

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

Minutes of May 21, 2012

Members Present: Rich Clark, Joel Harrington, Alan Zeller, Jerry Galus, Audrey Cass, Tom Weeks, and Ivy Vann.

Staff Present: Carol Ogilvie, Director Office of Community Development; Laura Norton, OCD Administrative Assistant; and Rodney Bartlett, DPW Director

Vice Chairman (Mr.) Harrington opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m. noting “this is a work session of the Planning Board, it is 5:30 and we have a quorum so let’s get started.”

GAR Hall Recommendation: Request from the Select Board for a recommendation from the Planning Board regarding the potential sale of the GAR property to Jason Hackler.

Ms. Vann asked “is there anyone here to speak for the GAR Hall?” Ms. Ogilvie noted Mr. Bartlett was present to answer any questions. Mr. Bartlett added “and Jason is going to try to be here as well.” Just as Mr. Bartlett finished his sentence Jason Hackler arrived.

Mr. Bartlett explained that under RSA 41:14-a “the Board of Selectmen have the right to buy and sell property” adding “and Article 15 of the 2002 Town Warrant mandates any such proposed sale be submitted to the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission for review.” Mr. Bartlett went on to note that once a recommendation had been received by both boards two public hearing will be scheduled “at least 10 days but not more than 14 days apart on the proposed action.” It was noted that those public hearing had already been scheduled for June 5th at 5:30 p.m. and June 19th at 7:00 p.m. at the Town House. “Then they make their decision” he said.

Mr. Bartlett mentioned the packets that had been sent to the members for review and confirmed their receipt. He briefly reviewed the process of negotiating a purchase and sales agreement and determining the fate of the cannons, cannon balls and granite retaining walls. He noted the zoning district was Downtown Commercial and reviewed some of the permitted uses in that district. Mr. Bartlett concluded with “right now it is being considered as a single family house.”

Mr. Harrington asked if any of the members had questions. Ms. Vann immediately asked “so what is the Board of Selectmen looking for from us?” Ms. Vann went on to note “if the use is altered it would have to come back to us right?” Mr. Bartlett replied “yes, anything other than a single family residence.” Mr. Zeller interjected “I read they would put in a driveway right?” with Mr. Bartlett replying “yes.” Mr. Zeller than commented on the side setback if a driveway were to be put in noting “other than that, I read the whole thing and that was all I picked up on.”

Ms. Vann asked “is the parking in the rear?” Mr. Bartlett replied “yes” with Ms. Vann replying “groovy, that is what we like to see.” Mr. Bartlett noted the Conservation Commission also recommended parking in the rear and had a question on whether or not there might be a garage in the back. He went to note that those types of things will be addressed when a driveway permit is applied

for. Mr. Weeks noted the potential need for a Special Exception from the ZBA with Mr. Bartlett adding "it is not a big lot, you might be right Tom."

Mr. Harrington asked if the retaining wall needed work with Mr. Bartlett replying it did "and so far we have looked at keeping the walls with the GAR property." Mr. Harrington noted "then it will be the responsibility of the new owner" with Mr. Bartlett replying "yes and it does need some work, no question." The members briefly discussed the Boccelli Garden located directly south of the GAR Hall with Mr. Clark noting "they are two separate lots." Ms. Vann noted "good I would hate to see the garden impinged on." Mr. Bartlett reassured the members that he has had a number of conversations with Mike Gordon about the garden. "We will work closely with Mr. Gordon" he said.

Mr. Weeks asked about the curb cut for the driveway permit and how the neighbors might feel. He asked "have you had any objections from the Petersons at all?" Mr. Bartlett noted he had met with Andy Peterson three times during the time the Request for Proposals went out. He added "we took him through the building and the only pertinent discussion has been about the property line." Ms. Vann asked about the possibility of a shared driveway with Mr. Bartlett replying "the town has not had that discussion." Ms. Vann went on to say "if an agreement with the Petersons could be reached you would only have to take down a little of the retaining wall in the back" adding "and pushing it toward the GAR Hall would gain access to a couple of parking places back there. I would urge consideration of that. Whether the Petersons buy it or not it seems that two driveways are cheek by jowl there." Mr. Bartlett replied "if the property is sold to Jason (Hackert) he can approach Andy (Peterson) about that." I would urge discussion of that" replied Ms. Vann, adding "it would be better than two side-by-side driveways and be half as much hard surface to the river."

Mr. Harrington told the members he knew the Hackler family. "They are very environmentally conscientious people." He noted they ran an antique business in Milford adding "I personally know Susie Hackler, she runs Conservation New Hampshire." Mr. Harrington then asked "do you need a recommendation?" Mr. Bartlett replied "we do not need a recommendation on whether to sell or not sell but rather a statement of what the Board thinks is important." Ms. Vann asked "do you need something in writing?" Mr. Harrington interjected "it is all in the Minutes." Mr. Bartlett nodded his head and replied "that should do it;" adding "next will be the two public hearings scheduled for June 5th and June 19th."

A very brief discussion about the Request for Proposal originally published in August of 2011 followed with several of the members wondering if the town would consider "going back" to evaluate interest in the building. Mr. Bartlett replied "we advertised in the paper and sent six sets of RFPs to locals we thought may be interested. Jason is the only one who responded." Mr. Bartlett concluded "the RFP was not so much money driven as it was to develop the potential of the property while maintaining its historic features. The end product is what the Selectmen have looked at."

Ms. Vann asked if Chair Monahan (who was absent) had left any comments regarding the GAR Hall. Ms. Ogilvie replied "he did, he is supportive of the overall concept, and also questioned whether or not the town may consider re-offering the RFP." Ms. Ogilvie concluded "other than that he noted the easement language was quite good." Moving on Mr. Harrington noted "our discussion is reflected in the Minutes, thank you both."

DOT Public Hearing on the Route 101 Bridge

It was noted that the state was soliciting comments on the project with one member noting “it is time to weigh in.” Ms. Ogilvie reminded the members “this is not the last opportunity as the project is not scheduled for a while but it is the start of their public process and it certainly will not hurt to get in at the beginning.”

She noted the first public meeting on the project was scheduled for Thursday, May 24th at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Harrington noted he was unavailable “but if a couple of members could go and report back to us that would great.” Both Ms. Vann and Mr. Zeller volunteered to attend the meeting.

The member spent a few moments discussing the bridge including ways to visually narrow the travel lanes and the addition of sidewalks. All members agreed that some sort of traffic calming would not be amiss. Mr. Harrington interjected “it looks like a highway bridge; it would be nice if it could blend in with the town.”

Ms. Vann left at 6:00 p.m.

Draft Work Plan

Mr. Harrington noted he would be more comfortable addressing the work plan when the Chairman was present. Ms. Ogilvie noted the Planning Board Workshop could take place on the third or fourth Monday of the month. She added “think about it, you can come to a decision on when you would like to have your workshops when Rick comes back.”

Other Business

Mr. Galus asked about revisiting the Master Plan with Ms. Ogilvie replied “yes indeed, we will” adding “I believe Rick wanted that to be a separate meeting.” Ms. Ogilvie went on to note “the Master Plan discussion may or may not relate to the work program” and gave the example of how the Master Plan may play into how the Board reacts to petition amendments. The members also briefly discussed definitions being in the wrong places as well as definitions that reflect new amendments that have been adopted.

The members concluded the workshop with a brief discussion on Commerce Park and a rural lot located between the Village Commercial and Family Districts. Mr. Clark noted “it should be one or the other but not rural, it is in between two grown-up areas.” Mr. Harrington noted another issue with the Village Commercial petition was whether or not they should have frontage on Routes 101 and 202. Mr. Zeller concluded “right now two (2) two-family houses is all he can do. No ifs, ands or buts.”

The meeting adjourned at 6:05

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton
Administrative Assistant

Approved June 11, 2012