

**FRANKLIN PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING MEETING
November 8, 2017
7:00 p.m.**

Minutes

Call to Order: 7:05 PM

❑ **Pledge of Allegiance**

- ❑ **Roll Call Present:** Brian Colburn, David Testerman, Jim Wells, Tim Stangroom, Scott Clarenbach, Jo Brown, Tim Flaherty, David Veysey, Richard Lewis **Absent:** Brian Sullivan, Ted Starkweather, Michael Freeman, Anthony Giunta
Chairman seated Mr. Flaherty for Mr. Sullivan and Councilor Wells for Tony Giunta.

- ❑ **Approval of Minutes from September 27th Meeting:** Member Flaherty/Mayor Clarenbach motioned / seconded acceptance of the September 27, 2017 minutes. Member Stangroom stated that he did not second a motion for acceptance of P17-05. It was corrected to be Brian Sullivan. With that correction the minutes were approved by a vote of 8-0-0.

Old Business: None

New Business:

- ❑ **P 17-06: Community Action Program**, applicant, is seeking Site Plan approval for the construction of, and site work for, a proposed 5,000 sq. ft. office building to replace a larger facility, at 82 Elkins Street, [Map/Lot 118-014-00, Map Sheet O8] in the R3 [1, 2, & 3 family Residential] district. Member Brown motioned / Member Veysey seconded to accept. All in favor

Gary Spaulding with Spaulding Design presented a quick description of the project which calls for the demolition of the existing 6000 sq. foot building and the construction of a 5000 sq. foot building with a new parking configuration. However since the application was submitted they have come up with an alternate plan which will further reduce the amount of pavement and lower the cost of the project. The new concept places the building closer to the front of the property which will create more green space on this abutter's side as well as a larger bio-retention area. The redesigned parking area accommodates 22 parking spaces.

Chair Colburn asked Planner Lewis if the new plan being presented right now complicated things. Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Spaulding what the square footage reduction in impervious area would be with the new plan. Mr. Spaulding answered that the original impervious area (pavement and building) was 62%. On the new plan it's 55%. The lawn area goes from 9100 square feet to 10,800 sq. ft. The new plan gives better retention area for drainage. It also limits access to one entrance off Winnepesaukee. Cost wise this is the better alternative.

Planner Lewis left it up to the Board to decide if they wished to accept this new plan, but added that any reduction to the total impervious area is a plus.

Member Brown asked what is gained by just having one entrance instead of one-way through traffic the parking area. Mr. Spaulding answered that the new plan with straight in parking offers better traffic flow and snow removal.

Member Stangroom inquired about the impact for a fire truck to enter into and out of this type of pattern? Mr. Spaulding said there was no need to get access behind the building for the fire trucks.

Member Veysey asked about the daily traffic flow through the site and whether the parking lot is always full.

Ralph Littlefield, Director of Community Action Agency for Belknap-Merrimack Counties answered that there is a constant flow on the site itself, but there are key days, for example WIC clinic days, when the parking lot is full. The 22 slots proposed should be sufficient to handle the need. Generally the clients have scheduled appointments.

Chairman Colburn asked about run off from the roof and the need for gutters. He also expressed a concern over the lack of a catch basin. Cindy Lewis, Architectural Link, answered that gutters were proposed over the areas where people walked. Mr. Spaulding added that the downspouts could be piped down to the bio-retention area. The Chairman then asked about the gap in the public sidewalk on Elkins Street. Planner Lewis said that there is talk in the City about eliminating some of the city sidewalks for both maintenance and cost reasons.

Public Comments: Greg Meagher, 91 Elkins, a direct abutter expressed concern about light pollution that would be created if the previous plan with the angled parking was used. He also mentioned that a lot of storm water discharge onto his property from the CAP parking lot. He felt the revised plan was better, but added that there might still be the need for some buffering with either a fence or plantings. Mr. Meagher questioned a couple statements on both the Planning Director's memo to the board and the Decisions and Conditions portion of the application. Planner Lewis addressed those points and stated that the condition that No Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued until the As-Built is submitted will be eliminated on the final decision.

Mr. Meagher reiterated that he would like to see some screening from the parking area, but that the neighborhood maintains a residential look.

No more public comments were made.

Chair Colburn asked about an additional condition to include landscaping for buffering purposes. He also encouraged a review of the sidewalk issue.

Planner Lewis suggested that in light of the revised plan the discussion be continued at the December 13th meeting after the members had sufficient time to review the revised application.

Member Flaherty / Mayor Clarenbach made and seconded the motion to continue the discussion at the December 13th meeting. By a vote of 8-0-0 the motion was approved.

- ❑ **P 17-07: Walter Brumbaugh**, owner/applicant is seeking Site Plan approval for the construction of a 20 ft. x 28 ft. addition to an existing auto repair garage, which was granted an original variance to operate in 1992. The property is located at 43 Nelson Street [Map/Lot 097-078-00, Map Sheet M7] on the R2 [High Density Residential] district.

Planner Lewis mentioned that the Zoning Board approved the variance for the non-conforming use on November 1st. He also mentioned that the pad for this 20' x 28' addition has been in place for a

number of years. The former owner installed the car lift on the pad. Mr. Brumbaugh is looking for site plan approval so he can enclose pad area so he can use the larger lift for doing work on bigger trucks. The property is of substantial size and there is no issue with setbacks.

Members Brown / Veysey motioned and seconded acceptance of the application. All were in favor.

Mr. Brumbaugh said that all he wanted to do was enclose the existing pad and knee wall so he can utilize the outside lift which rises higher than the lift in the current garage area.

Member Stangroom asked Mr. Brumbaugh if he was planning on putting office space above the work space and Mr. Brumbaugh answered that the 8 feet in height of the new structure is just to accommodate the full range of the lift.

Deborah Smith, abutter at 42 Nelson Street, informed the board that she is concerned about the cars parking on the side of the street and requested that Mr. Brumbaugh provide parking on his property. She also mentioned the possibility of installing a fence or plantings to block the view a bit.

Planner Lewis pointed out that the 1992 conditions, which limit the number of vehicles and the hours of operation, still apply. He also noted that the new Zoning Board approval was conditional on no further expansion of the operation to include towing or spray painting. If the Board were to approve the site plan there might be the requirement that parking be behind the garage or in the existing parking area and not on the street. Mr. Brumbaugh had no objection to that and added that he would provide directional signs for parking.

Chairman Colburn brought the discussion back to the Board asking if they were okay with the condition. Member Stangroom asked about any documentation for the original denial of the addition to the garage and Planner Lewis said he couldn't find any, but that the new owner has the right to come back and try again.

Member Stangroom then asked about the site and the possibility of any chemicals going down the slope into Chance Pond. Mr. Lewis answered that the site is pretty flat, and then questioned the owner as to what he did with used oil. Mr. Brumbaugh answered that he has someone come in to pick it up but he intends to get a used oil furnace. Member Flaherty asked if an additional stipulation be made that used oil either be picked up or burned and that all hazardous materials be handled in compliance with state requirements.

Member Veysey motioned / Member Flaherty seconded the approval of the site plan. By a vote of 8-0-0 the motion passed.

Public Comment: none

Other Business: Member Testerman stated that during the site plan approval for the CATCH project on Memorial Street, he asked if there was going to be any Section 8 housing and was told that it going to be market grade housing. Now it appears that it is going to be Section 8 Housing. Planner Lewis answered that although he is on the Board for CATCH, he abstained from any discussions with this project. He went on to say that CATCH always represented it as affordable housing which has many shades. Under the terms of the grants and loans that they received they have to allow housing for qualified individuals. Member Testerman said he distinctly remembered that when he asked about the housing he was told Market grade. Planner Lewis said he would have to consult the minutes. He added that since the time when the discussion of Section 8 housing cropped up he talked to the downtown development coordinator for the City of Concord about their experiences. Concord did not

Approved Dec. 13, 2017

even discuss the Section 8 issue since this voucher program can be applied anywhere. Planner Lewis also added that CATCH has outlined the extensive application review process: income requirements, background checks, drug checks, et cetera. Those thresholds and requirements for CATCH apply to all who are applying for CATCH housing whether you are paying out of your own pocket or with a Section 8 voucher.

Mayor Clarenbach stated that when CATCH came in front of the council they stated it was going to be 50-55% low income housing. The grant is what we required and it didn't say section 8, but a qualified applicant can't be denied just because they are using Section 8 vouchers.

Chairman Colburn also suggested a review of the minutes. He said he remembered workforce and affordable but not market rate housing or Section 8. He then suggested making contact with CATCH to see what their requirements are. Member Brown stated that she has been in contact with CATCH because her daughters are applying. There are very stringent requirements, but under the Fair Housing Act the city can not deny any fully qualified person due to their Section 8. She added that she didn't recall market rate which would be about \$800-\$900 a month and the proposed rents are more in the \$700- \$750 range.

Planner's Update: Planner Lewis mentioned the 10/11/17 Master Plan public hearing; since then some revisions, editing, and formatting work have been done. There were some minor revisions in the Vision Section and clearer goals, uses and objectives included in the Land Use Section. After running the revised draft by several city departments, he will be seeking approval in January or February of 2018. Member Brown remarked that she liked the concept of measureable goals. Planner Lewis said he detailed those goals in bullet statements so that it would be possible to go back and see if the goals were reached.

Mayor Clarenbach stated that the Planning Board needs to give guidance to the city council and the city manager regarding the direction in which the community needs to go. He added that he thinks that's a connection that has been missed in the past. The Master Plan document and the CIP document should be the two pillars as to where we need to go. Even with the guidance there can be steps made to make sure everybody is on the same page. This is an important document for the community.

Adjournment: 8:05 P.M.