

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, NH

Minutes of September 19, 2016

Site Visit

Members Present: Chair Ivy Vann, Alan Zeller, Bob Holt, Rich Clark, Jerry Galus, Ed Juengst and Joe Hanlon

Staff Present: Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development

Continued Preliminary Conceptual Consultation:

The members met at 59 Union Street regarding the potential redevelopment of Parcel Number U024-021-000. The project proposes to remove an existing two-family home on the property and subdivide the property into four building lots using the Traditional Neighborhood Design ordinance.

Chair Vann called the Site Visit to order at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed the members, the abutters, Mr. Branon and the representatives from GATO.

She noted “the purpose here is to look at the lot.” When Mr. Clark asked “are they going to tear down the house?” the discussion that followed included several opinions on the condition of the home (ranging from “good bones” to “unable to be rehabilitated”). Mr. Hanlon suggested they get a home inspection before making any decisions.

The members walked the lot and toured the inside of the home. Mr. Branon gave the members an idea of how the homes would be situated and suggested a new placement concept. He asked to have the meeting continued to the October meeting for further preliminary discussion.

Chair Vann continued the meeting to the date and time certain of Monday, October 10, 2016. At 6:30 p.m.

Planning Board Workshop:

Members Present: Chair Ivy Vann, Alan Zeller, Bob Holt, Rich Clark, Jerry Galus, Ed Juengst and Joe Hanlon.

Staff Present: Peter Throop, Director, and Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development

Chair Vann called the Workshop to order at 6:30 p.m. She introduced the members and staff and noted the first item of business was to re-open the public hearing for the Wilton Road Conditional Use Permit application that had been continued to this meeting. Chair Vann noted “we came to the sense we were in favor of granting this but we wanted to be clear as to why.” The members briefly discussed the minimal impact and higher elevation of the requested site, that the lot could not be subdivided in the future and the favorable comments from the Conservation Commission. “They are our watchdogs for this” said Chair Vann. The potential of a relocation of the driveway and a possible subdivision in the future was also briefly discussed.

Draft Findings:

1) The Planning Board finds that the “proposed crossing of the wetland Protection Overlay District is essential to the productive use of the land not designated as wetland” and the crossing will be “located and constructed so as to minimize and avoid to the maximum extent practicable, any detrimental impact of such uses upon the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone.”

2) In making this finding, the Board has considered that:

a) An alternative path to accessing the useable land not within the Wetland Protection Overlay exists, but such a crossing would create a greater impact to the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone than the proposed crossing;

b) The proposed crossing will be located at a point of minimum width of the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone;

c) There is no other way to access the land that is not within the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone; and

d) The Conservation Commission has conducted a site visit, reviewed the alternatives and concluded that the “stream crossing had less wetland impact, and was needed to access buildable upland.”

3) In evaluating the Performance Standards set forth in Section 233-52, the Planning Board finds the following:

- a) No net loss of buffer functionality is anticipated based on consideration of a function and values analysis performed in conjunction with a wetland crossing for a town road that was performed for the same stream on the abutting property prior to issuance of the Condition Use Permit; and
- b) Details of the crossing design will be completed by the applicant pending as a condition approval of this request. As such, review and approval of the design details to ensure that stormwater management requirements of the ordinance have been met as a condition of approval.

Mr. Galus felt 2)c of the findings (no other way to access the land) was incongruent with 2)a. Mr. Throop agreed and replied “we can take it out.”

A motion was made/seconded (Hanlon/Clark) to adopt the Draft Finding as written, with the omission of 2)c as discussed.

A motion was made/seconded (Hanlon/Holt) to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the crossing of the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone on Parcel U001-023-000 as shown on the plan entitled Topographic Plat prepared for HBL Farms. LLC by Richard D. Bartlett and Associates, dated January 27, 2016 and revised April 6, 2016, with hand drawn details subject to the following conditions prior to signature and issuance of the conditional use permit:

- (1) The applicant shall provide design details for the crossing that meet the Performance Standards set forth in 233-52 B of the Planning Board Regulations as approved administratively following review by the DPW Director, Community Development Director and the Planning Board Chairman.
- (2) The Applicant shall demonstrate receipt of a wetland permit from NHDES.

With all in favor.

Minutes:

A motion was made/seconded (Zeller/Holt) to approve the minutes of September 12, 2016 as written with all in favor.

Various Topics:

Potential Changes to the Bed & Breakfast Ordinance: Chair Vann noted “we have a laundry list of things here, adding “I have not been happy with the Bed & Breakfast ordinance since we passed it.” The members briefly discussed what in fact they had passed with Chair Vann suggesting the problem was with smaller entities (one to two bedrooms for rent) not paying their room and meals tax. “I have an issue about that philosophically” she said “but now the state has stepped in with a statutory change that requires anyone engaged in a short term rental (i.e. Air B&Bs) must get a room and meals tax number.” She went on to say “so it is not our problem anymore, the state will deal with it.” Chair Vann also noted an approach should address behaviors of the occupants, how rental income assists in letting home owners keep their homes and the level of protection (proper egress, fire alarms systems, etc.) to be provided to transient guests.

Potential Changes to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance: “The more I’ve thought about this the more I want to revisit it” said Chair Vann. Specifically noting the size requirement and that it had to be owner-occupied. “Think about it” she said adding “that makes it very difficult for Dario (Carrara, Code Enforcement Officer).” She cited many other 2-family homes (duplexes) that do not require owner-occupancy. “It goes back to addressing the behavior thing” she said noting “for college towns such as Keene, Plymouth and Durham it makes sense but I am not so sure it makes sense for us.” A brief discussion about some personal experiences followed with Chair Vann noting “I do not disagree with it, I just think it is more complicated that it needs to be.”

Parking Standards: The members watched a short video on municipal parking standards prepared by the City of Ottawa, Canada. “I think the issue is interesting enough to discuss it and *our* parking issues” said Chair Vann. She then mentioned the new parking lot off Grove Street and the redevelopment of buildings downtown “so this is a good thing” she said.

Chair Vann told the members builders build with the knowledge of how much parking is needed “versus us trying to figure it out” adding even the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) has admitted their calculations on need were kind of guessed. She concluded by noting “this is not a jump up and take action type of thing it is something to think about.” She noted the Traditional Neighborhood Design Ordinance was created to increase density in areas that have municipal water and closer to areas that are denser neighborhoods “that is the point of the ordinance and was the goal when we adopted it” she said.

Complete Streets: Chair Vann noted a Complete Street is a road that is designed to be safe for drivers, bicyclists, transit vehicles and users, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities. She again noted the potential for infill in the south and her concerns with what the DOT was doing to Route 202 South. “I am really unhappy with the turning lane access and 8 to 10 more feet of paving and guardrails in front of the bank, it is a highway” she said. When they began a discussion about potential infill behind the Peterborough Plaza Mr. Clark asked somewhat surprised “housing?” Chair Vann replied “yes, housing and some light business, I can see some infill housing in there” adding “the point is that it is likely to be where development is going forward and to make it feel like a village we need to go up against DOT and say what we want, to say what you propose is not what we want.” A discussion of how to do that followed with the members agreeing strong representation, recommendations and support from the Town Administrator, the Town Planning Board and the Town Board of Selectmen would be necessary. Mr. Throop interjected “the adoption of a Complete Street Policy would give us more leverage.” Chair Vann added “complete streets say the pavement does *not* belong exclusively to cars and *not* getting cars through at the fastest rate possible. We do not want our streets and roads to exist for cars moving as fast as possible. Also for economic reasons, cars don’t buy things, fast cars are far less likely to stop. Chair Vann asked “so can we agree that we want to adopt it?”

A motion was made/seconded (Holt/Clark) to have Mr. Throop make a recommendation to the Board of Selectmen to adopt a Complete Streets Policy with all in favor.

Before moving on a member noted a DOT Engineer was expected next week to discuss the Route 101/123 Intersection. “Which will probably involve a lot more paving” interjected Chair Vann. The members briefly discussed how road design affects speed and the danger of that particular intersection.

Design Standards: The members briefly discussed Big house, little house, back house, barn (a model of vernacular architecture consisting of the four essential components of a farm). Chair Vann encouraged the members to travel with their smart phone available to take photographs “when you see a good example of this type of building. This will help us write the standards of what we want” adding “the IDG building is a good example of what we don’t want.” She also noted the most recent examples of both Global Montello and GFA Federal Credit Unit actually moving the structure on their site plans based on suggestions from the Planning Board. “They took our advice” she said adding “but our design standards are not compelling enough to *make* them do anything.”

Mr. Throop noted community-minded projects were not really an issue “but if you get a developer from out of town who does not care, you may have a problem.” Specifically, he noted models for a new hotel in town. “A franchise like Super 8 may not contribute to the brand or character of the town and we may not be successful in persuading them to change.” Chair Vann reiterated what she has said all along “what we have is a cute little town (that) could be ruined by poor design and then we have nothing.” Mr. Throop noted the importance of community branding reflected in future development. “The aesthetics is an important part of the image of our town” he said. Chair Vann replied “and we have damage.” She pointed out while it was very unlikely another plaza area would be developed in town, “the two we have are collateral damage and we certainly do not want any more. Mr. Throop gave the members a brief update on the town’s efforts to reach out to the plaza owners.

Housing, the Missing Middle: Mr. Throop gave a brief synopsis of the public dinner meeting held September 15th at All Saint’s Church’s Reynolds Hall. Mr. Juengst interjected “it was well done, there was a good presentation and group exercise and the food was outstanding.” Mr. Clark agreed and added “our table discussion went a bit sideways but we got points of view we needed to hear.”

Chair Vann reviewed the attributes of a walkable, simple model that creates community and a diversity of styles and building types. “I think it was successful and accomplished what the Committee wanted it to do. It was not overwhelming or frightening” she said.

In closing Mr. Juengst reiterated the importance of design standards. “It all goes back to that” he said adding (referring to potential, imminent development) “and we can feel the breath being breathed on us.” Chair Vann reiterated “taking photos of things you love *or* hate” was important.

Next Meeting: October 10, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.

The Workshop adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton

Administrative Assistant