

PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, New Hampshire

Minutes of March 16, 2015

Members Present: Ivy Vann, Tom Weeks, Jerry Galus, Alan Zeller and Joe Hanlon.

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

Public Hearing:

Chair Vann called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and introduced the members and staff. Chair Vann noted the purpose of the public hearing was to hear a proposed amendment to the Zoning Map. “The effect of the amendment would be to rezone the land consisting of one parcel (No. U017-023-000) located at 46 Grove Street from the General Residence District to the Downtown Commercial District.” She looked up and said “the property directly to the north is already in the Downtown Commercial District and across the street is General Residence.” Before turning the meeting over to Mr. Bartlett Chair Vann noted “what is before us tonight is a proposal for a change in a zoning district and whether or not we would approve and adopt this amendment to go to town ballot.”

Before Mr. Bartlett began there was confusion over the nature of the application and who the applicant was. Mr. Bartlett explained the application was at the request of the town and had been headed through the Office of Community Development.

Mr. Bartlett briefly reviewed Article 14 from last year’s Town Meeting for a technical assessment of Downtown Parking options. “To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$80,000) for the purpose of site assessment, construction feasibility, design, and development of a probable cost of construction for the creation of new downtown parking at the so-called GAR Hall/Riverwalk parking option; this appropriation is to be offset by \$80,000 from the Greater Downtown Tax Incremental Fund revenues.” He noted both the Select Board and Budget Committee recommended the appropriation and that the Article had passed.

Mr. Bartlett also noted that the parking lot was associated with the GAR Hall (40 Grove St.) and the Peterson Realty building (42 Grove St.). He went on to say “it was not long before we realized the construction impact to 40 Grove Street (to get

back to the confluence of the rivers) would have a huge construction impact. The physical impact was not acceptable so subsequently we went to the south to 46 Grove Street.” Mr. Bartlett told the members “it could not be better, if you look to the southern border it looks like there is already a natural access.” He went on to say “so we approached Cara Hills LLC (the owner of 46 Grove Street) and after fairly long negotiations arrived at a Purchase & Sales agreement with them.”

Mr. Bartlett noted “Amendment B is to amend the zoning ordinance and zoning map relating to the zoning district designation of this parcel of land” adding “to see if the town would vote to rezone the land consisting of one parcel (U017-023-000) at 46 Grove Street from the General Residence Zoning District to the Downtown Commercial Zoning District.” He concluded “if the Planning Board adopts the amendment it will go to the Ballot on May 12th.”

Chair Vann noted that extending the property into the Downtown Commercial District “appears to provide more flexibility to the property in the future and does not present any new hurdles for the existing apartment building” adding “the lot does not have to be in the Downtown Commercial District to take advantage of TIF funds.” Mr. Weeks asked “then why are we here tonight? If it is not necessary to have the lot in the Downtown Commercial District to use TIF funds why are we re-zoning it?”

Mr. Bartlett reviewed the dimensions of the lot on a projected graphic and the members discussed the underlying zoning of the two districts. It was noted that extending the lot into the Downtown Commercial District would not leave a non-conforming lot in the General Residence District once the subdivision was completed. Mr. Weeks noted “so it will go with the zoning” adding “and parking *is* allowed in the Downtown Commercial District.” Mr. Hanlon asked if the Board would be creating a precedent by creating a non-conforming lot with Chair Vann replying “no” adding “and the only thing before us tonight is whether or not to approve the amendment and move it to ballot.” She concluded “it is my personal feeling that this is not unreasonable. It is one lot away from other commercial properties, it is not an outrageous thing.”

A motion was made/seconded (Weeks/Galus) to approve the Amendment B as written and move it to the ballot with all in favor. Mr. Bartlett noted that the parking lot design would be subject to review for flood mitigation and storm water drainage requirements.

Mr. Weeks noted the pipe classification for that particular line was not on the as built sewer plans “but I bet it is Class 1500” he said. Mr. Weeks also noted there were two sewer connections under the parking lot to the existing buildings.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton
Administrative Assistant