**Planning Board**

Town of Greenfield

Approved Meeting Minutes

Recorded by Janice Pack

January 9, 2017

**Members Attending**: Paul Renaud, Robert Marshall, Steve Chicoine, Ken Paulsen, Andrew Heck, Sherry Fox, Andre Wood

*SChicoine will be voting for Angelique Moon who is absent tonight. AHeck will be voting for the Vacancy.*

**Meeting Opened**: 6:00 PM

**Minutes**: The Minutes were read by PRenaud. Several amendments were made.

Line 36: “RSA674:4a” changed to “RSA 674:4-a”.

Line 56: “Road Officer” changed to “DPW Supervisor”.

Line 57: “Jack Bellette” changed to “Jack Belletete, developer.”

Line 59: “residents” changed to “Homeowner’s Association”.

Line 61: “sometime” changed to “something”.

Line 62: added “No action was taken.” after sentence.

KPaulsen motioned to accept the minutes as amended. SFox seconded and all were in favor.

M**ail**

AP Folder with invoice from Ledger-Transcript for $256.25 for Public Hearing noticing

Town Calendar

Notice from Town of Bedford, NH announcing a meeting to be held on January 17, 2017 regarding a cell tower

Supply Lines Winter Newsletter

SWRPC Commission Highlights December 2016 flyer

**Old Business**

PRenaud did speak to Aaron Patt regarding the Fire Department using the pond at Cameron’s Way; there is nothing further that the Planning Board needs to do. PRenaud also heard from Mr. Langreck, who thanked us for meeting with him, and let us know that he had decided to drop his possible petition at this time.

Lisa Murphy will be here on February 13th for a review of the Energy Chapter for the Master Plan.

The Board discussed the upcoming new Town website, and what features it will have available. We will look forward to more information on this. Jack Moran asked ”who is the person who controls what will be put on that website?” RMarshall said he would ask APatt.

The funds were encumbered for the Master Plan work; PRenaud thanked the Select Board for their assistance with that.

**New Business**

6:30 PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS (began at 6:32 PM)

The purpose of the Public Hearing is to share information. PRenaud went over the ground rules, reminding all to be respectful, and to identify themselves when speaking for the record.

AMENDMENT 1 – PRenaud paraphrased the intent of Amendment 1, and referred to the new definition regarding accessory dwelling units from the State and the fact that we needed to make a few changes to our definition to be in compliance.

William McLaughlin asked if the dwelling units would be rental units or in-law apartments. He felt that should be specified, as one was for gain, and one was not. PRenaud said there were no requirements for economic relationship in the State right now. WMcLaughlin asked about services (septic, well, etc.). PRenaud stated that if this were to be proposed, it would need to go before Code Enforcement as they had regulations and guidelines that would need to be followed. WMcLaughlin asked if these rules were from the Town or from the State. PRenaud confirmed that we needed to amend our definition to comply with the State’s regulations. There were no further Public Comments. Instead of describing each amendment in detail, the Planning Board decided to attach a copy to the minutes of the amendments proposed.

AMENDMENT 2 – This eliminates the restriction of 25% of the total floor area, and pertains only to the Rural/Agricultural District. There were no public comments.

AMENDMENT 3 – The changes here were to clarify that there cannot be more than one detached accessory dwelling unit on the lot. Jack Moran asked if there was anything regarding resolution of conflict that said you would have to allow a detached dwelling unit if it didn’t meet other requirements (one being that you needed to have at least 5 acres). PRenaud said there was not. JMoran said as it was stated right now, for an attached dwelling unit, there must be an interior door between the principal dwelling unit and the attached dwelling unit. JMoran felt that it should specify that the interior door should be part of a shared wall. There were no further public comments.

AMENDMENT 4 - Linda Nickerson asked for clarification on the verbiage of Amendment 4, and whether or not it was implied that the owner was occupying the first dwelling unit. The language says “3 additional” but it does not mandate that the owner be occupying the principal dwelling unit. There were no other comments.

AMENDMENT 5 – PRenaud stated that the next three Amendments referred to apartment buildings, and were necessary to differentiate between attached accessory dwelling units and apartments. There were no public comments.

AMENDMENTS 6 and 7 – these are to allow apartment buildings in the Center Village District and the Business District. This is just to allow more housing options in these two districts. LNickerson stated that she couldn’t think of a piece of land that large in that district. WMcLaughlin asked how much frontage was required. PRenaud said that wasn’t changing. In the Center Village District, minimum frontage is currently 250’. Discussion turned to Back Lots (Section 4-e) and how these Amendments applied. Adele Hale asked why the minimum acreage per dwelling is 1.5 acres when all that is required is 2 parking spaces. If the Economic Development Advisory Committee would like to see more dwellings in this district, isn’t that requirement counterproductive? JMoran stated that the lot size requirement precludes anything as no one has that much land, so no apartments would be allowed to be built in those districts.

There were no other public comments.

AMENDMENT 8 – pertains to the Business District and its permitted uses. This Amendment eliminates some of the listed permitted uses and allows any proposals to be governed by impact. JMoran said that from an EDAC standpoint, they were trying to define regulations which had not been clearly defined. They were also trying to get to a point where they weren’t using multiple ordinances to achieve the same thing. JMoran mentioned that one of the terms EDAC was trying to come to terms with was “Entertainment Hall”. John Hopkins asked if there was a reason this was restricted to the business District. PRenaud said another Amendment might address the other districts. There were no further comments.

AMENDMENT 9 – This is where the term “entertainment halls” was written, and since there is no definition for such, striking that sentence would foster economic development. Of course, any proposed business in the Business District would still need to come before the Planning Board. There were no public comments.

AMENDMENT 10 – lowering the minimum frontage in the business district only from 150’ to 65’. This would make it more proportional to the lot sizes. PRenaud read an email from Frank Linnenbringer, the Access & Utilities Supervisor at the New Hampshire Department of Transportation District 4. His department is responsible for driveway permitting on state roadways. His email stated that our reducing the minimum lot frontage would not affect the number of driveways available or granted. There were no public comments.

AMENDMENT 11 – Professional Uses and Customary Home Occupations. The proposal is to eliminate the word “Customary” to make it less restrictive and provide leeway on approving businesses based on Impact. It also strikes the line “No more than two (2) persons outside the household shall be employed in the use”. JMoran asked that the Board consider that we don’t know what tomorrow looks like. The rate of change is so great that calling anything “customary” is simply too limiting. WMcLaughlin suggested the term “*acceptable* uses”. PRenaud stated that we were trying to be as flexible as possible to allow more outlets for home based businesses. JMoran said “we want to open up the way properties can be used, thereby increasing a property’s value down the road.” There were no further comments.

AMENDMENT 12 pertains only to the Rural/Agricultural District, and the proposed change allows more flexibility by not mandating that the owner of the property be a resident, too.

PRenaud said that the comments from Town Counsel pertained to the Amendments and he asked if the Board had any objections to him reading the comments before the public. No one had any objection. The comments were read, and will be filed. There were no public comments.

AMENDMENT 13 refers to the requirement for a Planning Board Report to the Board of Adjustment before a special exception or variance can be granted. The proposed changes are basically to protect the Planning Board. There were no public comments.

AMENDMENT 14 – repealing the Open Space Development Ordinance. The Ordinance was originally adopted in 2004. The Board feels that there are a lot of inherent problems now in enforcing a Homeowners Agreement and complying with the Open Space Development Ordinance. There are a lot of problems associated with common lands. The Board would like to repeal the ordinance, and if a proposal comes in, it can go the regular route. There were no public comments.

AMENDMENT 15 – Last year the Town was redistricted from four districts to five. This is basically a housekeeping amendment to clean up earlier changes. There were no public comments.

PRenaud wanted everyone to know that any special exceptions for Accessory Dwelling Units would need to be approved by the Zoning Board.

**Hearing no further public input, PRenaud closed the Public Hearing at 8:12 PM.**

The Planning Board proceeded to go through the Amendments individually to vote on each. PRenaud reminded all that 4 affirmative votes would be needed to put them on the ballot.

Amendment 1 – The Board discussed common doors and shared walls. It was decided to change the language to “Having an interior door in a shared wall between it and the primary dwelling unit.” It was felt this was a minor change. AWood motioned to accept the change, and AHeck seconded. All were in favor to move Amendment 1 as amended to the Ballot. RMarshall so moved, and SFox seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 2 – RMarshall motioned to move Amendment 2 to Ballot. SFox seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 3 - RMarshall motioned to move Amendment 3 to Ballot. AHeck seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 4 – The Board discussed the square footage requirements and minimums. RMarshall motioned to move Amendment 4 as written to Ballot. KPaulsen seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 5 – RMarshall motioned to move Amendment 5 to Ballot. AHeck seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 6 – AHeck motioned to move Amendment 6 to Ballot. SFox seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 7 – AHeck motioned to move Amendment 7 to Ballot. SFox seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 8 – The Board discussed the thoughts from Legal Counsel. AWood motioned to move Amendment 8 as written to Ballot. AHeck seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 9 – AWood motioned to move Amendment 9 to Ballot. SFox seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 10 – The Board discussed the email from the DOT. AHeck motioned to move Amendment 10 as written to Ballot. SFox seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 11 – The Board discussed whether or not there were enough controls in place to do away with the word “customary” and allow new businesses based on individual impact. RMarshall motioned to move Amendment 11 as written to Ballot. AWood seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 12 – AWood motioned to move Amendment 12 to Ballot. SFox seconded; all were in favor (7-0.)

Amendment 13 – RMarshall motioned to move Amendment 13 to Ballot. KPaulsen seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 14 –KPaulsen motioned to move Amendment 14 to Ballot. SFox seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

Amendment 15 –SFox motioned to move Amendment 15 to Ballot. KPaulsen seconded; all were in favor (7-0).

The Board agreed that there were no substantive changed, and no need for a second public hearing.

PRenaud moved to adjourn the meeting, and AWood seconded. All were in favor.

**The meeting adjourned at 9:39 PM.**

These minutes were Approved as Amended at the regular meeting held on 1/23/17.