff Present: Carol Ogilvie, Director and Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development.

Vice Chairman Enos (Mr. Enos) called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He welcomed the audience and introduced the Board members. Mr. Enos appointed both Mr. Freitas and Mr. Wagner to sit. Mr. Enos then noted that this meeting was the regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board, not a Public Hearing for the proposed Wetland Ordinance. He noted "that was erroneously printed in the newspaper and would only have take place if a Special Town Meeting had been called."

Mr. Enos read the first and only case on the agenda:

Public Hearing on a Boundary Line Adjustment

The proposal is for an adjustment between two lots on Lookout Hill Road owned by Nineteen Lookout Hill Road Realty Trust and E. Leslie Lewis, Parcel ID #'s U019-033-000 and U019-032-000 in the Family District.

Rob Degan of Monadnock Survey, Inc. introduced himself as the presenter for Mr. Fry and Ms. Lewis. He explained the proposal as he displayed a simple graphic for the members that showed the lot line adjustment high-lighted in a before/after scenario.

Mr. Degan noted Ms. Lewis had two tracts of land (one tax parcel) and she would "transfer the back tract to 19 Look Out Hill Road and (as he turned the graphic from front to back) go from this to that."

Mr. Enos asked "have they always been separate tracts?" with Mr. Degan replying "yes, but it has always been one parcel on the tax maps." "So it would be one parcel with a lot line adjustment" said Mr. Enos. Ms. Ogilvie replied "yes."

Mr. Enos reviewed the Staff Report and asked if there were any questions "as far as the application being complete." Ms. Miller interjected "it looks complete."

Mr. Monahan in at 7:04 p.m.

Mr. Enos noted "both lots are non-conforming, so this would be a minor lot line adjustment. He went on to ask "does it make the non-conformance less is the only questions at hand." "What

does that mean?" asked Ms. Miller with Mr. Enos explaining "the lots are undersized for the district so if you are taking from one and making it larger you are obviously making the other one smaller. The worry is- is the smaller lot now *less* compliant?" Mr. Enos asked "the setbacks and frontage remain unchanged correct?" Mr. Degan replied "correct." Mr. Degan continued "and the lot at 19 Lookout Hill Road was somewhat smaller to begin with so it *gains* more conformity than the other lot *looses*."

Ms. Vann mentioned the aerial views, noting "they (the buildings) are all forward on their lots; I can't see anything wrong with lopping off the back section of the lot. In the context of where it is in town nothing is changing by doing such a thing." Mr. Enos noted "the questions is does it make anything worse?" Ms. Vann replied "I don't think it does." After a brief discussion about the topography Mr. Enos noted he would make a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Henry seconded with all in favor. Being the only application for the night, the members went straight to deliberation.

Deliberation:

Ms. Miller began by noting "I think I have already said what I have to say about this." Ms. Vann agreed. A motion was made/seconded (Wagner/Freitas) to approve the request as proposed with all in favor.

Wetland Proposal Update:

Mr. Enos gave a brief review of the status of the proposed wetland ordinance and the Wetland Workgroup's efforts. Mr. Enos noted the availability of time "to take a look at the integration between the shoreline and wetlands ordinances." Ms. Vann asked about the scheduling of future meetings noting she would like to remain a Workgroup member if possible. Mr. Enos replied the Workgroup would be meeting once month "at least until January."

Report Out of Board Members Serving on Other Committees:

Mr. Monahon gave a brief update on the Cultural Resources Subcommittee of the Master Plan Steering Committee. He noted the subcommittee "with all good intensions was on a roll but met with an internal crisis in scheduling availability for the members." He added "it is good, we are just not quite there yet and we don't know the next time we will meet."

Other Business:

None

Minutes:

It was noted there were two sets of minutes to approve, July 12, 2010 and July 19, 2010. Mr. Freitas noted "I read them and I can't find a thing wrong." The members took a moment to review the hard copies provided. A motion was made/seconded (Monahon/Vann) to approve the minutes of July 12, 2010 as written with all in favor.

A motion was made/seconded (Miller/Henry) to approve the minutes of July 19, 2010 as written with all in favor.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:23 p.m.

Ms. Miller asked for clarification between a public hearing and a workshop and a brief discussion followed. Essentially the members agreed the workshop environment was not intended for applications and in most cases input from the public was not taken, since it is time for the Board to get work done.

The Planning Board Workshop was called to order at 7:24 p.m.

Ms. Ogilvie distributed an updated issue list for the members to consider. She noted some of the items were planning related where others would be amendments to the regulations and /or zoning ordinance. She added “some of the items were either carried over or did not get completed or considered last year.”

Planning Projects:

Transportation Management

Ms. Ogilvie briefly discussed an exercise of “how a road functions in a nutshell” that was done on Elm Street and the possibility of doing another CSS road audit. She mentioned Parmelee Drive as a potential exercise, noting the road was completed but there were outstanding issues regarding pedestrian access and a crosswalk on Route 202. Ms. Miller asked what CSS meant and a brief discussion about *Contact Sensitive Solutions* followed. Mr. Monahan noted CSS was “basically what is appropriate for an area and the abutting conditions.” Adding “it is not just polling public opinion, but the content of a particular (say) road design including traffic calming and lighting. It is all the stuff that makes a very good approach to problem solving.”

Ms. Ogilvie briefly reviewed the Master Plan projects of the Contoocook River Management Plan (a state-wide corridor management plan that is not regulatory), as well as the Cultural Resources and Regional Concerns Chapters of the Master Plan.

Ms. Ogilvie went on to review potential zoning amendments that included the Wetlands Protection District, Open Space Ordinance and Planned Unit Development, Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND), Workforce Housing and a “Green” Building Ordinance. Having mentioned the green building the members went on to have a discussion about the pros and cons of the Blower Door Test. Mr. Enos concluded the discussion by noting “it creates problems for the code enforcement officer, we should find a way to accommodate this sensibly.”

Ms. Ogilvie also briefly touched on the rezoning of four parcels north of ConVal High School, the expansion of the MCH Healthcare District, the parking requirements (to add additional uses and/or categories) and the definition of “dwellings” and “housekeeping units”.

Mr. Enos proposed to prioritize the projects, noting “wetland of course, is first.” The members went on to place Workforce Housing second and Green Building third. Mr. Enos noted it would be helpful to have the Code Enforcement Officer present when they discussed green building.

Mr. Enos then mentioned Traditional Neighborhood Design with Mr. Henry interjecting “let’s make that a priority” Ms. Miller agreed and Mr. Enos replied “we can make it #3.” Ms. Vann asked the project be called Traditional Neighborhood Design, not Infill. “*Infill* gives people the hives” she said.

The members reviewed the list and regarding the definition of dwellings, Mr. Monahon interjected “remember we don’t want to redefine it we just want to clarify it.” Mr. Enos noted “I would like to hear from Tom (Weeks)” adding “we can have a meeting about green building and parking and get it all done in one afternoon with Tom.” Ms. Miller asked “Is it time we met Dario?” (Dario Carrara, the Assistant Code Enforcement Officer). Mr. Enos agreed it was appropriate to get Mr. Carrara involved as well.

Ms. Vann then led a review of the work that had been done on the TND project. She unfolded several maps and placed them on the floor so all could see. She reviewed the exercise she had completed last year whereby she had identified each part of town served by town water and sewer, “or was town water and sewer adjacent.” She reviewed the drafted standards of 10 to 30 foot setbacks and 60 feet of frontage for the creation of new, buildable lots within currently established neighborhoods. The members discussed the fact that current zoning mandates houses be further back on their lots with Ms. Vann noting “that breaks up the streetscape.” She added, “that is bad for the streetscape; it is a yucky thing and makes for a gapped-tooth look.” The members reviewed the “pink stars” (potential new lots) that could be created and built on. One member reiterated that this was totally a volunteer thing “if you do not wish to subdivide your lot for this purpose you do not have to” they said. The members went on to discuss the fact that they did not want to frighten people “by thinking we are ramming this down their throats.” Ms. Vann went on to explain the need for visuals to show the neighborhoods of Concord, Pine and Union Streets. “All the best parts of Peterborough” she said, adding “let’s suggest we make a few more of these *in* established areas.”

It was noted that adding infill to infrastructure “brings costs down for everyone.” Mr. Monahon interjected “the big gorilla here is the school system.” The members discussed the current status of the school system, and while there is a trend of a declining number of students in the system “our big number one is still the schools” said Mr. Monahon. The members also touched on the assets of infill that included things like a greater tax base and a better sense of community.

Mr. Enos noted his concern for the apparent uniformity of the neighborhoods adding “they just look so rigid; we need to see the little differences (between homes and streets). Those little differences add up and that is what makes us the town we are.” A reference to Levittown was made with Mr. Enos replying “I don’t think you could create a Levittown here.” The members also briefly discussed tearing down homes to build mega-mansions with tiny setbacks. They concluded with a discussion of frontage, setbacks, topography and other street challenges.

The members then spent some time reviewing the municipal sewer lines. Ms. Miller asked if residents without municipal service could tie in to the system if available in their area. Mr. Enos replied “yes, for a fee.” Ms. Vann spoke briefly about a new model she read about in the Midwest (?) that treats septic systems as part of the infrastructure. Mr. Enos interjected “I think that depends on the will of the town.” After another brief review of the town’s sewer lines the meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Norton
Administrative Assistant

Approved as written 9-13-10