



**Town of Plaistow, New Hampshire**  
145 Main Street, Plaistow NH 03865  
Phone: (603) 382-8469

## PB Minutes 12/02/15

### PLANNING BOARD MINUTES December 02, 2015

**Call to Order:** 6:31 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Tim Moore, *Chair*,  
Charlie Lanza, *Vice Chair, Excused*  
Gennifer Silva  
Shem Kellogg, *Excused*  
Steve Ranlett, *Selectman Ex-Officio*  
Geoffrey Adams, *Alternate*  
Laurie Milette, *Alternate, Excused*

Also present were: Greg Jones, *Town Planner*, and P. Michael Dorman, *Chief Building Official*

#### **G. Adams was appointed as a voting member for C. Lanza**

#### **Agenda Item 2: Minutes of November 18, 2015 Meeting**

**G. Silva moved, second by S. Ranlett, to approve the minutes of the November 18, 2015 meeting. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-0-0 U/A.**

#### **Agenda Item 4: 92 Newton Road Solar Array Project**

Dan Johnson, Plaistow Consultants, Brian Morrill, Coastal Solar Group and Steve Murray, Property Owner, were present for the discussion.

D. Johnson explained that the property owner would like to install a solar array. He noted that they couldn't put an adequate system on the rooftop and there was an issue with the direction that the panels needed to point. The panels would span 77 feet and are 10.6 feet wide. They would be between 8-10 feet high.

There was discussion regarding the placement of the solar panels. It was noted that there would be a setback issue that would require relief from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA). The array is proposed to be placed twenty-five (25) feet from the property line, where thirty-five (35) is the minimum. The array, once proposed to be 88 feet in length, has been downsized to 77 feet, which will only meet 80% of the property owner's electricity needs.

There was discussion of the placement of the array. There was also discussion regarding the need for an amended site plan because this parcel is a commercial/residential use that is governed by an approved site plan. It was noted that the Planning Board had determined at their last meeting that there would need to be an amended site plan reviewed and it would need to be recordable if/when approved.

There was discussion about the size of the panels and how they were supported in the ground.

There was discussion regarding possible landscaping to make the array more attractive without deterring from its effectiveness. Different types of plantings were discussed that would offer screening to give the potential applicants guidance in what the Board would be looking for as part of an amended plan. It was noted that there is some natural vegetation that would offer some screening. It was suggested that the Town's Landscaping Regulation be consulted for buffering requirements.

M. Dorman offered that he could deny the building permit application, which would allow them to seek relief from the ZBA and then move forward with an application to amend the site plan.

### **Agenda Item 3: 2015/2016 Zoning Ordinance & Subdivision/Site Plan Amendment Topics to Consider – Discussion**

The Board reviewed proposed language for Zoning Ordinance Amendments:

#### **Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-16-01**

Are you in favor of amending the Zoning Ordinance "Article III, General Provisions §220-8.1 Residential Garages" by deleting Section A (structure size restrictions based on lot size) in its entirety:

<u>Lot Size</u>	<u>Permitted Square Footage</u>
	(square feet)
Up to 40,000	900
40,001 to 80,000	1,200
80,001 to 120,000	1,500
120,001 to 200,000	1,800

**[INTENT: To eliminate the size restriction for a residential garage provided all other applicable zoning, such as setbacks and lot coverage, is compliant or a variance is granted.]**

#### Discussion:

This proposed change had been discussed at a previous meeting. There were no changes to the language of the proposed amendment

**S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva, to post the proposed zoning ordinance change for Public Hearing. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-0-0 U/A.**

#### **Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-16-02**

Are you in favor of amending the Zoning Ordinance "Article IX, Signs, §220-58.1. Residential districts" by adding a new (D) which will read:

"Signs may be erected to designate the name of a residential subdivision. The size of the sign may not exceed eight square feet."

**[INTENT: To allow a sign that will identify a residential subdivision. Such a sign would increase traffic safety by providing advance identification of the subdivision.]**

#### Discussion:

M. Dorman noted that size of the sign that was put in the language was "middle of the road"

between what is currently allowed for a residential sign (three (3) square feet) and what is allowed for a single-business commercial use in the Commercial II and Village Center Districts (fifteen (15) square feet)

There was discussion as to whether or not this would apply to the signs erected for the purposes of promoting a new development as well. It was noted that those signs are already regulated elsewhere in the ordinance. This change is designed only for permanent signs that identify a named development.

***S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Adams, to post the proposed zoning ordinance change for Public Hearing. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-0-0 U/A.***

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-16-03**

Are you in favor of amending the Zoning Ordinance "Article V, Establishment of Districts and District Regulations, Table 220-32B. Commercial I, D. Special Exception Criteria for the use "Care and Treatment of animals" by adding a new (10) which will read:

"Facilities for the care and treatment of animals shall be stand-alone business and not located in retail plazas. ~~This restriction shall not apply to such businesses that care and treat animals on a one at a time basis, such as groomers and/or veterinarians.~~"

**[INTENT: To restrict and prevent facilities that house numbers of animals for longer periods of times from being located in retail plazas, particularly where there are or could be food establishments. ~~Groomers and veterinarians are exempted because the animal owner is usually present either with the animal and the animals are not outside the facility.~~]**

Discussion:

There was discussion as to the need to exempt groomers and veterinarians. It was noted that the same rules that make any animal care or treatment facility unsuitable for a plaza would be applicable to a groomer and/or a veterinarian. It was decided that those reference would be stricken and the proposed amendment would read:

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-16-03**

Are you in favor of amending the Zoning Ordinance "Article V, Establishment of Districts and District Regulations, Table 220-32B. Commercial I, D. Special Exception Criteria for the use "Care and Treatment of animals" by adding a new (10) which will read:

"Facilities for the care and treatment of animals shall be stand-alone business and not located in retail plazas."

**[INTENT: To restrict and prevent facilities that house numbers of animals for longer periods of times from being located in retail plazas, particularly where there are or could be food establishments.]**

***S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Adams, to post the proposed zoning ordinance change, as amended in discussion, for Public Hearing. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-0-0 U/A.***

M. Dorman noted that he would have at least one more zoning ordinance change to propose to the Board at the next meeting.

**Agenda Item 5: Reading of Communications Directed To/From the Board**

## Renewable Energy Committee

G. Jones noted that the Renewable Energy Committee (REC) was helping to craft a Warrant Article that would establish an exemption for solar installations. It was noted that currently the town does not assess extra for a solar installation. The proposed Warrant Article would provide for an exemption for those who install solar equipment. The language of the intent notes that the exemption would have a positive tax implication on each taxpayer of approximately 1/100 of 1% and that a majority vote would be required to pass the Warrant Article.

There was discussion of how the proposed Warrant Article would fit with the NHRSAs (72:61) on Solar and whether or not it would eventually make the Warrant Article void. There is language in the RSA which refers to all renewable energies, where the Warrant Article is exclusive to solar.

M. Dorman offered that those with solar installations already get a break on their electric bill so he was not in favor of providing an additional exemption.

There was discussion as to who the exemption would apply to and what would be considered the “immediate site.” It was also questioned whether or not selling the excess electric or credits for excess were properly addressed. It was noted that the intent of the Warrant Article was to incentivize the use of solar energy.

There was also discussion on the use of the town’s capped landfill to install solar arrays. It was noted that the State’s metering cap needed to be reviewed.

## **Agenda Item 6: Other Business**

G. Jones noted that there was a Transportation Capital Reserve Account Warrant Article being proposed by the BOS.

There were no additional matters before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dee Voss  
Recording Secretary