

**PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, New Hampshire**

Workshop Minutes of February 25, 2013

Members Present: Jerry Galus, Barbara Miller, Alan Zeller, Tom Weeks, Joel Harrington and Rich Clark.

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

Chair Harrington called the Workshop to order at 5:35 p.m. "Let's get started" he said adding "we will start with the Consultants."

Carolyn Radisch of ORW Landscape Architects and Planners introduced herself as well as Roger Hawk of Hawk Planning Resources. She began with a comprehensive overview of "where we have been and what is proposed." She encouraged Member and Audience questions and participation.

Ms. Radisch reviewed a Power Point presentation which began with the timeline. "We began in October, with community workshops in November and December. We were back before this Board in January with an overview of the regulatory framework and here tonight with the proposed ordinance." Ms. Radisch went on to explain the community outreach and noted the workshops included discussions that addressed the character of the neighborhoods, aging (population) challenges, College graduate challenges and neighborhood involvement. "We talked to stakeholders, community planners and residents and encouraged them to talk. We looked at location of parking and tax implications" adding "the future is *not* going to look like the past in response to housing."

Ms. Radisch reviewed several strategies in planning for the future which included infill housing, more relaxed requirements for accessory units; big house/little house/back house models, barn farmhouse clusters and upper floor housing in the Downtown. She reviewed the principles of neighborly homes (including the building's mass, street orientation, front and side setback patterns, hidden parking, landscaping and trees, the preservation and re-use of historical buildings and making an effort to respond to the architectural features of the streetscape in general). She noted the setback requirements would be within 15% of the average existing developed lots located within 300 feet of the property. "It is paying attention to the neighborhood context" interjected Mr. Hawk, adding "so that you fit in to the context of what is around you."

Deb Kaiser asked about the possibility of deep lots (with frontage) and adding an attached or not attached building in the back. Sharon Monahan interjected "or even see if the homeowner is willing to come a bit closer to the road so the parking could be in the back." Ms. Radisch noted the rhythm and scale of the buildings could vary "but they are still unified."

Mr. Hawk continued with Ordinance Provisions. Amendment #1 included Purpose and Intent, Authority and Administration, Applicability, Permitted Uses, Procedure and Minimum

Requirements (town water and sewer, re-use of existing buildings, lot size and frontage, front and side setback requirements, lot coverage, parking and driveways, and sidewalks). “The key is going out and putting what makes a new building fit within the built environment in town in writing.” Mr. Hawk also reiterated that the Overlay Zone was based on the underlying zoning. “You can do what you can do already, you do not lose any rights” he said adding “it provides the opportunity to increase density, but you have to follow the rules. The base zoning is still there.”

Mr. Weeks asked for clarification and noted the potential for misuse of the ordinance. Mr. Hawk again noted the key was following the rules and a brief discussion about frontage, setbacks and lot sizes followed. Mr. Weeks asked if an applicant could get a Conditional Use Permit from the Planning Board without a building plan. “No” replied Mr. Hawk as Ms. Radisch shook her head *no*. “It is a one-shot deal they must have a building plan.” Mr. Weeks asked how the setback information would be obtained and asked “would you have to go and get a survey?” with Mr. Hawk replying “using your GIS mapping would work, it is not intended to be accurate, it is intended to be averaged” adding “and it is *certainly* not intended to add financial burden.”

Mr. Hawk went on to say “it is trying to mirror the in-town intimate scale, with a bit of variation.” He noted “the setbacks vary so much so you take it from the existing neighborhood pattern with some flexibility.” Mr. Weeks replied “so this Board would have flexibility to allow something be a bit closer or further away.”

Ms. Monahan mentioned the minimum side and rear setback requirement was 10 feet. She pointed out the risk of encroachment noting “you typically need 20 feet for the machinery.” She also noted visual screening versus actual setback was also important. Mr. Hawk agreed noting “it is all subject to the approval of the Planning Board.” Ms. Monahan also noted the State regulation of not allowing more than 30% impervious coverage along the rivers. Chair Harrington replied “those are good points” adding “consistency up front to a developer is key.”

Mr. Weeks noted his concern with the Procedure. “The way it is written” he said, may allow an applicant to build an addition with a Conditional Use Permit from the Planning Board when they should be at the ZBA requesting a Variance. Ms. Monahan noted that she felt that was not the intent, “and that (Mr. Weeks’ example) should be seen as an expansion of an existing house, not new dwelling spaces.” Mr. Hawk agreed noting “that is *not* the intent of the amendment; the intent is to create new in-town living units.”

A brief discussion about local and environmental laws (including the 100-foot Shoreland ordinance) and how they interplay followed.

Ms. Radisch continued with a review of the guidelines for building orientation and location of parking with several graphics. Mr. Weeks noted it would be helpful to show the property lines on the pictures, “as well as the 300 feet each side on the example with dotted setbacks.”

Ms. Radisch showed a slide that presented an existing condition with an illustrative visual simulation of new homes that incorporated the massing, similar height, orientation and front setbacks she had talked about. The new building also mirrored the architectural features of the

neighborhood context. Each member agreed that was a perfect example of what this ordinance could do and how it should be used.

Chair Harrington asked “can we get to the map and how you came up with the red line?” Ms. Radisch noted Amendment #2, which was to amend the Peterborough Zoning Districts Map to include a new Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone. She noted the map was included in their handouts and the Overlay Zone was indeed, in red. She reviewed the proposed boundaries of the Overlay Zone with the members. She noted the half-mile radius from the town center was depicted as well. “That is the general walkable catchment area for the downtown” she said adding “and then we looked out to the neighborhoods” She also noted “we can change the boundary lines, you know Peterborough way better than we do, this is an arrow in the quiver, and you may have a better arrow.”

Chair Harrington asked “does the line follow actual lot lines?” with Ms. Radisch replying “yes” and reiterating “we are open on the map.”

Mr. Weeks suggested the elimination of the old Perry Motors and the Bowling Alley as they were commercially zoned. Ms. Radisch agreed, noting “we should take it out for clarity.”

A brief discussion about the demolition of several old buildings that many thought could be saved as well as several standing old buildings that potentially face the same fate followed. From the audience Tyler Ward asked “how do you stop that from happening?” he noted a beautiful old house at one of the town’s gateways and said “it is a blight now, fallen by the wayside.” He added it most likely would be knocked down as well and again asked “how do you stop that?” A brief discussion about intent and using the ordinance in the manner it was conceived followed. Chair Harrington concluded by noting “we have a year to do this, we have plenty of time and the feedback has been great.” He went on to note “we need good public input on these issues and I believe it is the sense of the Board to go out and get that.”

Ms. Ogilvie gave the members a brief update of the status of the grant (a request to reserve a portion of the grant money to use later as well as the continued effort of the Consultants). “We are waiting on an approval but it looks good” she said.

Chair Harrington concluded with “we encourage all the land use boards to stay involved.” Ms. Miller added “we would like to thank you and Roger so much.”

Chair Harrington noted Craig Hicks was next on the agenda for a discussion on a potential amendment to the Commerce Park. Mr. Hicks moved to the front of the room and sat down. Chair Harrington looked at Mr. Hicks and asked “what is your idea?” Mr. Hicks replied “well we had a conversation after town meeting last year on how to move forward.” He referred to his petition last year to allow Retail as a permitted use in the Commerce Park District. He noted he had another petition for Town Meeting in May “but there was confusion about the deadline and I did not get it in on time.”

Chair Harrington asked what he would like the Planning Board to do. Mr. Hicks asked if the Planning Board would entertain bringing his request to ballot this year. He briefly recalled the

“misinformation” about his petition last year and how he would like to not let it take over the actual information again this year. He told the Board there was time to accomplish his request.

Chair Harrington explained why, in terms of time “it is too late.” He went on to note “I have concerns about a rehash and bringing back the same thing, it is not a good idea.” He told Mr. Hicks “we would need at least another workshop on this, then a meeting to vote. You can see that puts us way out of time.” Mr. Hicks asked “will you set aside some time for me next year?” Chair Harrington replied “yes, we will. We will revisit and rethink this with the public” adding “it is just too tight for this year.” Mr. Hicks replied “thank you, I will see you in June.”

With no other business the Workshop adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton
Administrative Assistant