

MINUTES

**PLANNING BOARD
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE

7:00 P.M.

MARCH 15, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Ricci, Chairman; Paige Roberts, Vice Chairman; Nancy Novelline Clayburgh, City Council Representative; Anthony Blenkinsop; Cindy Hayden, Deputy City Manager; MaryLiz Geffert; and William Gladhill;

MEMBERS EXCUSED: John Rice; Richard Hopley, Building Inspector; and Brian Groth, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Planning Director

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Minutes from the December 15, 2011 Planning Board Meeting – Unanimously approved. (Councilor Novelline Clayburgh and Mr. Blenkinsop abstained.)

.....
II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – OLD BUSINESS

*The Board’s action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

A. The application of **Michael R. Clark, Owner**, for property located at **325 Little Harbor Road (Belle Isle)**, requesting Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into two lots with the following: Proposed Lot 1 having 276,867 ± s.f. (6.36 ± acres) and Proposed Lot 2 having 218,736 ± s.f. (5.02 ± acres), and lying in a district where a minimum lot area of 5 acres is required. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 205 as Lot 2 and lies within the Rural (R) District. (This application was postponed from the February 16, 2012 Planning Board Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Corey Colwell, of MSC Civil Engineers/Land Surveyors, appeared for the owner. He indicated that they were before the Board last month and received preliminary approval. Final approval was postponed pending review by the City Attorney of the revised Roadway Maintenance Agreement and the proposed easement deed associated with the road. In a Memorandum from the City Attorney to Chairman Ricci dated today the City Attorney stated his opinion that Planning Board requirements

regarding the private roadway and bridge maintenance agreement and the easement deed necessary for final approval of the subdivision would be satisfied by the execution, delivery and recording of these two documents. However, these deeds cannot be recorded until the subdivision plan is recorded and he spelling that out in his Memorandum.

Mr. Colwell noted they have also made minor revisions to the plans since last month. They clearly defined the limits of Lady Isle Road in the Roadway Maintenance Agreement and added a detail in the lower right hand corner of Sheet 1. They bolded that line to make it stand out on all sheets and in the lower corner you can see the detail, which defines the private road terminus.

The second revision was on Sheet 3 where they revised Note 2 by adding the deed reference associated with that note and Note 7 was added and describes that Lady Isle Road is a private road and refers to RSA 674:41-B II and RSA 674:41-D. Those statutes describe that buildings can be erected on lots served by public or private roads.

Deputy City Manager Hayden noted that in the Planning Director's Memorandum it says that Planning Board approval required to change the name from Belle Isle Road to Lady Isle Road. She asked if it had always been known as Belle Isle Road. Mr. Colwell responded that it shows on the tax map only as Belle Isle Road and the island has always been known as either Belle Isle or Lady Isle. Deputy City Manager Hayden asked if there was a road sign. Mr. Colwell stated there is no road sign. Deputy City Manager Hayden indicated that she was asking because the Planning Board has a role, even with private roads, to make sure for 911 purposes road names are called out correctly. What they might want to do is add a stipulation that a change in road name to Lady Isle would be contingent upon the approval of the public safety officials.

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Deputy City Manager Hayden made a motion to grant final subdivision approval with the first two stipulations in the Planning Director's Memorandum and the third to be revised to read the final plat and all easements and agreements shall be recorded as specified in the City Attorney's Memo of March 15, 2012 in the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the Legal and Planning Departments. She wants to acknowledge Attorney Sullivan's legal research on this. She also wanted to add a fourth stipulation that the applicant's request to rename the road from Belle Isle Road to Lady Isle Road be contingent upon approval by the City public safety officials. Mr. Blenkinsop seconded the motion.

The motion to grant final Subdivision approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. All property monuments shall be set as required by the Department of Public Works prior to the filing of the final plat.
2. GIS data shall be provided to the Department of Public Works in the form required by the City.
3. The final plat and all easements and agreements shall be recorded as specified in the City Attorney's Memo dated March 15, 2012 at the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the City Legal and Planning Departments.
4. The applicant's request to rename the private road from Belle Isle Road to Lady Isle Road shall be contingent upon approval by the City public safety officials.

.....
III. PUBLIC HEARINGS – NEW BUSINESS

*The Board’s action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

A. The application of **A. Robert McGuire, Jr. and A. Robert McGuire, III, Owners**, for property located at **677 Dennett Street**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into two lots with the following: Proposed Lot 1 having 26,119 s.f. and 138’ of continuous street frontage off Dennett Street and Proposed Lot 2 having 23,158 s.f. and 110’ of continuous street frontage off Dennett Street, and lying in a district where a minimum of 7,500 s.f. is required and 100’ of continuous street frontage. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 161 as Lot 31 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, from Ambit Engineering, appeared on behalf of the applicants. Mr. Chagnon stated this was a simple subdivision of one lot into two lots. Last fall they received approval for the consolidation of four lots and that plan has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds. They were also before the Board to develop housing on the property as a single lot. At this time they would to subdivide the lot into two lots and proceed from there. Each lot has the required area and frontage under the ordinance. The Staff Memo recommends some stipulations of approval. Mr. Chagnon was not sure that recommended stipulation #4 is not needed at this time as they will be going to DPW for their driveways at a future time when they develop the lots and they may want to have a common driveway but at this time there is just the proposal to create the two lots.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked if he would be agreeable to change Stipulation #4 to read “The final plat and Common Driveway Easement, *if applicable*, shall be recorded concurrently at the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the Planning Department.”

The Chair opened the public hearing and asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the petition.

Nancy Johnson, 81 Clinton Street. She was seeking clarification and was not speaking for or against. It is her understanding of the Zoning Ordinance is that a GRA lot of this size can only have one dwelling structure and a maximum of three units per structure. Chairman Ricci confirmed they would have a maximum of four units. Ms. Johnson asked if the McGuire/Hyder proposal is for one structure per lot with a maximum of three units. Chairman Ricci confirmed that was correct. Her only concern was the future ramification of a shared driveway and parking if that were to come before the Board. If the lots were ever owned by two separate parties she felt there should be two separate driveways and separate parking.

Robert Lister, 69 Diamond Drive. Mr. Lister was speaking as someone who lives close to the neighborhood and he wanted to be an advocate for the property being developed, cleaned up and a

facility or building that fits into the neighborhood. He doesn't know how much control the Planning Board has over that. He doesn't have a problem with the property being subdivided because they want it back on the tax rolls but his concern is what buildings will go on the property. It is a gateway into the City and he would like it to look like a place to welcome people. The previous plans showed buildings that looked like a hotel which they don't need more of in that area.

Lenore Weiss Bronson, 828 Woodbury Avenue. Ms. Bronson was concerned that the buildings fit in the neighborhood with a pleasant and appropriate design. She asked if the property doesn't contain the PUD will they still be subjected to architectural review. Chairman Ricci confirmed they will not. She asked what the department recommendation and four recommended stipulations were and they were read into the record.

The Chair asked if anyone else was present from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Blenkinsop asked how many dwelling units were allowed on this lot. The Memorandum says the lots would support 3 units, rather than 4. Mr. Cracknell confirmed that the GRA supports 4 but these lots only support 3.

Mr. Blenkinsop made a motion to grant preliminary and final subdivision approval with the four recommended stipulation, with the fourth amended per Deputy City Manager Hayden's comment. Ms. Roberts seconded the motion.

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked if the buildings will come back to the Board under a separate application. Chairman Ricci confirmed they will come back under Site Review. Deputy City Manager Hayden added that, unlike before, the Board will not have building design review. motion to grant final Subdivision approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. All property monuments shall be set as required by the Department of Public Works prior to the filing of the final plat.
2. GIS data shall be provided to the Department of Public Works in the form required by the City.
3. The final plat and all easements and agreements shall be recorded as specified in the City Attorney's Memo dated March 15, 2012 at the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the City Legal and Planning Departments.
4. The applicant's request to rename the private road from Belle Isle Road to Lady Isle Road shall be contingent upon approval by the City public safety officials.

.....
Deputy City Manager Hayden made a motion to read Item B & C together and vote separately. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Liberty Mutual, Owner**, for property located at **225 Borthwick Avenue**, for Conditional Use Permit Approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for 4,230 s.f. of temporary impact and 740 s.f. of permanent impact within an inland wetland buffer for the installation of three back-up generators to be placed on a concrete pad. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 240 as Lot 1 and lies within the Industrial (I) District.

C. The application of **Liberty Mutual, Owner**, for property located at **225 Borthwick Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the addition of three back-up generators to be placed on a concrete pad, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 240 as Lot 1 and lies within the Office Research (OR) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Chairman Ricci confirmed that there was a Memorandum from Peter Britz, Environmental Planner, at everyone's desk tonight stating that this application appeared before the Conservation Commission yesterday and they voted unanimously to recommend approval with no stipulations.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dave Fenstermacher, Senior Project Engineer from VHB, representing Liberty Mutual. There are two water features on the site associated with the buffer. There is a well-in the corner and the onsite pond. There are three generators on site and they are looking to add two additional generators and three pads. One pad is a reserve for a future generator. At this time the plan is to use the third pad as a fueling area and it will have a rim around it. The fuel truck can lie a temporary containment down and it will be contained on all four sides.

Mr. Fenstermacher stated they need Conditional Use Permit approval for work done within the 100' buffer which runs adjacent to the pond and the wetlands. To get the generators behind the building they need to do some temporary clearing to get the truck around. That will be loam and seeded after they are done. There are couple of trees that need to be removed but Liberty Mutual had brought the trees up as a concern anyways because they are getting to a height that is causing a safety concern. A portion of one of the permanent generators and some of the gravel pad total 740 s.f. within the 100' buffer. There is a portion of a walkway that is there now which they will be ripping out and planting to offset some of the new impervious in the buffer. They will also be providing some trees and bushes to screen and add additional buffer between the ponds. Additional work includes the switch yard to accommodate the new generator and the final work will include some new conduits with these generators and to avoid utility conflicts they will bypass the drainage and go around. Jeff LaPointe, from Liberty Mutual, and Bill Taber, from VHB, were also present.

Chairman Ricci referred to the utility trench detail and asked if they could refer to Note #2 where it says Magnetic Tracing/Warning Tape. With all of the water out there he felt it was very critical. He also asked if the fuel in the current generators is self contained.

Bill Taber, of VHB, stated the generators are similar to the existing generators with belly tanks. They will have an 8,000 gallon belly tank under the generator and it will have secondary containment which is basically a double walled tank which is monitored electronically in the security office.

Ms. Geffert asked if there was any history of any spills on the property with the existing generators. Mr. Taber confirmed there has never been a spill and they do have a spill plan.

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked if generator #6 was planned and why aren't they doing it now. Mr. Fenstermacher stated it was primarily because of money.

Mr. Gladhill asked how high the generators were. Mr. Taber stated they were 11' high.

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Conditional Use Permit:

Mr. Blenkinsop made a motion to grant Conditional Use Permit approval. Deputy City Manager Hayden seconded the motion.

The motion to grant Conditional Use Permit approval passed unanimously.

Site Plan:

Mr. Blenkinsop made a motion to grant Site Plan approval with the a stipulation regarding Chairman Ricci’s request on the magnetic warning tape. Ms. Roberts seconded the motion.

The motion to grant Site Plan approval passed unanimously with the following stipulation:

1. The utility trench detail shall be modified where it says “Warning Tape” to read “Metallic Tracing/Warning Tape, See Note #2”.

.....

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Request of Rodney Rowland, of Strawberry Banke, to change the definition of “museum” in the Zoning Ordinance.

Deputy City Manager Hayden spoke to this request. The Zoning Ordinance used to allow retail sales from a museum and the Planning Director’s Memo says that provision was probably written with Strawberry Banke in mind because of the 2 acre size. When they did their major revision they eliminated that minimum lot area requirement and also redefined “Museum”. As a result they unintentionally restricted what Strawberry Banke has always done, which is retail sales form the museum. The Planning Director drafted a revision that allows retail sales from museum provided all such accessory uses are incidental and subordinate to the primary non-profit museum use. This is really more of a housekeeping matter as they are going back to what they used to have in 2010 before they revised the Zoning Ordinance and inadvertently eliminated those provisions. Larry Yerdon was unable to attend tonight and sent his apologies but appreciated the Board taking a look at this.

Mr. Blenkinsop felt that the change makes sense but questioned where it says “clearly” incidental and subordinate. He wondered exactly what that meant and how it could be implied. Ms. Geffert agreed that was a very good point.

Mr. Gladhill asked if that meant their current retail is non-conforming or illegal? Deputy City Manager Hayden clarified it is just the gallery.

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked if the proceeds would go back to the museum and was relevant. Deputy City Manager Hayden noted it was a non-profit organization but it was probably not germane to the zoning change.

Deputy City Manager Hayden made a motion to recommend that the City Council amend the definition of “Museum” as specified in the Planning Director’s Memo with the exception that the word “clearly” in the next to last sentence be stricken. Ms. Geffert seconded the motion.

The motion to recommend that the City Council amend the definition of “museum” as follows passed unanimously:

A non-profit permanent institution, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, exhibits, and interprets objects having scientific, historical or artistic value. Museums may include exhibit and display areas, libraries and research areas, administrative offices, areas for constructing exhibits, and storage areas for museum materials, artifacts and objects. Accessory uses may include retail sales ~~(but not including the regular sale of objects collected or displayed)~~, food services for museum visitors or others, manufacturing for museum purposes, and events such as craft demonstrations, receptions, and periodic celebrations, **provided that all such accessory uses are incidental and subordinate to the primary non-profit museum use.** ~~Museums include galleries for the display of works of art, but do not include commercial galleries for the sale of art work.~~

.....
Ms. Roberts made a motion to move Item B to the end of the City Council referrals. Councilor Novelline Clayburgh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

V. CITY COUNCIL REFERRALS/REQUESTS

*The Board’s action in these matters has been deemed to be legislative in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

A. Request of Northern Tier Real Estate Acquisition and Development, LLC, for property located at 172 Hanover Street to remove the glass atrium on the Vaughan Mall side of the property.

Deputy City Manager Hayden indicated this was the Page Restaurant on the Vaughan Mall. She explained that half of the glass atrium is on City property and this request is simply to remove the atrium. The owners have other plans that they wish to pursue which will require any number of City and Board review and will be considered at a later date.

Ms. Geffert made a motion to recommend that the City Council approve the removal of the atrium as requested. Mr. Blenkinsop seconded the motion.

Mr. Gladhill asked if the area become public again once the atrium is removed. Deputy City Manager Hayden indicated that was an open question because there is a floor under the atrium but all they are asking to remove is the glass atrium itself.

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked if we had any idea what their future plan is. Deputy City Manager Hayden believes they want an open deck seating area for seasonal use.

The motion to recommend that the City Council approve the removal of the atrium as requested passed unanimously.

.....
B. Request of David Choate, III, Grubb & Ellis Northern New England, for an amendment to Section 10.836.20 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding drive-through lanes for retail/commercial buildings outside of the Central Business District.

Nick Cracknell explained that the current Zoning Ordinance has two performance standards for drive through lanes. The first performance standard is that no facility should have more than two drive through lanes and the second performance standard is that the size of the building dictates the number of drive through lanes that you are eligible for. They also are proposing to revise having to go to both the BOA for a variance and the Planning Board for Site Plan Review and streamline the process by having the Planning Board be the permit granting authority under a Conditional Use Permit. Also, rather than focus on the size of the building they are proposing to focus on the screening requirements, the additional impervious surface and traffic impacts. They will try to ameliorate the visual impacts into the site with landscape screening and maybe a low fieldstone wall or something to screen the extra lanes as well as have the ability to screen for the menu boards and signs associated with the restaurants.

They are trying to streamline the permitting process and allow, in certain instances, a conditional use permit to get the third lane.

Mr. Cracknell also wanted to point out the performance standard for a 24' canopy that would clearly cover those drive through lanes but upon further inspection he thinks they would be better to go with 26' rather than 24'.

Ms. Roberts stated her first inclination would be to be opposed to this. She doesn't know anything about the banking business but three lanes seems to be an incredible amount of pavement and it raises all sort of other issues. It seems unnecessary to her. Deputy City Manager Hayden stated she was not a fan of drive through lanes either but was in support of this because what happens is that they now go to the BOA and typically get their approval. This gives more control to the Board that should have control and it enables them to have more performance standards in place and, at the same time, beef up their Site Review Regulations.. It does seem to be an industry standard and she would rather have the Planning Board manage it rather than the BOA. Ms. Roberts asked what leeway will they have to deny if they feel appropriate. Deputy City Manager Hayden responded they could not deny it because it would come under Site Plan Review but they might want to beef up the performance standards and screening standards. Ms. Roberts agreed that it would be better to have it come through this Board and give them more control over the issue. She is concerned about the unnecessary amount of pavement in a community that is supposed to be so attuned to sustainability. Chairman Ricci reminded the Board that the Planning Board is not compelled to grant Conditional Use Permit applications. He agreed that the Planning Board should control this "hot button".

Mr. Gladhill agreed they would certainly have more control over the drive throughs than they have now.

Deputy City Manager Hayden indicated that the Board does not have to recommend this to the Council tonight and she asked if the Board could give guidance to staff on what they may want for additional performance standards or Site Review requirements. Ms. Geffert felt that it becomes very difficult once you get beyond screening to deny this and that would be beyond their scope. Chairman Ricci felt they would have control over noise and traffic. Deputy City Manager Hayden didn't think that they would probably break the noise ordinance. It's more of the nuisance factor with people pulling up in the dead of night at the ATM.

Mr. Blenkinsop wanted to make sure this did not change the downtown area and they would not be allowed in that area. Chairman Ricci confirmed that it would not change downtown. He also asked for clarification on the two recommendations in the Memorandum. Deputy City Manager Hayden confirmed that A is for changes to the Zoning Ordinance and B is for changes to the Site Plan Regulations.

Chairman Ricci indicated that, unfortunately, he supports this and feels that it is the situation where they have the most control. Not that the BOA doesn't do a great job but their function is much different than this Board.

Ms. Geffert agreed and also thought it was very important to get the changes to the Site Review Regulations very quickly as she sees this as a signal that within the next few months they will see this in front of them.

Deputy City Manager Hayden felt they would be fine time-wise as it will take 4 City Council meetings to get the Zoning Ordinance amendments approved. If the Board decides they want to change the Site Review Regulations, they can make those regulations effective on the same date that the City Council does their final reading. They are not only looking at the site plan for a drive through but they are also looking at a conditional use permit, so they are tied together and the Board will have more ability to manage the site. They should also keep in mind that nothing forces them to approve a conditional use permit but it would be difficult to turn them down if they met the performance standards.

Ms. Geffert asked what the difference was between 26' vs. 24'. Mr. Cracknell explained it will give them a little overhang over the ATM.

Deputy City Manager Hayden made a motion to recommend that the City Council amend the Zoning Ordinance as described in the Planning Director's Report with the exception that under 10.826.21 the number 24 be changed to 26. Ms. Geffert seconded the motion. Ms. Roberts thanked them for the discussion as it was helpful.

The motion passed unanimously.

Deputy City Manager Hayden made a motion to schedule a public hearing at the April Planning Board meeting to consider amendments to the Site Plan Review Regulation, Section 3.6. – Drive-Through Facilities, to address screening of drive-through lanes and any other design and performance standards that may appear appropriate. Mr. Gladhill seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

C. Letter from Barbara Devanna and Robert Cohen requesting an access easement over Pine Street Park for property at 55 Meredith Way (previously identified as 55 Pine Street).

Nick Cracknell explained that this property has been in existence for a long time and the driveway has crossed Meredith way which is a paper street. The driveway currently extends over City property, known as the Pine Street Playground, to Pine Street. The applicant is requesting an easement to continue to use the driveway. They are looking for a 30' wide easement along the edge of the Pine Street Park.

Deputy City Manager Hayden noted that given the long history with this and that the City has a process that it goes through whenever it gives up rights to any City owned land, the Planning Director is recommending that this matter be referred to the Legal Department for a report back before taking any action.

Mr. Blenkinsop made a motion to refer this request to the Legal Department for a report back. Deputy City Manager Hayden seconded the motion.

The motion to refer this request to the Legal Department for a report back passed unanimously

D. Request of New Hampshire Department of Transportation for an easement under the Scott Avenue Bridge in support of the Memorial Bridge project.

Deputy City Manager Hayden reminded the Board that was a request for an easement for a generator and some other support items for the Memorial Bridge project which was before the Board last month and was postponed to tonight. The NHDOT has asked that they postpone this again until next month's meeting as the key people from the State were unavailable to appear tonight.

Ms. Geffert made a motion to postpone this matter to the April Planning Board meeting. Councilor Novelline Clayburgh seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone this matter to the April Planning Board meeting passed unanimously.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Land Exchange with State of New Hampshire Relating to General Sullivan Bridge Reconstruction.

David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works was present with Don LaBelle, of NHDOT. Mr. Allen explained that this is a project that the NHDOT has been working that effects our property, the Booster Water Station. All water than comes down from Madbury goes into this tank and is pumped into Portsmouth. This is a very important infrastructure for the City. As part of the Sullivan Bridge project, the State is widening out the Spaulding Turnpike and they will be widening on the side of the City's building and tank. There will be jug handle (Exit 3) to get on and off Woodbury Avenue and

the Spaulding Turnpike and to get into Pease through Arboretum Drive. Mr. Allen displayed plans showing the 1.93 acres the State will be taking and the similar amount of land behind the facility they will be giving the City. It is important to do an exchange of land because the PSNH power lines run through our property and encumber our property. Because the State is offering them the rear land it will provide an area to build a new tank if ever necessary. City Staff has reviewed a lot of technical details and any impact on the City's infrastructure and are in favor of this land exchange.

Chairman Ricci asked if the area that the City is gaining is on Government property. Mr. Allen confirmed that NHDOT has purchased that property from the State. Mr. LaBelle, of the NH Right of Way Division, explained that the land they are purchasing from the Pease Development Authority needs FAA approval and is required to sit on the Federal Register for 30 days which is where it sits right now. There is an agreement in place for the purchase but there is no signed deed but there will be shortly.

Chairman Ricci asked what size pipe runs into this building. Mr. Allen stated it was a 24" pipe.

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked is the green area, on the exhibit, was the land that the City will own, and if there was any chance they could ever develop anything else on the property or would they just hold it in reserve for another water tower. Mr. Allen confirmed it would be there strictly for water purposes. It is less than 2 acres.

Mr. Blenkinsop asked if, after all construction, they will still have frontage on a road. Mr. Allen stated they will put in a new driveway and will come out onto Arboretum Drive rather than the Spaulding Turnpike.

Ms. Geffert made a motion to recommend that the City Council undertake the proposed land exchange. Deputy City Manager Hayden seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

(continue to page 12)

.....

VII. PLANNING DIRECTOR’S REPORT

A. Upcoming Meetings

March 22 7:00 pm Council Chambers	Planning Board Work Session Zoning Amendments for Downtown Parking
March 26 6:30 pm High School Library and Little Theatre	Quarterly Work Session – Context-Sensitive Redevelopment City Council / Planning Board / Historic District Commission / Economic Development Commission
April 26 7:00 pm Council Chambers	Planning Board / Historic District Commission Joint Work Session Proposed Zoning Amendments – Historic District exemptions and procedures; Mixed-Use Planned Development; Neighborhood Commercial Uses

.....

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn at 8:15 pm was made and seconded and passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Acting Secretary for the Planning Board

These minutes were approved by the Planning Board on April 19, 2012.