

A special meeting of the City Planning Board was held on Wednesday, March 30, 2011, in the City Council Chambers in the City Hall Annex at 7:00 PM.

Present at the meeting were Members Drypolcher, Swope, Dolcino, Foss, and Hicks. Messrs. Woodward and Henninger, Ms. Hebert and Ms. Osgood of the City Planning Division were also present, as was Ms. Aibel, the City's Associate Engineer.

At 7:05 PM a quorum was present and the Chair called the meeting to order.

Annual Organizational Meeting

1. Annual Election of Officers

a. Election of a *Chair* for 2011

The Clerk presided over the election and called for nominations for Chair for the ensuing year.

Mr. Swope nominated Gerard Drypolcher for another term as Chair. Ms. Dolcino seconded. There were no other nominations.

Mr. Swope moved that nominations be closed and the Clerk be instructed to cast one ballot for Gerard Drypolcher for Chair for 2011. Ms. Dolcino seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Drypolcher again presided.

b. Election of a *Vice Chair* for 2011

The Chair called for nominations for Vice Chair for the ensuing year.

Ms. Foss nominated John Swope for another term as Vice Chair. Mr. Hicks seconded. There were no other nominations.

Ms. Foss moved that nominations be closed and the Clerk be instructed to cast one ballot for John Swope for Vice Chair for 2011. Mr. Hicks seconded. Motion carried.

2. Annual nominations of two **representatives to the Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission (CNHRPC)**.

Ms. Foss and Mr. Hicks expressed a willingness to continue to serve as representatives to the Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission.

Mr. Drypolcher moved and Mr. Swope seconded that Ms. Foss and Mr. Hicks be reappointed as the Board's representatives to the Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission. Motion carried.

3. Designation of a **representative to the Heritage Commission**

Mr. Woodward noted that Gerard Blanchette was the last member to represent the Planning Board on the Heritage Commission. There has been no representative since Mr. Blanchette resigned from the Planning Board. He further noted that Mr. Shurtleff currently serves on the Heritage Commission as the City Council's representative.

The Chair asked for a volunteer to represent the Planning Board on the Heritage Commission. There were no immediate volunteers and the appointment was postponed.

There was a brief discussion relative to Planning Board membership and the concern that there are currently two vacant positions and a number of hold-over appointments among Board members.

New Business

4. Consideration of a proposed **amendment to the Transportation Section of the Master Plan 2030** so as to incorporate references to the recently published bicycle planning documents.

Mr. Woodward explained that at the special meeting of the Planning Board on February 23, 2011, the Board received copies of two bicycle planning reports (City of Concord Bicycle Master Plan and the Merrimack River Greenway Path Feasibility Study - Concord, NH), and heard presentations relative to the reports. At the conclusion of the presentation and discussion, the Board voted to direct the Planning Division to prepare an amendment to the Transportation Section of the Master Plan 2030 that would be set for public hearing. The amendment would incorporate appropriate references to the documents presented.

He reported that the Planning Division had prepared a proposed amendment to the Transportation Section as well as edited the Master Plan Exhibit VI-3, Bicycle Plan. The annotated text revealed just how much material on bicycle transportation was included in the Master Plan 2030 for which a Pedestrian and Bicycle Workshop was held during the master planning process. Some of the proposed edits simply add a phrase about the inclusion of bicycle lanes to certain project descriptions to mirror what is shown in the Exhibit. New issues, or those issues which expand on issues previously raised in the Master Plan, relate to the need for bicycle parking facilities at destinations, increased focus on signage and pavement markings both for safety as well as navigation that will benefit bicyclists and motorists alike, and bike paths for bicycle commuting as well as recreational use. While off-road paths were previously referenced in the Master Plan, the phrase "shared use" path is incorporated as a reference to the proposed Merrimack River Greenway Path.

He reported that the edits to the Exhibit call for the addition of some new links in the Bicycle Plan as well as deletion of some that had been previously included. In some cases, the Exhibit had links which were not included in the new reports, but are retained

in the Exhibit. The general intent of the connections envisioned for the Merrimack River Greenway Path is displayed to the extent that links were not already shown, although links proposed for the high-speed rail corridor in the Opportunity Corridor are not included as this would conflict with the rail planning initiatives contained elsewhere in the Transportation Section of the Master Plan as well as the aspects of the Opportunity Corridor Plan which are also integrated within Master Plan 2030.

Ms. Foss and Ms. Dolcino noted minor edits that should be made.

Mr. Swope moved that the Planning Board schedule a public hearing for its regular meeting on April 20, 2011, to take testimony and consider adoption of an amendment to the Transportation Section of Master Plan 2030. Ms. Dolcino seconded. Motion carried.

5. Consideration of a report from the Deputy City Manager - Development relative to proposed **changes to the City's Land Use Regulations and Development Review Procedures- Part 1.**

Mr. Woodward reminded the Board about the public process conducted by a facilitator retained by Concord 2020 which hosted a series of public forums specific to the issue of land use regulations and development review practices. At the conclusion of the process, both Concord 2020 and EDAC submitted reports with their findings and recommendations for zoning amendments and other policy changes. These reports were referred to the Community Development Department by the City Council. The Community Development Department reviewed both reports and found that some of the recommendations had already been addressed but required more explanation, while others needed changes to make the regulatory process more efficient and responsive to the community. The report that the Board received from the Deputy City Manager is considered Part 1 of the results from the Department's review.

Mr. Woodward indicated that he would not go through the text of the report in detail unless Board members had questions. He noted that there was a page with a list of some 21 Exhibits, 11 of which were in the form of proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. He then provided a brief overview of the proposed ordinance changes, most of which had been drafted by the Planning Division but three of which were from the Code Division, primarily in response to items that were the focus of constant applications to the ZBA including removal and replacement of mobile homes, and certain non-conforming features of structures.

One proposed amendment was for a map change made by citizen request. Only one other amendment related to a map change which was actually based on the Master Plan's Land Use Section which called for breaking out the general business zone on Manchester Street as a locus for motor vehicle sales in the City, and restoring the other general business districts to mixed use zones exclusive of motor vehicle sales.

Mr. Swope felt that the recommendations for ordinance changes that involved mapping issues should not be grouped with proposed text changes. He felt map changes would

likely generate more citizen input than text changes and would likely need their own hearing by the Board.

Mr. Woodward also reported that a recommendation relative to language providing for living suites/accessory kitchens was actually not proposed as a Zoning Ordinance change but rather being proposed as a building code modification. This was intended to address the issue of "in-law" or accessory apartments without changing the Zoning Ordinance.

The Board discussed scheduling a special meeting to review these ordinances in detail, perhaps at the same time as the continued review of the site plan review regulations. This discussion was set aside until later in the meeting.

6. Consideration of a proposal for the **preparation of an Energy Section for Master Plan 2030.**

Mr. Woodward reported that the City's Energy Committee had expressed an interest in working with the Planning Board on preparing an Energy Section to the Master Plan. RSA 674: Master Plan: Purpose and Description, was amended in 2008 to provide the option to have a section on energy. The Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission has some funding available to provide assistance in this effort.

He reported that, unlike other more traditional sections of the master plan, there are no standardized models for an energy section. However, a number of communities across the State as well as the country have addressed the topic. The Planning Division sought information through the Planning Advisory Service, a research arm of the American Planning Association, and obtained some national publications together with citations from a number of Master Plans from communities as distant as Portland, Oregon and Olympia, Washington, to as proximate as Williston, Vermont and West Hartford, Connecticut. This information was used to help to frame an outline prepared by the Planning Division. Pending the Board's consideration of the outline, it will be shared with the Energy Committee for its input.

Mr. Swope felt this was timely but did not understand how the Planning Board would regulate something like this and what its goal would be. Mr. Woodward responded that there are green building codes now and some standards are built into the building codes now. The goal would be to encourage conservation of energy through not only regulation but also through programs and capital investments by the City.

Ms. Dolcino felt that the Master Plan could inform regulations regarding such things as composting and green roofs by setting priorities in the Master Plan. This would reinforce some of those policies.

Ms. Foss noted that there is a lot of interest in building with life cycle issues in mind and thought it might be worthwhile to consider devoting a chapter to the topic of life cycle construction.

The Planning Division will continue to work with the Energy Committee and start to gather information and continue to provide updates and status reports to the Planning Board on this effort.

Old Business

7. Continuation of the review of the draft **Site Plan Regulations with a focus on Chapter 4**, in general, and Sections 19, 20, 21, 22, and 26, in particular.

The Board continued its review of the draft Site Plan Regulations with a focus on Chapter 4.

Section 19 Access and Driveway Standards

Under Section 19.03, Ms. Dolcino questioned the rationale behind the requirement for separate driveways for each unit in a duplex. Mr. Henninger responded that this came about a few years ago as a result of applications the Board had been receiving that would provide a single driveway with parking stacked one behind the other, or alternatively, creating a large paved area for a parking lot. The intent was to allow each unit to have a driveway for the use of the respective unit. After discussion, Mr. Henninger indicated that he would look at the language of this section again.

Ms. Dolcino suggested adding "All residential units in these developments shall be independently accessible." to that section.

Section 20 Loading and Solid Waste Facility Standards

There were no comments on this section.

Section 21 Sidewalks, Multi-Use Paths, and Trails

Under Section 21.02, Ms. Dolcino suggested that the phrase "Isolated sections of sidewalks should be avoided" should be linked to the earlier sentence "Sidewalks may be required to link a site...."

Section 22 Storm Water Management

Mr. Henninger indicated that in many ways this section paralleled the recently updated Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Foss felt Section 22.03 backed off the general requirement noted in Section 22.01. She suggested it start with "After all reasonable efforts are made to reduce or eliminate runoff from the site, a connection should be made...."

She also suggested "...for storm water that cannot otherwise be infiltrated" to finish the sentence after "shall be required to connect to the municipal storm drainage system."

Under Section 22.14, Ms. Foss felt there should also be a reference to Best Management Practices. Ms. Aibel responded that the new State Alteration of Terrain regulations now have an entire section devoted to Best Management Practices.

Section 26 Buffers and Screening

Mr. Hicks had a question relative to the maintenance of fencing that is required as a condition of approval by the Board. Mr. Henninger responded he would add something about maintenance in this section.

Under Section 26.01, Ms. Foss expressed confusion about the term "buffer yards". Mr. Henninger responded that it was defined in the Zoning Ordinance. However, he suggested it could be changed to "buffer area".

There were no further comments on Sections 19, 20, 21, 22, and 26.

Members agreed to review Sections 27-30 at a special meeting on either April 27 or May 4, 2011 along with the Zoning Ordinance revisions discussed in the report from the Deputy City Manager for Development. It was noted that April 27 falls during a school vacation week and at least two of the members present would not be available; therefore May 4th appeared to be the preferable date for those present. However, the Clerk was instructed to email the membership to determine the availability of those members who were not in attendance this evening.

There was no further business to come before the Board and the meeting adjourned at 9:00 AM.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

Douglas G. Woodward
Clerk

o