

**CITY OF CONCORD PLANNING BOARD
March 20, 2013 MEETING**

The regular monthly meeting of the City Planning Board was held on March 20, 2013, in City Council Chambers, in the Municipal Complex, at 37 Green Street, at 7:00 p.m.

Present at the meeting were Chair Drypolcher and Members Kenison, Hicks, Smith Meyer, Swope, and Dolcino. City Planner McPherson, Mr. Henninger, Ms. Hebert and Ms. Muir of the City's Planning Division were also present.

The Chair sat Alternate Members Dolcino and Kenison for Members Regan and Lavers, respectively.

At 7:00 p.m., a quorum was present and the Chair called the meeting to order.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Architectural Design Review Applications

- 1. Applications by the following for approval of signs at the following locations under the provisions of Section 28-9-4 (f), Architectural Design Review, of the City of Concord's Code of Ordinances:**

The Chair opened the public hearings for all the sign applications.

- **Application by the Ninety Nine Restaurant requesting Architectural Design Review approval for façade renovations, new awnings and light fixtures, located at 60-66 D'Amante Drive, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Henninger stated that the applicant is proposing renovations to the exterior of the restaurant, including a comprehensive repainting, new awnings, new exterior building lights, and minor modification to the entry vestibule. He stated that the Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) recommended approval as submitted, with the recommendation that the existing screening around the loading docks and dumpsters be painted to match the body of the building. Mr. Henninger advised the Board that the architectural elevations had been revised to show the screening for the loading docks, dumpsters and the cladding for the refrigerator units had been addressed.

Hearing no comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Hicks moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval to allow for renovations to the Ninety-Nine Restaurant at 60-66 D'Amante Drive as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Picnic Point Holding requesting Architectural Design Review approval for façade renovations, located at 32 Commercial Street, within the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the application is to modify two façades of an existing wood-frame addition to a historic brick building at 32 Commercial Street, including the substitution of segmented hardipanel for metal siding on the two façades, a replacement window facing Commercial Street, and the substitution of a window for a doorway on the western façade facing 28 Commercial Street. He stated that the ADRC recommended approval of the renovations as proposed.

Hearing no comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval to allow for renovations at 32 Commercial Street by Picnic Point Holding as submitted. Mr. Hicks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Natalia Strong / Soup Gallery LLC, requesting Architectural Design Review approval for a new hanging sign, located at 55 North Main Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger explained that the application is for a new hanging sign on an existing bracket. Mr. Henninger reported that the ADRC recommended approval as submitted.

Hearing no comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for the new hanging sign as submitted by the applicant. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by US Cellular requesting Architectural Design Review approval for a replacement affixed sign and a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign, located at 260 Loudon Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Henninger explained that the application is for a replacement affixed sign and a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign. Mr. Henninger reported that the ADRC recommended approval as submitted, with the recommendation that the background of the affixed sign remain white as shown on the plan dated March 6, 2013.

Hearing no comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to grant Architectural Design Review approval for a replacement affixed sign and a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign with the stipulation that the background of the

affixed sign remain white as shown on the plan dated March 6, 2013. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Michael Baron / Baron's Appliances requesting Architectural Design Review approval for a new changeable copy sign over a portion of an existing time and temperature freestanding sign located at 350 Loudon Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Ms. McPherson reported that the ADRC voted to table the application.

Mr. Kenison moved to table the application per the recommendation of the ADRC. Ms. Dolcino Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Carlson's Motor Corp. requesting Architectural Design Review approval for a replacement time and temperature sign and a replacement changeable copy sign both on an existing freestanding sign, located at 13 Manchester Street, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Ms. McPherson reported that the ADRC voted to table the application.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to table the application per the recommendation of the ADRC. Ms. Dolcino Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Subdivision Application

- 2. Application by Donald Stever and Sarah Heath, for property located at 44 Graham Road, requesting Minor Subdivision approval for a lot line adjustment creating no new lots. (2013-0011).**

Ms. Hebert stated that the application is complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Swope moved and Ms. Smith Meyer seconded that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and ready for public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

John Arnold, from Hinckley Allen Snyder, and Jen McCourt from McCourt Engineering, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Arnold explained that the purpose of the subdivision is to adjust a lot line between the Stever property at 44 Graham Road and the Heath property off of Shaker Road, annexing 9.22 acres of back land from the Heath property to the Stever property. He reported that the Generation Farm project was approved by the Planning Board about a year ago.

Ms. McCourt stated that currently the Stever parcel is 66.10 acres and the Heath parcel is 73 acres; with the subdivision the proposed lots would be 75.32 acres (Stever) and 64 acres (Heath). She summarized the requested waivers explaining that most of the waivers were being requested due to the large size of the two lots and the land being transferred is a small portion of back land. She stated that the plan provides enough detail to clearly depict the land conveyance.

Ms. Hebert stated that the staff supports the approval of the lot line adjustment and that no construction on the lots is being proposed.

Hearing no further comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a waiver to Sections 15.02(3) and (4) of the City of Concord Subdivision Regulations, to allow the plan to be prepared at a scale of 1" = 100' for the area of land being transferred and a scale of 1" = 200' for the remaining area of the parcels. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a waiver to Sections 15.02(6) & 15.03(2) of the City of Concord Subdivision Regulations, to not provide a survey at an error of closure of 1 in 10,000 for the entire boundary line of the Heath property off of Shaker Road. The plan provides adequate detail to clearly depict the land conveyance. The area of land to be transferred to the Stevers has been surveyed at an error of closure greater than 1 in 10,000 and the entire boundary of the Stever property was also recently surveyed. The approximate bearing and dimensions of the Heath property boundary have been shown at a scale of 1" = 200'. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a waiver Sections 12.03(5), 12.07, 12.09(5) & 15.01(3) of the City of Concord Subdivision Regulations, to not include the natural features, wetland boundaries and buffers on the lot line adjustment plan. The plan includes the transfer of a small area of back land and no new construction is proposed. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a waiver to Sections 12.08(3) & 15.03(4) of the City of Concord Subdivision Regulations, to not include the topographic information on the lot line adjustment plan. The plan includes the transfer of a small area of back land and no new construction is proposed. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Swope moved to grant final subdivision approval for the Minor Subdivision application of the Donald Stever Revocable Trust and Sarah Heath, as prepared by J.E. Belanger Land Surveying, PLLC, plan entitled "Resubdivision Plan Between Lots 3 & 13 Tax Map 123 Block 3" subject to the following condition:

1. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the applicant shall revise the plat drawings to address any minor corrections and omissions noted by City staff.

Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Conditional Use Permit Applications

- 3. Application by AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. / Centerline Communications LLC, for property located at 19 Industrial Park Drive, requesting a Conditional Use Permit with Architectural Design Review approval, pursuant to Article 28-5-23, Wireless Telecommunications Equipment, of the Concord Zoning Ordinance, for the installation of new and replacement equipment in an existing fully-enclosed cell tower and new and replacement ground-mounted equipment within the existing compound. (2013-0001)**

Mr. Henninger stated that the application is complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Hicks moved and Mr. Kenison seconded that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and ready for public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

John Lawrence, from Centerline Communications LLC, was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Lawrence stated that the proposal is to remove three existing antennas and add three new antennas, which will remain interior to the pole. He explained that there would be no changes to the site. Mr. Lawrence explained that AT&T is doing upgrades within the City, which will improve data functions for its customers.

Hearing no further comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow the installation and alteration of wireless telecommunication equipment in an existing tower as requested by the applicant at 19 Industrial Park Drive, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed wireless equipment shroud and accessory ground mounted equipment shall match the existing color of the pole and equipment.
2. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the applicant shall provide a financial guarantee for the removal or demolition and disposal of the antennas pursuant to Article 28-5-23(i) of the City of Concord Zoning Ordinance. The financial guarantee shall be in an amount as approved by the City Engineer and in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor. The term of the guarantee shall extend one year past the period of validity of the permit.
3. In accordance with Article 28-5-23 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for a period of three years from the date of the vote of the Board. The permit may be renewed pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b).

Mr. Hicks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Application by Global Tower Partners / Centerline Communications LLC, for property located at 2 Pillsbury Street, requesting Architectural Design Review approval for the installation of new and replacement antennas and equipment on the rooftop and side of an existing building. (2013-0002)

Mr. Henninger stated that the application is complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Hicks moved and Mr. Kenison seconded that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and ready for public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

John Lawrence, from Centerline Communications LLC, was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Lawrence stated that currently there are six antennas and the proposal is to add three additional antennas and remote radio heads on the roof. He explained that the proposed new and replacement antenna will be painted to match the walls they will be placed upon, the new rooftop equipment will be placed adjacent to existing roof equipment and will match the equipment in color and size, and a surge protector will be placed on the stair tower roof. Mr. Lawrence reported that the surge protector will be relatively short and will not be visible from many locations.

Hearing no further comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Hicks asked whether the existing antennas will be painted at the same time as the new antennas will be installed. Mr. Lawrence responded that this was not in the plan, but could be a condition of approval.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant a Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow the installation and alteration of wireless telecommunication equipment in an existing tower as requested by the applicant at 2 Pillsbury Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed wireless equipment and rooftop mechanical shall match the existing antenna and equipment.
2. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the applicant shall provide a financial guarantee for the removal or demolition and disposal of the antennas pursuant to Article 28-5-23(i) of the City of Concord Zoning Ordinance. The financial guarantee shall be in an amount as approved by the City Engineer and in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor. The term of the guarantee shall extend one year past the period of validity of the permit.
3. In accordance with Article 28-5-23 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for a period of three years from the date of the vote of the Board. The permit may be renewed pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b).

4. Existing antennas will be repainted at the time the new antennas are installed to match the new antennas.

Mr. Swope seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- 5. Application by Crown Castle / Centerline Communications LLC, for property located at 217 Fisherville Road, requesting Architectural Design Review approval for the addition of new antennas, remote radio heads , and surge arrestor on an existing monopole and new and replacement ground-mounted equipment within the existing compound. (2013-0003)**

Mr. Henninger stated that the application is complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Swope moved and Ms. Smith Meyer seconded that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and ready for public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

John Lawrence, from Centerline Communications LLC, was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Lawrence stated that there are currently six antennas on a monopole and the proposal is to add three additional antennas and remote radio heads on the existing monopole at the same height as the existing equipment. He explained new and replacement ground-mounted equipment will be housed in an existing fenced enclosure at the base of the tower.

Hearing no further comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Mr. Swope moved to grant a Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow the installation of wireless telecommunication equipment in an existing tower as requested by the applicant at 217 Fisherville Road, subject to the following conditions:

1. The three proposed wireless telecommunications antennas and six proposed radio reception units (RRUS-11) shall be installed at a centerline height of 168 feet, as shown on the submitted plans, and shall be grey in color to match the existing tower.
2. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the applicant shall provide a financial guarantee for the removal or demolition and disposal of the antennas pursuant to Article 28-5-23(i) of the City of Concord Zoning Ordinance. The financial guarantee shall be in an amount as approved by the City Engineer and in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor. The term of the guarantee shall extend one year past the period of validity of the permit.
3. In accordance with Article 28-5-23 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for a period of three years from the date of the vote of the Board. The permit may be renewed pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b).

Mr. Kenison seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Application by Crown Castle / Centerline Communications LLC, for property located at 102 Little Pond Road, requesting Architectural Design Review approval for the addition of new antennas, remote radio heads , and surge arrestor on an existing monopole and new and replacement ground-mounted equipment within the existing compound. (2013-0004)

Ms. Dolcino recused herself from this hearing.

Mr. Henninger stated that the application is complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Swope moved and Ms. Smith Meyer seconded that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and ready for public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

John Lawrence, from Centerline Communications LLC, was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Lawrence stated that the proposal is to add three additional antennas and six remote radio heads on the existing lattice tower at the same height as the existing equipment. He explained new and replacement ground-mounted equipment will be housed in an existing fenced enclosure at the base of the tower.

Hearing no further comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant a Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow the installation of wireless telecommunication equipment in an existing tower as requested by the applicant at 217 Fisherville Road, subject to the following conditions:

1. The three proposed wireless telecommunications antennas and six proposed radio reception units (RRUS-11) shall be installed at a centerline height of 156 feet, as shown on the submitted plans, and shall be grey in color to match the existing tower.
2. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the applicant shall provide a financial guarantee for the removal or demolition and disposal of the antennas pursuant to Article 28-5-23(i) of the City of Concord Zoning Ordinance. The financial guarantee shall be in an amount as approved by the City Engineer and in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor. The term of the guarantee shall extend one year past the period of validity of the permit.
3. In accordance with Article 28-5-23 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for a period of three years from the date of the vote of the Board. The permit may be renewed pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b).

Mr. Swope seconded the motion. Motion carried with five members affirming the vote and Ms. Dolcino abstaining.

7. Application by Crown Castle / Centerline Communications LLC, for property located at 58 Locke Road, requesting Architectural Design Review approval for the addition of new antennas, remote radio heads , and surge arrestor on an existing monopole and new and replacement ground-mounted equipment within the existing compound. (2013-0005)

Mr. Henninger stated that the application is complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Kenison moved and Mr. Hicks seconded that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and ready for public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

John Lawrence, from Centerline Communications LLC, was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Lawrence stated that the proposal is to add three additional antennas and six remote radio heads on the monopole at the same height as the existing equipment. He explained new and replacement ground-mounted equipment will be housed in an existing fenced enclosure at the base of the tower.

Hearing no further comments from either the applicant or the public, the Chair closed the public hearing and the Board began deliberations.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant a Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow the installation of wireless telecommunication equipment in an existing tower as requested by the applicant at 217 Fisherville Road, subject to the following conditions:

1. The three proposed wireless telecommunications antennas and six proposed radio reception units (RRUS-11) shall be installed at a centerline height of 170 feet, as shown on the submitted plans, and shall be grey in color to match the existing tower.
2. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the applicant shall provide a financial guarantee for the removal or demolition and disposal of the antennas pursuant to Article 28-5-23(i) of the City of Concord Zoning Ordinance. The financial guarantee shall be in an amount as approved by the City Engineer and in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor. The term of the guarantee shall extend one year past the period of validity of the permit.
3. In accordance with Article 28-5-23 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for a period of three years from the date of the vote of the Board. The permit may be renewed pursuant to Article 28-5-23(b).

Mr. Swope seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Site Plan Review

8. Application by Havenwood-Heritage Heights, for property located at 149 East Side Drive, requesting Site Plan approval, Architectural Design Review approval, a Conditional Use

Permit pursuant to Section 28-4-4(d), Disturbance to Bluffs and Buffers to Bluffs, and a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 28-2-4(j) and 28-8-2(c), Modification of an Existing Residential Social Service Center, of the Zoning Ordinance, for the redevelopment of the north end of the property, including the demolition of 65 residential dwelling units, construction of 34 new residential dwelling units, construction of a new private road, driveways, sidewalks, stormwater management, lighting, landscaping, and related site improvements. (2013-0008)

Ms. Hebert stated that the application is complete and ready to be set for public hearing on April 17, 2013.

Mr. Swope moved and Ms. Smith Meyer seconded that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and set it for public hearing on April 17, 2013. Motion carried unanimously.

Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance

9. **Consideration of proposed amendments to Article 28-4, *Development Design Standards*, which would add a new development type, *Continuing Care Retirement Community*, and design and performance standards; and corollary amendments to Section 28-2-4(j) *Table of Principle Uses*, Section 28-9-4(f) *Decisions by the Planning Board*, *Architectural Design Review* and Section 28-7-2(e) (A) *Table of Off-Street Parking Requirements, Principal Uses, Residential*.**

The Chair stated that this hearing was continued from last month and that he would like to continue it until the next meeting, as the Planning staff is waiting for additional information from the Code Administration

Ms. Smith Meyer moved that the Planning Board continue this hearing until April 17, 2013. Mr. Kenison seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Amendments to the Site Plan Regulations

10. **Consideration of proposed amendments to Appendix A: Fees, of the Site Plan Regulations.**

[Refer to the minutes under Item # 11].

Amendments to the Subdivision Regulations

11. **Consideration of proposed amendments to Appendix A: Fees, of the Subdivision Regulations.**

The Chair opened the public hearings for proposed amendments to the fee schedules of the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. McPherson stated that the Planning staff is proposing to modify the fee schedules and that some of the changes are to add more descriptions, especially under the subdivision headings. She also stated that she thought the new format was easier to read.

Ms. McPherson stated that she is proposing a reduced fee of \$300 for Major Subdivision – Design Review Phase in an attempt to have applicants come in at the design review phase. If the applicants avail themselves to the design review phase, they would pay a \$300 subdivision application fee, if they do not use the design review phase, the application fee for a subdivision would be \$1,000, another way to encourage applicants to meet with the Planning Board early in the Design Phase.

The Chair stated that there were issues in the past with applicants coming before the Planning Board for preliminary review because that starts the clock for statutory time limits for review. Ms. Hebert responded that it is only the vesting clock that begins.

Ms. Smith Meyer suggested that this would be a good idea, as the background information is needed and the developer won't have to have the landscape and planting plans at the time, but will have a conceptual site plan. Ms. Hebert stated that the applicants would have 12 months after the design review phase to submit their application. Ms. McPherson stated that this would be a way for the Planning Board to provide comments early in the process.

Mr. Kenison asked whether abutters would be able to weigh in on the projects in the design review phase. Ms. Hebert stated that the abutters are notified by certified mail, but testimony is not taken at this time, only the applicant and their agent can talk with the Planning Board. Ms. McPherson stated that the abutters would have a chance to speak at the regular meeting for subdivision approval. Ms. Dolcino asked what would happen if abutters vehemently opposed the project and stated that it seems bizarre to provide notice to the abutters but not to let them speak. Mr. Swope agreed and stated that the abutters should at least be able to submit something in writing.

Ms. McPherson stated that the Planning staff would review the process section of the Subdivision Regulations and come back to the Planning Board with changes to allow public testimony at the Design Review Phase.

Ms. McPherson stated that under the Site Plan section of the fee schedule, she divided the site plan review fees by major and minor instead of residential or commercial, and that the fee for the square footage was increased by \$50.00 for major site plan reviews.

Ms. McPherson explained that she also separated out Condominium Declarations from the Site Plan and/or Subdivision section and added a \$300 fee for each new land unit created, which was a type of subdivision that had fallen through the cracks without a fee charged.

Ms. McPherson reported that she added a \$50 application fee for signs. The Chair asked whether the fee was for each individual sign or a sign application. Mr. Henninger asked whether the same fee would apply to a replacement panel as well as for a new sign. Ms. Smith Meyer asked whether this fee was in addition to the sign permit fees paid to the Code Administration. Ms. McPherson responded by stating that they were coordinating the application fee for signs with Code

Administration, but had not heard back from them. She said she would come back to the Planning Board on this item.

Ms. McPherson stated that there were new tiered fees proposed for Conditional Use Permits for disturbances to buffers, wetlands, bluffs, etc., with a higher fee for greater disturbance.

Ms. McPherson stated that the current fee scheduled has a fee for Further Consideration by the Planning Board, but no one was sure of what that meant, so she deleted that section and added two subsections under Miscellaneous Fees – Request for an Amendment and Request for an Extension and added abutter notification fees for these two subsections.

Ms. McPherson explained that she also added a subsection for Inspection Fees. She reported that request for inspections for temporary certificates of occupancy are becoming more and more common and take up a lot of additional time for the Planning Division. She stated that the Planner must visit the site and review everything that is required for a certificate of occupancy to provide the temporary certificate of occupancy and then do the same thing when the developer is ready for the final certificate of occupancy. The time for the regular certificate of occupancy is rolled into the original fee paid, but there is currently nothing to cover the time spent on a temporary certificate of occupancy.

Ms. McPherson reported that the only other changes is that the recording fees for documents and plan sheets are now separate and the fee for voluntary mergers is being increased from \$70.00 to \$75.00.

Ms. Smith Meyer stated that she likes the new layout of the fee schedules and that it is easier to read.

Mr. Swope suggested that a note be added stating that more than one fee could apply to each application. Ms. McPherson agreed this was a good idea.

Ms. McPherson stated that she would review the design review phase regulations regarding public testimony, subdivision fees and regulations as well as the sign fees and return to the Planning Board next month.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved that the Planning Board continue this public hearing until the April 17, 2013, meeting. Mr. Swope seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR MEETING

12. Consideration of proposed amendments to Chapter 4, Design Standards, which would add a new section on Open Space Residential Development Design Standards and corollary amendments to renumber the Site Plan Regulations as necessary.

Ms. McPherson reviewed the changes that were discussed at the last Planning Board meeting and stated that they were now incorporated into the new draft amendments.

Mr. Hicks asked about whether any changes were made to the amendments regarding ten percent maximum for recreational fields. The Planning Board discussed the viability of having soccer fields in an open space residential development and the issues of associated parking, management of the fields, and passive versus active recreational uses.

Mr. Swope moved to set this item for public hearing at the April 17, 2013, Planning Board meeting. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

13. Consideration of proposed amendments to Chapter 4, Design Standards, which would add a new section on Open Space Residential Development Design Standards and corollary amendments to renumber the Site Plan Regulations as necessary.

Ms. Hebert reviewed the changes that were discussed at the last Planning Board meeting and stated that they were now incorporated into the new draft of the Site Plan Review Regulations. She stated that the Site Plan Regulations and the Subdivision Regulations were compatible with this draft amendment.

Mr. Hicks asked why the section on Site Analysis Plan included “or other qualified professional” stating that he did not feel it was appropriate for either the Planning Board or the Planning staff should decide on the qualifications. Ms. Smith Meyer suggested that the landscape architect should be a licensed landscape architect. Ms. Hebert stated that the draft would be changed to remove “or other qualified professional” and to add “licensed landscape architect.”

Mr. Swope moved to set this item for public hearing at the April 17, 2013, Planning Board meeting. Ms. Smith Meyer seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

14. Consideration of the Minutes of the January 16, 2013, and February 20, 2013, Planning Board meetings.

Mr. Swope moved to accept the minutes of the January 16, 2013 and February 20, 2013 Planning Board minutes. Mr. Hicks seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Hebert provided the Planning Board with copies of the Draft Energy Chapter of the Master Plan for their review. She stated that the Energy and Environmental Committee would like to provide a presentation to the Planning Board and discuss the Draft Energy Chapter with the Board. Ms. Hebert added that the Planning Board would need to adopt the Energy Chapter as part of the Master Plan, and therefore a public hearing would need to be set.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to set this item for public hearing at the April 17, 2013, Planning Board meeting and invite the Energy and Environmental Committee to provide a presentation to the Board and the public at that time. Mr. Kenison seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

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

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

Gloria McPherson
Clerk
djm