

**TOWN OF NEW HAMPTON
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
NEW HAMPTON TOWN OFFICE
NEW HAMPTON, NH 03256**

January 21, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Mertz, Mr. Luciano, Mr. Love, Mr. Irvine, Mr. Joseph, Ms. Gregg (7:01 pm), and Mr. Kettenring (7:59 pm) were present.

OTHERS PRESENT: Town Administrator Mrs. Lucas and Reno & Paul Rossi were present.

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Mertz called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Mertz appointed Mr. Joseph to vote in place of Mr. Conkling.

MINUTES: Mr. Irvine made a motion, seconded by Mr. Joseph, to accept the minutes as written. The motion passed.
12/17/13

1/6/14 Mr. Irvine made a motion, seconded by Mr. Joseph, to accept the minutes with the following changes. The motion passed.

1. Page 6 - under discussion regarding sq. footage and its amendment up to 5,000, where the examples are given, the 2-acre and 3+ acre parcels need to change from 3,000 to 5,000.

CORRESPONDENCE: There was none.

MASTER PLAN UPDATE Mr. Mertz stated that there is nothing to report and the sub-committee is still working on the update.

FORMAL ACTION ON ZONING ORDINANCE CHANGES FOR 2014 Mrs. Lucas distributed copies of the warrant articles for zoning. She explained that the first public hearing was held on 1/6/14 and notices were posted for the 1st hearing and a 2nd hearing, if substantive changes were made. The posting met the statutory requirements. A 2nd hearing was necessary and was held on January 13, 2014. It was discovered that there must be 14 days between the two hearings, which was not the case. Town counsel advised that the board could either put forward the articles without the amendments made at the 1st hearing, or decide not to bring the articles to the voters at this time. Counsel also advised that if the Planning Board chose, they could hold one special election to consider the amendments made at the 1st hearing, which could place in conjunction with the State Primary.

The board reviewed the amendments that had been made at the 1st hearing, many of which were grammatical clarifications, which the board noted should be changed in the future. Relative to Warrant Article #7, Mr. Mertz stated that he believed the 3,000 sq. ft. limitation on outside display was an improvement to what existed previously in the ordinance, and felt that moving ahead with this amendment was appropriate, advising that the square footage limitation could be increased and amended at a later date. The board agreed. The board agreed all these changes could be proposed on a special ballot at the State Primary.

Mr. Irvine made a motion, seconded by Mr. Joseph, to proceed with the zoning amendments as presented at the 1st public hearing. Vote was unanimous.

The Planning Board took a position on each of the warrant articles:

1. Petition Warrant Article to repeal Article IV, Section C (4) vii. There was discussion that some members did not support the language used in the petition but supported the intent of the petition to rescind the 10% rule. There was concern that supporting this petition, could be a problem if the voters approved it, but voted against #7.
The board voted to support this article 4-1.
2. Amend Article IV, Section F (6) v.
The board voted to support this article 5-0.
3. Amend Article IV, Section F (7) iii.
The board voted to support this article 5-0.
4. Amend and add new definitions to Article XIV Definitions.
The board voted to support this article 5-0.
5. Amend Article IV, Section C 3 -Mixed Use District (MU).
The board voted to support this article 5-0.
6. Add to Article IV, Section F Village District (V). There was some discussion on the intent of this article being that the permitted Agricultural Uses in this district were to be for personal and not commercial use. The board agreed they would look at the language in the future, for further clarification.
The board voted to support this article 5-0.
7. Amend Article IV, Section C 4(v) - Mixed Use District (MU); Section D 4(v) - Business Commercial District (BC2); Section E 4(v) in the Business Commercial District (BC3).
The board voted to support this article 5-0.
8. Amend Article IV, Section C, 4(vii) - Mixed Use District (MU); Section D 4(vii) - Business Commercial District (BC2); Section E 4(vii) - Business Commercial District (BC3).
The board voted to support this article 5-0.

**CAPITAL
IMPROVEMENTS
PROGRAM**

Mr. Irvine advised that during the budget season there was discussion that there are some significant pieces of equipment that will need replacement such as the fire trucks, ambulances, loader, and grader. He said the department heads have been asked to provide age of vehicle, projected date of retirement, anticipated replacement costs. The Planning Board can then take this information to create the Capital Improvement Program so the voters can see what is anticipated in the future.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Realtor Richard Gowan was present. He said he is representing a client who wants to purchase 20 Old Bristol Road, which is very large and currently has 2 residences. His client would like to create 4 units out of the home. The only addition would be for parking spaces.

Mr. Irvine advised that the client came to meet with the Selectmen and it was noted that a multi family use was allowed by Special Exception. The board advised that after the client applies to the ZBA it would require an application to the Planning Board for Site Plan review. They suggested the Fire Chief be contacted for any possible life safety issues. Mr. Gowan said each unit would likely be 1,000-1,200 sq. ft. with 2 bedrooms each. Mrs. Lucas suggested that lighting be looked at, for its impact to abutting properties and to contact the Public Works Director, for site distance, due to the increased traffic with a multi-family.

Mrs. Lucas pointed out that under General Provisions in the Village District it states that Multi-Family does not require a Site Plan review. As state statute

(Planning Board, January 21, 2014, cont.)

dictates otherwise, this should be corrected at some point in the future. Mr. Kettenring advised that there is a statement in the ordinance which states that any provision in the ordinance which differs from any statute or regulation, the greater restriction or higher standard applies.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Mertz, seconded by Mr. Joseph. Vote was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela Vose

DRAFT