

Town of Plaistow, NH
Office of the Planning Board
145 Main Street, Plaistow, NH



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES (***DRAFT MINUTES – Subject to change once approved and amended by the board at its next meeting on June 15, 2022***)

June 1, 2022

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM.

1. ROLL CALL:

Tom Alberti, *Ch.* – Present at Town Hall
Tim Moore, *Vice Ch.* - Present at Town Hall
Laurie Milette - Present at Town Hall
Karen Robinson – Excused
Richard Anthony, Alternate – Present at Town Hall
Darrell Britton, *Selectman's Alt.* - Excused
Bill Coye, *Selectman's Rep.* - Present at Town Hall
Dee Voss, *Zoning Official/Administrative Assistant* –Present at Town Hall (non-voting)

Also Present: Sarah Tartarczuk, Rockingham Planning Commission
Adam Crunk, Crunk Engineering
John Skevington, CEO, Parkland Medical Center

Ch. Alberti appointed R. Anthony as a voting member for this meeting.

2. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MAY 18, 2022 MINUTES:

Draft minutes of the May 18, 2022 meeting were included with the meeting materials.

T. Moore moved, second by L. Milette to approve the minutes of the May 18, 2022 meeting as written.

The motion to approve the minutes as written passed 5-0-0.

3. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISCUSSION:

Ch. Alberti welcomed Sarah Tartarczuk of the Rocking Planning Commission to the meeting. She said she planned to talk about the process of launching the survey, including the timeline and the options within the survey platform that the RPC uses.

She said it would take about two meetings to develop the survey, and that tonight would be a discussion of the high level goals and objectives of the survey, and then another meeting in July or August the Planning Board could review a draft survey and take it via the online platform before it goes out to the community. She said it is challenging to launch a survey in the middle of the summer due to vacations, etc., and recommended a post-Labor Day September launch. This would give the Board a chance to talk about how to promote the survey across the Town. The Board agreed this made sense, and it decided against holding a workshop meeting on July 6th.

S. Tartarczuk discussed the survey platform options. She said the RPC has access to a tool called PublicAccess.com on which they host all their surveys; and that it tracks and records all the answers that taken online and provides a nice report which will allow the RPC to provide a summary to the Planning Board which will summarize and cross tabulate the results. The platform is customizable for the survey which will be its own web page with an introduction to why the survey is being presented, how it fits in with the Town's Master Plan, and what the Planning Board will do with the survey.

The platform allows for open-ended questions or ones the taker ranks how they agree/disagree with a statement, and all questions can have space for comments from the takers. All the comments on a question can be made public to any survey taker if desired, or can be kept private and available only to the surveying entity. Maps can also be part of the survey and the takers could drop pins on a map to indicate what they might like to see or not see in specific areas of town. She noted this type of specific information breaks down a bit in paper surveys.

The platform will record any part of the survey taken by an individual whether they finish it or not. The platform does not allow comments on someone else's comments, it flags anything that might be inappropriate, and the RPC also monitors it, and any names called out can be redacted. There was discussion of whether comments should be visible and it was noted this can be decided question by question, so that comments related to dropping pins on the map could be visible.

It was agreed that the value of the online survey's summary and cross tabulation was greater than could be gained from paper surveys but there would need to have paper copies, but the majority of responses will likely be online and the staff will be able to input the information into the online platform. S. Tartarczuk said they generally look for a 10% response rate but 7% would be a good goal for this survey.

The demographic questions were discussed. S. Tartarczuk said the benefits are they allow you to cross tabulate. She said age and length of time lived in town are meaningful, but household income could be left out. She noted that while the survey is open you can tell if you are missing responses from a certain groups of residents and can then target ways to get the survey to those types of people. She said gender, education and household income might not be overly relevant for this survey and we might consider other questions.

S. Tartarczuk asked about the end goal of the survey – why it was being done and what will be done with the results. Ch. Alberti noted the Rte. 125 economic corridor and the fact that certain types of businesses are attracted to a border town. He said the Board is looking at why there are certain types of business here and not others, and that the Town has been reacting to the businesses rather than being proactive about what types of business are desired. He also noted that while this is primarily about commercial properties it could move into residential and housing issues. S. Tartarczuk summed up that the survey would deal mainly with what types of businesses are desired and where, it would look at the Commercial/Industrial Districts (Rte. 125), Main St. and the Village Center traffic and development, Town enforcement, what is missing in Town

(businesses or uses) and what should be preserved, quality of life choices. There was discussion of how long the survey should be in number of questions and time it takes to complete it.

T. Moore suggested that the survey should not ask questions we already know the answers to. There was discussion of the need for water and sewage along Rte. 125. It was agreed to ask if people want improvements enough they would pay more taxes for it. There was discussion about design standards in the site plan regulations. S. Tartarczuk said she would add the input from the meeting to her suggested survey questions and bring it all back to the Board. There was discussion about getting feedback from developers on the issues of concern, perhaps going to the engineers for input.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

PB 21-18-R: A request from Crunk Engineering to re-open the public hearing for a Site Plan. The plan was conditionally approved on January 19, 2022, but was not signed nor recorded. The plan proposed the demolition of an existing retail building and the construction of a new 9,500SF 24-hour outpatient healthcare facility, with related parking, drainage, lighting, and landscaping. The applicant now proposes to revise the plan by adding 387SF (new total 9,887SF) to the building, relocate HCA parking, remove a transformer, and replace it with a dumpster enclosure. The property is located at 26 Plaistow Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 4 in the C1 Zoning District. The property owner of record is Bendetson-Plaistow Realty Trust, Norris and Margery Bendetson, TR. If the application is found to be complete, the Planning Board may immediately conduct the public hearing.

T. Moore moved, second by B. Coye, being that all interested parties have been notified, that the public hearing for Planning Board Matter PB 21-18, 26 Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 25, Lot 4, be reopened for the purpose of review of changes to the site plan that was conditionally approved January 19, 2022.

L. Milette noted that during her tenure the Board had never reopened a hearing after the 65 day window of its jurisdiction and asked if the Board was accepting the application as complete. D. Voss said it had already been accepted as complete and the reason it is a re-opening rather than an amending of an existing site plan is because the plan was never signed or recorded so it is not considered approved yet. L. Milette asked if the Board could call an applicant back in for a rehearing under similar conditions; D. Voss said she would ask Attorney Cleary.

The motion to reopen the public hearing was approved 4-0-1 (L. Milette).

Ch. Alberti reopened the public hearing. Adam Crunk, Crunk Engineering, 7112 Crossroads Blvd. – Ste. 201, Brentwood, TN spoke to the application. He noted that the changes needed to be made because over the course of satisfying the conditions for approval, which included a septic permit from the State of New Hampshire as well as the NH DOT for change of use, slight modifications were made to the building making it more rectangular and resulted in an additional 387 SF, the drop off area on the south side of the building was moved 10 feet to the east, and that they moved the existing dumpster closer to the building to aid in winter months.

Ch. Alberti asked if the conditions have been successfully met and was told yes except they still need to provide a lighting plan. He detailed on the site drawings the changes that have been made to the plan.

There was discussion of the change to the drop off area canopy. L. Milette asked if there was any kind of agreement with Plaistow or the other towns in the area that they will drop off patients. John Skevington,

CEO, Parkland Medical Center said there would not be an agreement to receive patients from any of the ambulance agencies who take patients based on their EMS protocols and the patient's status. He said they do have a contracted agency they will use if they were transporting a patient to a higher level care facility.

T. Moore moved, second by B. Coye, to approve the updated plan for 26 Plaistow Rd Tax Map 25, Lot 4, which proposed the demolition of an existing retail building and the construction of a new 9,997SF, 24-hour outpatient healthcare facility, with related parking drainage, lighting and landscaping. With the following conditions:

- **All comments in the KNA Rev #2 and KNA COA1 reports are addressed, and the plan updated accordingly, and a letter received from KNA verifying the same**
- **Appropriate Professional Stamps on all plans**
- **All conditions are to be met writing ninety (90) days of the date of this decision**

L. Milette asked if all the conditions from the previous vote have been met; D. Voss said the only condition that still remains is the lighting plan.

Ch. Alberti asked for public input; there was none.

The motion to approve was passed 4-1-0 (L. Milette).

Ch. Alberti noted that since the dimensions for the building have changed the impact fees have changed as well.

Impact Fees: This project will be subject to Public Safety Impact Fees in the amount of \$2,358.39. This is calculated as the net gain in square footage of 1,857 DF (9887 proposed – 8,030 existing) times \$1.27/SF. If the square footage of the new building changes, then this number would be adjusted accordingly.

Recording, Pre-Construction/Bonding: Information regarding the recording, bonding, and pre-construction process will be provided in the Notice of Decision.

L. Milette asked if the Board can set a time limit for conditions being met; D. Voss said it could be done. Ch. Alberti said his concern is that someone might want to sit on a plan and come back saying the changes were slight, or even bringing it back to a new Board. He asked if there should be a time frame for signatures after all conditions are met. D. Voss said attorney Cleary recommends 90 days. It could be set as a condition for approval. L. Milette suggested tightening it up due to all the building being done.

5. OLD BUSINESS

Amendments to Rules of Procedure – 2nd Reading and Adoption:

The Board continued its discussion of the Planning Board Rules of Procedures. Ch. Alberti read out the following changes to be made.

§225-2. Members, B (1). Training. Within 12 months of assuming office for the first time, any member is encouraged to complete at least six hours of training, as offered by ~~the Office of Strategic Initiatives (OSI) or other NH state agencies.~~ *NH state agencies*

§225-3. Organization C(1)

~~(1) The Board shall make recommendations to the Board of Selectmen for two people to represent Plaistow as Representatives to the Rockingham Planning Commission (RPC). A third person may be designated as an Alternate Representative. The Board of Selectmen must then approve the recommendations made by the Board. RPC Representatives and Alternate Representatives serve four-year terms and may be any resident of Plaistow.~~

(1) The Board shall make recommendations to the Board of Selectmen of a Commissioner to serve on the Rockingham Planning Commission (RPC) in accordance with RSA 36:46-III

§225-4. Duties, A (7) Shall speak for, ***or appoint a designee to speak for*** the Board;

R. Anthony moved, second by T. Moore, to adopt the changes to the Plaistow Planning Board Rules of Procedure as read at the May 4, and June 1, 2022 Planning Board meeting.

The motion to adopt was passed 5-0-0.

6. NEW BUSINESS

The Board agreed not to meet on July 7, 2022

7. COMMUNICATIONS, UPDATES, FYI'S AND OTHER BUSINESS

Ch. Alberti noted that Tom Tombarello is resigning from the Code Enforcement Officer position but will stay on as electrical inspector. D. Voss noted his potential replacement going through a background check; he would be full time.

Ch. Alberti noted the RPC submitted a proposal to Greg Colby for support of the Planning Board; he will follow up and advise the Board of its status. There was discussion of whether the RPC could serve as a clearing house for candidates, the platform used to conduct the search, and the need for someone with roots in New Hampshire. There was discussion of how the residents bring code enforcement issues to the Town.

D. Voss noted that 152 Plaistow Road has submitted some engineering plans but are not ready to submit an application but have an escrow account for Keach-Nordstrom Associates to look at the plans.

49 Plaistow Rd – ConvenientMD was also discussed, along with the change light pattern.

D. Voss also noted that 2 Main Street was denied the variance that would allow an apartment on the second floor. It was noted the property looks nearly abandoned. There was discussion about projects that go on for years and whether restrictions can be place on the length of time these carry on.

There was discussion about all the hearing in the legal notice for the next meeting. D. Voss reported that the RSAs require these be presented to the Board for action on completeness within 30 days. All that needs to be done is to accept it as complete; the Board does not have to open the public hearing right away, it can be continued to the next meeting. ***Are you okay with changing it to “the Board does not have to immediately open the public hearing for a presentation but must do so in order to continue the application to the next meeting.”?***

There was discussion about meeting the new Code Enforcement Office and who s/he is responsible to.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 8:23 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charlene A. Glorieux
Minute Taker