

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

January 17, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Kenneth Kettenring, Chairman; Karen Gregg, Vice Chairman; Secretary, John Conkling, Kenneth Mertz, Neil Irvine, Robert Joseph, and Daniel Love were present.

George Luciano and Daniel Fielding were not present.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mrs. Lucas, Town Administrator

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Kettenring called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Robert Joseph was appointed to fill in for Mr. Luciano.

MINUTES:

12/20/11

Mrs. Gregg noted the last sentence on the first page under the Informational/Conceptual Meeting for Bruce Vaal, was not clear. She read: *He pointed out that Mr. Vaal was making changes to the plans from the original submission and given that the abutters have not been notified of the changes that the application should be rejected at this time and be required to be resubmitted.*

Mr. Kettenring suggested it should be two sentences with a period after "submission" and striking the word "that" in the second sentence.

Mr. Joseph made a motion to accept the minutes as corrected, seconded by Mr. Conkling. The motion was passed.

CORRESPONDENCE:

There was no correspondence.

**INFORMATIONAL/CONCEPTUAL
MEETING - SITE PLAN REVIEW**

Bruce Vaal, Owner G10, LLC
Tax Map R-5, Lot 5
599 Route 104

Mrs. Lucas noted the only correspondence she has received was from his engineer, Holden Engineering, requesting a copy of the decision of the Zoning Board regarding the setback of the existing building on the lot. He wanted to incorporate that decision into the plans he was preparing. Mrs. Lucas noted she had spoken with Mr. Vaal after the decision.

Mr. Irvine made a motion to table this item because of weather conditions and see if Mr. Vaal appears later in the meeting. This was seconded by Mr. Joseph. Mr. Mertz asked if Mr. Vaal was planning to submit a new plan. Mrs. Lucas said she explained to him the next meeting would be conceptual only if he was

bringing in a conceptual plan. His engineer had told her the month before he was working on a new conceptual plan. Mrs. Lucas advised Mr. Vaal the January meeting would be Informational/Conceptual and a new application and new plans would have to be submitted.

Mr. Kettenring confirmed the Board had voted to deny the existing plans without prejudice. The vote to table Mr. Vaal's Informational/Conceptual Meeting was passed.

**DISCUSSION OF 2012 ZONING
AMENDMENT AND ZONING
PETITION FOR MARCH 2012
TOWN MEETING**

Mr. Kettenring advised it is required the Planning Board vote to state whether it recommends or does not recommend the amendment by petition. This vote was not done at the last meeting. Mr. Kettenring read the statute requiring the action to the Board. Mr. Mertz advised he recused himself from this matter as he owned a home occupation in town.

Mr. Irvine stated he was not present at the last meeting and noted the wording of the petitioned amendment did not include any wording regarding height of displays. He asked if that had been discussed at the hearing. Mr. Kettenring advised the issue was brought up by a number of people who expressed concerns. He noted another person brought up the fact that the dimension of display could conceivably be 2 feet by 50 feet. Mr. Kettenring advised the petitioner was not present and the Board could not make any adjustment to its wording because it was a petition.

Mr. Irvine stated his position would be to not recommend this amendment. He was asked if he wished to make a motion to that effect. Mr. Irvine declined, wishing to hear any discussion from the Board first.

Mr. Conkling stated he thought the Board had voted to pass this item. Mr. Kettenring noted the motion voted on at the end of the hearing was whether to forward the petition to voters. He noted the Board did not vote as to whether it supported the petition or not.

Mr. Joseph commented that his concern was a certain quality in the town present for many generations, and secondly the particular party who put forward the petition was very close to the intersection with Route 104 and Main Street. Mr. Kettenring noted the petitioner's location was irrelevant as the petitioned amendment would be in effect town-wide. He noted a decision to support this or not support it would be based on consideration of this amendment applying all over town. Mr. Joseph noted he had real concerns for safety and a quality of life in this town which dated back to pre-revolutionary times. Mr. Joseph felt the

idea of preserving the separation of residential and commercial areas was important.

Mrs. Gregg stated that because of wording, the effect of the ordinance could be stretched in ways that would be uncomfortable for many people. Mr. Kettenring noted there is no mention of setbacks in the wording, so display could be right up to property lines.

Mr. Fielding asked if the Board voting would have any effect on the wording. Mr. Kettenring advised there could be no change to the wording at all. The Board would only advise voters if they recommend or not recommend passage of the proposed amendment.

Mr. Irvine asked if the Board would be asked to explain its recommendation at the Deliberative Session. Mr. Kettenring advised they could be asked. Mr. Love asked why the petitioner didn't ask for a variance. Mrs. Gregg asked Mrs. Lucas if the petitioner received any assistance on the wording. Mrs. Lucas advised that the petitioner had a discussion with the Select Board. The Selectmen explained to her that changing the zoning for her property was not possible (it is called "spot zoning"). She was informed about the variance, but the petitioner was not interested in that avenue. She indicated to the Selectmen that she felt outside display was a reasonable condition for home occupation.

Mr. Kettenring noted the petitioner never came before the Planning Board to develop the wording, and did not appear to support the petition at the hearing. He noted everyone who attended the hearing expressed opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Irvine made a motion that the Planning Board does not support the petitioned warrant article. This was seconded by Mr. Joseph. The motion was passed unanimously. Mrs. Lucas recommended the Board authorize a letter to the petitioner to explain the Board's position and to invite her to come before the Board to discuss the issue further if she desires. The consensus of the Board was to authorize the letter. Mrs. Lucas will provide a draft to the Chairman.

DISCUSSION:

Master Plan Update for 2012

It was recalled by the Board that in 2011 the Board intended to proceed with a new town survey as a starting point in the update of the Master Plan. Mr. Kettenring suggested the survey would prioritize the Master Plan sections for review and updating.

Mr. Conkling noted when he was researching the drive-thru matter with regard to the Mixed Use Zone he found a number of

items he felt could use review. Mr. Kettenring noted the Master Plan had different sections but was not like the ordinances. Mr. Irvine read the section headings which included Visioning, Population, Land Use and Historical Resources. Mr. Kettenring noted the Master Plan was a statement of philosophy and a guideline for planning and zoning.

Mrs. Gregg asked if the Board might consider having someone from the LRPC to speak to the Board regarding any changes in the way the Master Plans are done, or if other towns are doing things in a different manner. Mr. Conkling expressed a desire to invite Mr. Koulet of the LRPC to speak to the Board. Mr. Kettenring agreed the Board could use assistance developing the questionnaire. The Board is looking to evaluate the existing Master Plan and identify where there is a need for change or improvement.

Mr. Irvine offered to do this work. Mr. Mertz suggested forming a committee to meet on an off night and report back to the whole Planning Board. Mrs. Gregg asked for a clarification of what the committee was to do. Mr. Kettenring advised the committee would be charged to look at the master plan and determining the extent and priorities for revision.

Mr. Irvine, Mr. Mertz and Mrs. Gregg were appointed by Mr. Kettenring who advised they could set up their meeting times. He advised the Committee would be placed on the agenda each month to report their progress to the full Board.

As pointed out a year ago, Mr. Kettenring recalled, it has been some time since the last survey. He noted going outside the Board for input was not only preferable, but necessary. He added he did not see the entire Master Plan requiring a re-write. He envisioned the committee identifying those sections requiring updating, and prioritizing the work going forward. Mr. Kettenring said it was reasonable to expect several years to complete the entire plan.

Mr. Mertz noted there was a great deal of census information in the last survey. His sense was there had been too much emphasis on demographics determining what direction the town should go in – he felt a vote is a vote. Mr. Mertz asked for the other Board members' feelings on this point. Mr. Kettenring said at first blush he agreed with Mr. Mertz but the work of the committee would have to flush this out. Mr. Kettenring noted in some areas the demographics do matter in long and mid range planning and used housing for the elderly as an example. Mr. Mertz noted the last survey asked for a lot of personal information which made him less inclined to participate. Mr.

Irvine pointed out that the 2010 census information is available, as well as the last census before the previous survey. He noted it would be easy to point out the changes in demographics over time.

Mrs. Lucas suggested that knowing who was responding to the survey was equally important. Mr. Kettenring suggested that income was one question which turned him off, but age might be important to understand. Mr. Conkling suggested the survey should be via regular mail rather than email or a web survey.

Mrs. Gregg suggested a committee chairman be chosen. Mr. Kettenring advised it would be up to the committee to select their leader. Mr. Mertz advised he would contact Mrs. Gregg and Mr. Irvine to set up the first meeting of the committee.

TABLED ITEM:

Bruce Vaal, Owner G10, LLC
Tax Map R-5, Lot 5
599 Route 104

Mr. Irvine moved to take Mr. Vaal's Informational/Conceptual discussion off the table, seconded by Mr. Joseph. Mr. Vaal was not present.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mrs. Lucas reminded the Board that the open house for the new Public Safety Building will be on Saturday, January 21st from 10 am to 2 pm.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Irving and seconded by Mr. Joseph. The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin Harmon