



**Town of Plaistow, NH  
Office of the Planning Board  
145 Main Street, Plaistow, NH 03865**

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
January 18, 2017**

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

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

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

**★G. Adams was appointed as a voting member for this meeting.**

**Agenda Item 2: Minutes of January 4, 2017 Meeting**

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva to approve the minutes of the January 04, 2017. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-0-1 (Lanza abstaining)**

**Agenda Item 3: Continuation of a Public Hearing: 2017 Zoning Ordinance Updates**

- Article VIII – Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)
- Plaistow Code, Article III – Unregistered vehicles and commercial equipment
- Article V – Establishment of Districts and District Regulations, Table 220-32B “Commercial 1” Zoning District Table of Permitted Uses, Table 220-32A “Industrial 1” Zoning District Table of Permitted Uses, and Table 220-32K “Industrial II” Zoning District Table of Permitted Uses.
- Article IX - Signs

G. Jones noted comments from Planning Board Attorney Charles Cleary. The Board considered those changes.

Note: The entire text of the proposed ordinance changes was not read at this meeting as it was read at the first Public Hearing. Only changes were considered at this meeting.

**Article VIII – Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)**

§220-57.F. *In No case shall there be more than two people residing in an ~~in-law~~ accessory apartment accessory dwelling unit*

The recommendation from C. Cleary is that the paragraph be removed entirely as it is likely not permissible.

§220-57.G Change the word “structure” to Accessory Dwelling Unit. (Housekeeping)

§220-57J. & K. Attorney Cleary suggests that the requirement for a new certificate of occupancy (CO) be limited to when a new ADU is constructed or remodeled and not with the change of tenancy. He noted t

T. Moore noted that this has already to posted to the Warrant with certain conditions, one of which was positive comments back from Attorney Cleary.

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by C. Lanza amend the Warrant Article to Article VIII, Accessory Dwelling Unit, to include the changes as suggested by Attorney Cleary. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.**

### **Article III § 220-13.B**

Attorney Cleary's suggestion is that the words "of not more than" be added between "vehicle" and "one-ton" to make the sentence read better.

C. Lanza asked if there as a problem with leaving the number of vehicles at two (2).

M. Dorman said that it wasn't an issue for his office.

G. Jones noted that he thought it had to do with potential impacts to water quality with the larger trucks on residential properties.

The Board discussed scenarios where there may be more than one (1) commercial vehicles on a residential property, such as in an ADU situation where the tenant and the owner might each have commercially-lettered vehicles. It was decided to leave the ordinance at the no more than two (2) commercial vehicles. There was clarification as to what was considered to be a one-ton vehicle.

T. Moore asked if the Board still wanted to strike the sentence that requires the second commercial vehicle to be screen or garage. Consensus was that sentence could still be struck.

M. Dorman noted the other proposed change that would allow for a greater than one-ton vehicle for those confirmed to be in an on-call status. He suggested that vehicle needed to be considered as one (1) of the two (2) allowed commercial vehicles and not a third.

No more than two commercial motor vehicles of not more than one-ton weight limit may be kept in any lot in the residential zone.

S. Ranlett asked about a 550 size truck as food for thought.

S. Ranlett asked about construction equipment language in section C.

M. Dorman explained that it was to restrict large construction equipment from being stored on residential properties. He noted that it didn't apply to equipment being used on the property as part of a construction project, nor to small items like Kabotas that people use on their own property. He noted that he uses a common sense approach to enforce this ordinance.

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva to amend the Warrant Article for Article III, § 220-13.B and C. to include the changes as suggested by Attorney Cleary. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.**

The amendment will be posted as corrected to the Warrant.

It was noted that other changes suggested by Attorney Cleary were to the formatting, suggesting that the same font be used throughout for consistency. It was noted that would be done when the changes are incorporated into the Zoning Ordinances after Town Meeting.

#### **Article IX, Signs**

There was discussion regarding the wording regarding the amendments to the sign ordinance. It was decided to include the words "as stricken" to update the intent statement.

***★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Adams to update the intent statement and post to the Warrant the changed to Article IX. Signs. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.***

#### **Other Business and Updates**

G. Jones gave the following updates:

- Safe Routes to Schools – the funds have not been depleted and there may be additional funds available to the town. A letter is being prepared for submittal to begin the process to hopefully access some of those funds.

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dee Voss  
Recording Secretary