

**PLANNING BOARD
RINDGE, NEW HAMPSHIRE
October 26, 2004
MINUTES**

DATE: October 26, 2004 TYPE: Work Meeting DATE APPROVED: 11/16/04

TIME: 7:00-9:30 PM. Katie Duffy, Chair

CALL TO ORDER, at 7:00 PM

ROLL CALL: Katie Duffy, Charles Carroll, David Tower, James Hoard, Arthur Fiorelli, Jo Anne Carr, Robyn Payson

Planning Board Budget for 2005- Jo Anne presented the proposed budget for 2005 to the Board. Arthur Fiorelli said that the budget minus salary, FICA and benefits should be raised a full 2% as per the will of the Board of Selectmen. Katie Duffy said she wanted to review the budget with Dr. Gerry Parker and Dick Isakson and any other interested members of the board prior to submission. She has notified the Town Administrator that the budget needed further review before it can be submitted.

Site Plan Regulations- Amendments and additions to the site plan regulations were proposed and discussed in preparation for presentation to the citizens of The Town of Rindge in future public hearings.

Uses requiring Site Plan Approval- the following amendments were proposed:

- Projects of less than 1000 sq. ft of building may require Site Plan Review if, in the judgment of the Planning Director, there are potential significant impacts. Any question of significant impact would be brought before the board. Otherwise, projects of less than 1000 sq. ft would be exempt from Site Plan Review.
- Projects of less than 2,500 sq. ft of paving or development of impervious area may require Site Plan Review if, in the judgment of the Planning Director, there are potential significant impacts. Otherwise, projects of less than 2,500 sq. ft of paving or development of impervious area would be exempt from Site Plan Review.

Katie Duffy raised concern over “demolition and removal” requiring a site plan. She felt that a Site Plan should be required if a building was being demolished in order to replace it with another building. Katie felt that if the individual’s intention was to demolish the building with out replacing it, following established procedure through the Building Department should be sufficient. Dave Tower said that it could be argued that the regulation always implied that demolition would require a site plan, and adding “demolition and removal” provided clarification. According to current regulation, any change made to a commercial building or development requires site plan review prior to work being started. Katie said that the difference is that if you are planning to remove a building with no plans to re-develop the site, an individual should not have the expense of a Site Plan. Katie went on to say that she had reviewed the Site Plan Regulations in the surrounding towns. Although she saw that for a change of land use, a Site Plan was necessary, she saw nothing mandating a Site Plan Review for the demolition of a building. Jo Anne pointed out that a building 20’x 50’ or less would not require a Site Plan Review and would be under the jurisdiction of the Building Department. Katie felt it was too

restrictive and costly if the person would go through the Building Department to remove a building and then add the expense of Site Plan Review for demolition purposes only. Katie felt that the stipulation of “demolition and removal” requiring a Site Plan not be included in the amendments to the Site Plan Regulations. Other members disagreed saying a Site Plan Review would be required regardless of whether demolition or removal” language was included. The intent is to clarify the regulation.

Site Plan Criteria Amendments-

Criteria for determining whether an application qualifies as a *Minor Site Plan* includes but is not limited to, the following:

- a) When there is no new construction.
- b) When new construction is no greater than 2,500 sq. feet in area (i.e. buildings 1,000-2,500 sq. ft.)
- c) When site impacts are not expected to be significant, in terms of traffic, noise, parking, lighting, etc.
- d) Any development which results in the construction of between 1,000 sq. feet and 9,999 sq. ft of gross floor area and impervious surface.
- e) Minor site plan review criteria and submission requirements may be less comprehensive. See revised Site Plan Checklist.
- f) A scaled plan may be acceptable for a minor site plan review.

Major Site Plans (affecting more than 40,000 sq. ft) Engineering calculation used to determine the post development peak discharge rate is equal to or less than the pre-development peak discharge rate (based on a 2-year 24 hour storm, 10-year 24 hour storm). The storm-water system shall be sized to treat and store the 2-year storm and infiltrate the 1-inch storm.

(Revised to address larger development only-per public comment) Projects affecting between 10,000 sq., ft and 39, 999 sq. ft of gross floor area and impervious surface may require a storm water plan if, in the judgment of the Planning Director, there are potential significant impacts such as proximity to wetlands, surface waters, water supply, floodplain or aquifer protection areas.

Developments having Regional Impact-Copied from Subdivision Regulations and added to Site Plan Regulations. No language changed. Jo Anne will be looking into addressing cumulative impact.

Flood Hazard Areas-This section was included because Rindge participates in the National Flood Insurance Program and have a floodplain ordinance. We are required to have this language in the Site Plan Regulations.

General Standards and Requirements-Factors taken into account by the Board when evaluating new building designs.

Limit Impervious Areas-It was suggested and discussed that there be a percentage limit to the amount of impervious area on each development, and providing for Open Space. Katie Duffy felt that a percentage number would be too restrictive and that it should be decided on a case by case basis. David Tower felt that the board needed time to think about this issue for further discussion. He said what he was looking for was preserving a feeling of some open space which will, at the same time allowing for development that will be consistent with what that property is zoned for.

Katie Duffy expressed concern that she did not feel enough of the year’s goals had been accomplished. Jo Anne disagreed saying that many goals set out in March as well as new

projects that came up had been completed. David Tower said that it was more important to give the Board time to reflect on these issues and the different circumstances that may surround them and not to rush through revisions in order to give the Town the best regulations possible.

David Tower Motioned to adjourn Charles Carroll 2nd

Meeting Adjourned 9:30 p.m.

NEXT MEETING

November 2, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Robyn Payson