

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

Minutes of April 8, 2013

Members Present: Vice Chair Ivy Vann, Barbara Miller, Alan Zeller, Tom Weeks, Jerry Galus, Audrey Cass and Rich Clark.

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

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Vann (Ms. Vann) at 7:00 p.m. She introduced the members and staff and noted “tonight we have a Site Plan Review for 26 Wilder Street.” It was noted the applicant, William Thomson was in the audience.

Looking at the application Mr. Vann noted “I expect the first thing we should do is review the waiver requests, then accept the application as complete and then go into the public hearing.” Ms. Ogilvie noted the building had been in its current state for quite some time. As the members reviewed the waiver requests Mr. Weeks noted he had a list of questions. He noted there were two plans, one with parking spaces being 9 by 8 feet in dimension and the *correct* plan, which denoted the parking dimensions as 9 by 18 feet in size.

Mr. Weeks stated that the narrative in the application noted a duplex with a studio type work/living space above the garage, the intent of which was to be a separate rental unit, making it the third rental unit on the property. Mr. Weeks said “the narrative states that there will be no changes to the exterior of the property or the driveway and parking.” He asked for clarification on the parking spaces for each unit, specifically spaces 5 and 6 (beyond the current paved area). The discussion that followed included the clarification that the parking spot size required is 9 by 18 feet *each* and tandem parking is not permitted. Mr. Weeks also noted that the plan did not state the surface material for parking spaces 1, 2 and 6. “We have no indication as to what the upgrade is going to be” he said and then asked “or are they just going to be parking on the lawn?” Mr. Thomson interjected that the intent was to be parking on the paved area and a discussion about the widening of the paved area with crushed stone or gravel followed. Mr. Weeks concluded that discussion by noting “there is no surface material or parking for spaces 1, 2 and 6. It shows they are currently parking on the lawn. That is all I am saying.” Ms. Vann interjected “Ok, do we want to require more of a driveway?” Mr. Weeks reiterated “it can be gravel” and asked “are we going to approve a site plan with parking on the lawn? I don’t think we have ever done that” he said.

The members continued to review the parking spaces with it being noted that spaces 3 and 4 were in the garage. Mr. Weeks suggested the surface material to widen the driveway be shown with Ms. Vann in agreement. “It should be shown so that we are *not* approving the plan with parking on the lawn.” Ms. Ogilvie noted the challenges of this particular case as the regulations “are for a different kind of development” with no new development and trying to accommodate parking at a home. “It is a little bit of a confusing situation that differs from a standard site plan” she said. When a member asked if the Board could allow tandem parking Ms. Ogilvie replied “no, you could waive the number of parking spots necessary but not that provision.”

Mr. Weeks stated the intent of the regulation was to keep people from parking in the street to avoid the hassles of moving tandem cars in and out. Ms. Vann suggested the plan should be amended to show the number 5 and 6 parking spaces as actual 9 by 18 foot stalls adjacent to the

garage, number 1 and 2 as 9 by 18 foot stalls with gravel added to meet the dimensional requirements. Additionally the amended plan will include the setback requirements and the word *approximately* will be removed from the plan. "That is a perfect solution" said Ms. Miller.

Mr. Weeks noted another problem with parking place number 2 on the driveway. After discussion the members also added a 3 by 18 foot swath of gravel or crushed stone to the driveway as well. Ms. Miller asked why they tenants couldn't just park on the grass with Mr. Weeks replying "our regulations require parking facilities."

Ms. Vann looked around and asked "so are we done? Is this complete?" Mr. Weeks made a motion to accept the plan. Mr. Galus noted they should accept the application as complete first. Ms. Vann noted the application was complete and the waivers requested were appropriate. A motion was made/seconded (Weeks/Miller) to accept the application as complete with all in favor.

Ms. Vann then noted she would entertain a motion to approve the application as presented with all the contingencies for parking incorporated (listed above). A motion was made/seconded (Weeks/Miller) to approve the site plan with the conditions noted with all in favor.

Mr. Weeks shook his head and said "I hate being *that* guy" with Ms. Vann replying "it's OK, somebody has to be *him*." At the same time with a smile Mr. Clark interjected "but you do *him* so well!"

Review of the Population and Housing Chapter of the Master Plan

Ms. Vann asked what the Board needed (if anything) to do with Ms. Ogilvie replying "really nothing, except for holding a public hearing." Ms. Ogilvie noted the completion of the Municipal Facilities Chapter and suggested they couple the two chapters in a single public hearing.

Work Program

Ms. Ogilvie noted "as you know we have talked about this and it just makes sense to wait until after town meeting to start work on this."

Ms. Ogilvie also noted a potential new alternate. She noted this individual has a lot of experience in other towns and may be willing to put their toes in the water here.

Minutes

A motion was made/seconded (Zeller/Cass) to approve the March 11, 2013 Minutes as written with all in favor.

Ms. Ogilvie reminded the members of the Spring OEP Planning and Zoning Conference on May 11th in Manchester.

The meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Norton
Administrative Assistant