Moultonborough Planning Board P.O. Box 139 Moultonborough, NH 03254

Regular Meeting February 22, 2012

Minutes

Present: Members: Joanne Coppinger, Natt King, Chris Maroun, Tom Howard,

Peter Jensen; Town Planner, Bruce W. Woodruff

Alternate: Keith Nelson

Excused: Member: Judy Ryerson, Ed Charest (Selectmen's Representative)

I. Pledge of Allegiance

Ms. Coppinger called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. and appointed Keith Nelson to sit on the board with full voting privileges in place of Judy Ryerson.

II. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Nelson requested that for further clarification in a statement he made, additional language be added to the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 3 of the minutes, adding "or two parcels described in one deed."

Motion: Mr. King moved to approve the Planning Board Minutes of February 8, 2012, as

amended, seconded by Mr. Nelson, carried unanimously with Mr. Maroun

abstaining.

- III. New Submissions
- IV. Boundary Line Adjustments
- V. Hearings
- VI. Informal Discussions
- VII. Unfinished Business
- VIII. Other Business/Correspondence

<u>Discussion of Possible Projects for 2012 Work Plan</u> – Mr. Woodruff noted the board had been provided with a draft work plan in which he had revised based on the discussion from the last meeting. Members were asked to review the work plan and prioritize the items included on the draft. After compiling the results of the individual members, they reviewed the items to determine if all were satisfied with list of projects. Members were in agreement that there should only be about 10-12 items on the 2012 Work Plan. Board members discussed the time frame for the items, with some noting the twelve month schedule would need to be rearranged to accommodate the items in order of prioritization. Mr. Woodruff stated that could be done, but they should keep in mind that this was a list of items that could be worked on as time allows throughout the year.

<u>Discussion of Parking Standards</u> – Mr. Woodruff provided the board with a draft Parking Regulation Table which included many proposed uses, and the number of Vehicle parking spaces required for each use. He stated that the numbers were taken directly from the ITE parking standards. He also noted that he had reviewed the parking requirements for several other communities in New Hampshire. These parking regulations would become part of the Site Plan Regulations, therefore they may be waived or amended on an individual case by case application.

It was noted there was a column provided for Bicycle spaces. After a brief discussion regarding spaces for bicycles, members were in agreement that this column was not necessary for Moultonborough. Mr. Nelson questioned the requirement in the table for Professional Office, in which 5 parking spaces were required per employee on a maximum shift. This was discussed with the Planner, and members were in agreement that that appeared to be a high number. Mr. Woodruff will revise the requirement as discussed.

Board members were provided with a working draft copy of the Site Plan Regulations which included the insertion of the Parking Regulation Table and several other changes. It was the decision of the board to continue the discussion regarding the parking table until the work session on February 29th, allowing time for Mr. Woodruff to make the changes as discussed this evening.

Motion: Mr. Howard moved to table the discussion regarding Parking Standards to February 29, 2012, seconded by Mr. King, carried unanimously.

<u>Discussion of Access Management</u> – Board members referred to the Planners Memo dated October 3, 2011, regarding access management. Mr. Woodruff noted the suggestions had been inserted into the working draft copy of the Site Plan Regulations. Members reviewed the standards, which include a matrix for driveway locations and spacing standards for Non-Residential Uses in all zoning districts. Mr. Woodruff stated the reasons why these standards were necessary was to reduce the number of conflict points for vehicles, reduce traffic congestion and improve traffic safety along all corridors that have non-residential uses.

Mr. Nelson noted the matrix referred to arterial, collector and local roads, and questioned if there was a definition for the three. Mr. Woodruff stated yes. Members felt that the definitions should be included in the language. Mr. Woodruff will revise the draft to include the definitions.

Mr. Nelson referred to a section which offers an incentive for the reduction of driveways, and questioned if an access road provided between two or more lots would count in lot coverage. Board members discussed this, noting that it has been the practice of the Board to count that area when calculating lot coverage. There was a question regarding lot coverage, what was the purpose of it? Is it for environmental or aesthetics and density? Members questioned if pervious materials, such as pervious pavement or pervious concrete were calculated in lot coverage. Again, it was noted that it has been the practice of the Board to count that area as lot coverage. It was stated that an area on a site which is grass, but is used for a display area is also calculated as lot coverage. Board members requested Mr. Woodruff craft and propose a definition for lot coverage.

Other questions and discussion were related to reducing setbacks and allowing an increase in building height.

Ms. Coppinger stated that there was a conflict in the working draft copy of the Site Plan regulations regarding the Technical Review Committee (TRC). In one section the regulations states "Applicants are strongly encouraged to meet with the Technical Review Committee to ensure technical compliance and completeness of the proposal, regardless of whether an informal review occurs. and another section which" and another section which states "The Planning Board shall take no action on an Applicant's development proposal until it has received a report from the TRC evaluating said proposal". She noted one says strongly encouraged, while the other says the Board shall take no action until an applicant has met with the TRC. Mr. Jensen questioned if the Planning Board Chairperson should be included in the TRC. He went onto say that in the seminars held by the Local Government Center (LGC) it has been said

PB Minutes 2/22/12 Page 2

that board members should not participate in such reviews. Members asked that Mr. Woodruff contact LGC regarding this, and solicit their position on this subject. Mr. King, Howard and Maroun did not think that a PB member should be on the TRC.

Mr. Woodruff will make the changes as requested by the board. Not to include an interconnecting access road between lots in the lot coverage calculations and to add a purpose and definition for lot coverage.

The board closed their discussion on access management at this time. They will review a revised draft on February 29th.

- 1. Mr. Woodruff stated that Cristina Ashjian had noted at the prior meeting that Plan NH was accepting applications for grants for the 2012-2013 Charrette Program. The Board had requested Mr. Woodruff to look into the grant and the deadline. He noted the deadline is March 16th. If Moultonborough were chosen, Plan NH requires a payment of \$5,000, and the value of the Charrette team is between \$25,000 and \$50,000. Ms. Ashjian has volunteered to complete the application with the assistance of the Planner and have the Heritage Commission (HC) as the applicant so long as the work product is what the Planning Board has agreed to was adhered to. The HC will discuss this at their meeting on February 27th. It was noted that there were not any funds appropriated for the \$5,000, and the funds would need to be secured by stakeholders if the town was chosen for the grant.
- 2. Zoning Board of Adjustment Draft Minutes of February 15, 2012 were noted.
- 3. Selectmen's Draft Minutes of February 16, 2012 were noted.
- IX. Committee Reports
- **X. Adjournment:** Mr. King made the motion to adjourn at 9:16 PM, seconded by Mr. Howard, carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted, Bonnie L. Whitney Administrative Assistant

PB Minutes 2/22/12 Page 3