

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



**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**Dec. 1, 2021**

**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 (late)  
Laurie Milette - Present at Town Hall  
Karen Robinson – Present at Town Hall  
Greg Taillon, *Selectman's Rep.* Present at Town Hall  
Maxann Dobson, Alternate – Present at Town Hall  
Bill Coye, *Selectman's Alt.* - Present at Town Hall  
John Cashell, *Planning Director* –Present at Town Hall (non-voting)

Also Present: Daniel Koravos, DK Engineering LLC  
Michael Malynowski, PE, Allen & Major Assoc.

Ch. Alberti appointed M. Dobson a voting member in the absence of T. Moore.

**2. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 3, 2021 MINUTES:**

Draft minutes of the November 17, 2021 meeting were included with the meeting materials.

*G. Taillon moved, second by M. Dobson to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2021 meeting as issued.*

*The motion to approve the minutes as issued passed 5-0-0*

**3. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

***Continued from November 17, 2021***

**PB 21-16:** The completeness of an application from George Semaan for a Site Plan for a retail use. The Site Plan proposes to raze the existing building and construct a new 3,550 SF, 2-story, retail building, with related parking, drainage, lighting and landscaping. The applicant is also seeking a Conditional Use Permit for a wetlands crossing. The property is located at 27 Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 25, Lot 33 in the C1 Zoning

District. The property owner of record is Semaan Properties of NH, LLC. The application was found to be complete, the Planning Board may immediately continue the public hearing

Ch. Alberti opened the Public Hearing.

Applicant's representative Daniel Koravos, DK Engineering LLC, 59 Granite Lane, Chester, NH reported on the progress of the project. He noted he received a letter from Steve Keach saying everything was fine. They received a letter from the NH DOT regarding the driveway permit, and he expects to have some information from them within a few weeks. G. Taillon asked if the egress had changed, and if it had not why the DOT was requiring it. D. Koravos said he had been first told it was not needed, then that it was because the building size has changed and is considered a change of use.

Ch. Alberti said the reason for this continuation tonight is to ensure that all details are being covered. He asked if there were any questions on any of the updates; there were none. He asked for public comment; there was none.

***G. Taillon moved, second by K. Robinson, to grant the Conditional Use Permit for driveway access at 27 Plaistow Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 33, with the following condition:***

***- The date of the approval of the Conditional Use Permit shall be noted on the final plan set***

***The motion to grant the Conditional Use Permit passed 5-0-0***

***K. Robinson moved, second by G. Taillon, to approve the amended site plan for a retail use 27 Plaistow Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 33, with the following conditions:***

***- Receipt of NHDOT Driveway Permit and a note added to the Final Plan Set to indicate the permit number as well as the date of the approval***

***- A note added to the Final Plan to indicate approval of the Conditional Use Permit with date of approval***

***- The granted waiver notes be updated to show an approval date of November 17, 2021***

***- All professional stamps must appear on the Final Plan Set***

***The motion to conditionally approve the amended site plan passed 5-0-0***

Impact Fees: The applicant is assessed Public Safety Impact Fees in the amount of \$2,965.00. This number was determined by taking the net gain in square footage and multiplying by \$1.27 as prescribed in the Impact Fee Ordinance.  $3,550 - 1,215 - 2,335 \times \$1.27 = \$2965.45$ .

Information regarding submission of final recording documents and pre-construction procedures will be included in the Notice of Decision.

**PB 20-07:** The completeness of an application from Ocean Storage, LLC c/o Bussiere & Bussiere, PA. The application seeks to amend an approved site plan to change the previously approved, but not constructed, retail space, to a climate control self-storage building of +/- 99,000 GSF. The preoperty is located at 88 Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 21, Lot 21 in the C1 District. 88 Plaistow Road, LLC/Mark Murphy is

the property owner of record. If the application is found to be complete the Planning Board may immediately conduct the public hearing.

Applicant's representative Michael Malynowski, PE, Allen & Major Assoc., 400 Harvey Rd., Manchester, NH 03103 asked the Planning Board allow a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy for the project. He said the project is well under construction, paving and curbing is installed, storm water is installed, and they are finishing the interior construction. He said they anticipate opening in January. He note at this time it is too cold to install landscaping so they are seeking a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (CO) and will complete the landscaping in warmer weather in the Spring and be completed prior to June 1, 2022. G. Taillon asked if the front of the building had been cleared out to the road and if all the pathways from the parking lot are operation; he was told yes the final pavement and curbing is in and the walkways installed. The lighting will also be installed.

K. Robinson asked about the landscaping, noting a comment that said they would be planting grass or trees or shrubs and asked for exactly what will be going in because the anticipation was there would be trees and the grass and filling with flowers and such in the front. M. Malynowski said there is a full landscaping plan submitted as part of the site plan and all those will be installed, some more than other, and that they anticipate some sort of hay mulch spread on the exposed loam to cover for winter conditions and protect against erosion. In the warmer weather the landscape approved by the Board will be installed.

Ch. Alberti noted there is a 10% bond being held for this project, which includes all the site work such as drainage, paving as well as landscaping and that would not be released until the permanent CO is granted. M. Malynowski said that as soon as plant materials can be added and survive the client will be pushed to complete the landscaping. J. Cashell noted that June 1<sup>st</sup> is early in the growing season and conditions may not be good for planting at that time so the Board should consider a caveat that they can ask for a continuance to the end of June if needed.

***G. Taillon moved, second by K. Robinson, to grant authorization if a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (CO) to 88 Plaistow Road, pending completion if the landscaping, with the following conditions:***

- All disturbed areas shall be stabilized for winter.***
- A written report is received from Keach-Nordstrom Associates (KNA) that all other site plan items have been completed***
- The applicant must meet all requirements if the Department of Building Safety and Fire Department prior to the Temporary CO being issued***
- The Temporary CO will expire on June 1, 2022***
- The applicant shall request, through the Planning Department, final inspection by KNA of the landscaping prior to requesting their Permanent CO***
- All applicable Impact Fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of the Temporary CO***
- All escrow and bond monies will be held until the Permanent CO is issued and the Planning Board approves their release***

***The motion to conditionally grant a Temporary CO passed 5-0-0***

Ch. Alberti closed the Public Hearing.

Ch. Alberti noted that T. Moore had arrived but M. Dobson was the voting member of record. He welcomed T. Moore to the meeting. He noted that if there are any other votes this evening M. Dobson would be back to her status as an alternate member.

#### 4. REVIEW OF ZONING AMENDMENTS:

Ch. Alberti noted the Board had received comments from Atty. Cleary on the proposed Zoning Amendments with minor notes. He noted the Zoning Amendments Public Hearing is set for 12/15/2021 and the final drafts should be achieved this evening.

Ch. Alberti noted the one change recommended by Atty. Cleary (in blue below).

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-22-A:** Are you in favor of Amendment #1, as proposed by the Plaistow Planning Board, to the Plaistow Zoning Ordinance, Article II, Definitions as follows?

**Renumber the existing introductory paragraph as Paragraph B and add a new Paragraph A as follows:**

**A. Hierarchy:**

- 1) Terms and words not defined in this article but defined in applicable New Hampshire state statutes or regulations shall have the meanings given therein.*
- 2) Terms and words not defined in this article but defined in the Building Code shall have the meanings given therein.*
- 3) Terms and words not defined in this article, ~~the RSA's~~ **New Hampshire State statutes or regulations**, or in the Building Code shall have the meanings understood in common usage and as defined in standard American dictionaries.*

**Add a new definition for an Apartment as follows:**

***APARTMENT - A self-contained living unit which provides sleeping, cooking, dining, bathroom, and leisure space for no less than one person.***

**Add a new definition for road as follows:**

***ROAD – See STREET. The terms road(s) and street(s) may be used interchangeably throughout this document.***

#### **Voter's Guide Information:**

**Explanation: Article Z-22-A:** This amendment adds a definition for apartments to distinguish them from hotel/motel rooms, Bed & Breakfast rooms and Rooming and Boarding House rooms. It also adds a definition of roads that states roads and streets may be used interchangeably. Finally, it clarifies that some words that are not specifically defined in the ordinance, but have common use definitions, the common use definitions shall prevail throughout the zoning ordinance.

Ch. Alberti asked if there were any issues with the amendment; there were none.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-22-B:** Are you in favor of Amendment #2, as proposed by the Plaistow Planning Board, to the Plaistow Zoning Ordinance, Article III, General Provisions, § 220–10, Roadway construction as follows?

**Modify Paragraph A as follows:**

~~A. All *proposed residential subdivision and Planned Residential Development (PRD) streets* roads shall be dedicated as public roads. and constructed as public roads including all residential/commercial/industrial subdivisions, Planned Residential Subdivisions, and Housing for Older Persons subdivisions.~~

**Add a new paragraph C as below:**

*C. All new commercial and industrial streets shall be constructed using street construction standards, as specified in Plaistow's zoning ordinance and subdivision regulations. For streets expected to include heavy trucking, such streets may require construction standards that exceed those for public streets. New streets in commercial and industrial subdivisions may be designated as private streets with a note on the subdivision and/or site plan stating all maintenance including snowplowing shall be performed at the property owner's expense. No performance bonds will be required for such private streets.*

#### **Voter's Guide Information:**

**Explanation: Article Z-22-B:** This amendment does two things: 1) It allows commercial and industrial streets to be private, rather than public streets; and 2) it minimizes street repair and maintenance costs associated with streets having heavy trucking.

There was discussion of Atty. Cleary's adjustment to paragraph A. G. Taillon suggested that the regulation had already saying that PRD streets would be public streets. He questioned Atty. Cleary's comment on paragraph C that "Plaistow will need to have a strong reason for requiring all residential streets to be public." Ch. Alberti suggested this comment was pointed at paragraph A. J. Cashell noted this is Atty. Cleary's opinion but that townspeople realize that when residential roads are approved as private they always become a political problem in that people have to pay for the maintenance and plowing and when they start getting these bills on top of everything else they start asking the Town to do the maintenance. He suggested leaving the language as proposed and then if a developer has some valid points for private road status the Board has the authority to waive any of its own sub division regulations.

Ch. Alberti asked if the Voters Guide should be updated for the change in paragraph A. T. Moore said that the real change was to paragraph A and once that was done adding C gives the rationale for commercial/industrial. T. Moore noted he is not comfortable with the word dedicated which Atty. Cleary added to paragraph A, and suggested designated as a better word since the BOS have to accept the street as public. It was agreed to change dedicated to designated.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-22-C:** Are you in favor of Amendment #3, as proposed by the Plaistow Planning Board, to the Plaistow Zoning Ordinance, Article IV, Natural Resources Protection, §220.18, Wetlands Conservation District as follows?

**Add two paragraphs A and B to §220.18.2, Applicability, as follows:**

*A. In all zoning districts where new or amended site review plans and/or subdivision plans are being proposed and there are wetland buffer encroachments, or setback encroachments or stream crossings an applicant must apply for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). CUP approval by the Planning Board must be obtained before the site review plan and/or subdivision plan shall be approved or conditionally approved.*

*B. In all residential zoning districts where an applicant is proposing changes on a single lot and there are wetland buffer encroachments, or setback encroachments, or stream crossings the applicant shall apply to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance to remediate the stream crossings and/or encroachment.*

Modify the title of §220.18.7 from “~~Permitted Uses:~~” to “*Limited Use Buffer Permitted Uses:*”

Modify the footnote language for clarification of setbacks in §220.18.3.D, Table of Wetland Buffers and Setbacks, to the following: “*Man-made drainage structures including but not limited to detention ponds, retention ponds, and drainage swales shall be exempt from any structure setbacks.*”

**Voter’s Guide Information:**

**Explanation: Article Z-22-C:** The existing ordinance is not clear if an applicant should apply for a variance or a Conditional Use Permit when wetland buffer encroachments, or setback encroachments or stream crossings are involved. The addition of paragraphs A and B to section §220.18.2 states when a CUP or variance should be used. The title change to “Limited Use Buffer Permitted Uses” is an attempt to clarify the list of permitted uses and its relationship to the table of Wetland Buffers and Setbacks found in §220.18.3.D. The modification of the footnote to the same table is to clarify the intent of the footnote.

Ch. Alberti said there had been good discussion of this on the Board and that Atty. Cleary had asked “Could Plaistow require a CUP wherever there is a wetlands buffer encroachment? Why a higher threshold for the homeowner? Where are the CUP criteria listed?”

T. Moore said the CUP criteria are listed in the ordinance itself. He said the homeowner would have to get a variance for a wetlands crossing or buffer encroachment as opposed to a CUP. The rationale was these are apt to be single lots where the Building Inspector has authority so it never comes to the Planning Board. Ch. Alberti noted the Board had similar questions but settled on the CUP, and questioned that the homeowner has a higher threshold. T. Moore said if a homeowner went for a CUP they would have to have a public hearing.

It was agreed to change paragraph B as follows. ***B. In all ~~residential~~-zoning districts where an applicant is proposing changes on a single lot and there are wetland buffer encroachments, ~~or~~ setback encroachments, or stream crossings the applicant shall apply to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance to remediate the stream crossings and/or encroachment.***

\*\*\*\*\*

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-22-D:** Are you in favor of Amendment #4, as proposed by the Plaistow Planning Board, Article V, Establishment of District and District Regulations, § 220-32. District objectives and land use control by amending Table 220-32 as follows?

Table 220-32 I, Minimum Dimensions for all Districts, Paragraph A, Structure Setbacks as follows?

<b>Zoning District</b>	<b>Front Setback</b> (Measured from front property line) (All dimensions are in feet)
<b><del>Commercial 1 (C1)</del></b>	<b><del>50</del></b>
<b><i>Commercial 1 (C1): Lot size is greater than 120,000 square feet and/or building size is greater than 10,000 square feet. Applies only for buildings constructed after March 8, 2022.</i></b>	<b><i>80</i></b>

<b>Commercial 1 (C1): All other C1 lots</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Commercial 3 (C3)</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Commercial 3 (C3): Lot size is greater than 120,000 square feet and/or building size is greater than 10,000 square feet. Applies only for buildings constructed after March 8, 2022.</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Commercial 3 (C3): All other C3 lots</b>	<b>50</b>

**Voter's Guide Information:**

**Explanation Article Z-22-D:** This amendment will increase the front setback for C1 and C3 properties when either a large lot size (greater than 120,000 sq ft) or a large building size (greater than 10,000 sq ft) is being proposed. This will result in a greener, more visually pleasing look along Route 125. Making the change effective for new building construction after March 8, 2022, will prevent existing lots from becoming non-conforming lots.

Ch. Alberti asked for comments and questions on this amendment – there were none, the Board expressed satisfaction with it.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-22-E:** Are you in favor of Amendment #5, as proposed by the Plaistow Planning Board, to the Plaistow Zoning Ordinance, Article VIII, Accessory Dwelling Units - ADU, §220–57, General Requirements as follows?

**Modify the text in Paragraph K** from “... under the provisions in letters A through **J** in this ordinance.” to “... under the provisions in letters A through **K** in this ordinance.”.

**Renumber Paragraphs K through M as Paragraphs L through N.**

**Add a new Paragraph K as follows:**

***K. Driveways for the primary residence and its ADU shall have an ingress/egress onto a Class V or better road via a single curb cut unless the Building Inspector determines that a second curb cut is safer and/or aesthetically pleasing.***

**Voter's Guide Information:**

**Explanation Article Z-22-E:** The current ADU ordinance, Article VIII, does not specify whether ADUs are allowed their own driveway. This amendment attempts to clarify the conditions when a separate driveway would be permitted.

L. Milette asked if anyone wanting a second driveway would have to go to the ZBA. J. Cashell said any appeal having to do with single family homes and duplexes goes to the Building Inspector. T. Moore said the current ordinance doesn't state one way or the other, and there would be no way to deny it unless the Building Inspector found it dangerous. It was noted this comes up when the first driveway is already there and the homeowner wants to add another. L. Milette noted there was a case before the ZBA about a house on Old County Rd. where a second driveway was requested for an ADU. She noted it was better to go before a Board than one person. She said the current ordinance wants the residence with an ADU to retain the look of a one family home with one driveway. G. Taillon asked if for an ADU the family member moves out can the homeowner rent the ADU to someone else; J. Cashell said yes the homeowner has to live on the premises but could live in either section. L. Milette asked what happens if the owner dies and the heirs don't want to live there so they rent both units. J. Cashell said it is not legal, but it happens.

There was continued discussion about who has the authority to grant a second driveway. Ch. Alberti noted the only reason a resident would have to go to the Zoning Board is if what they want to do is in violation of ordinances, and it was suggested there is not an ordinance yet. J. Cashell said the ordinances for an ADU are silent about a second driveway. He quoted the ordinances that “the ADU shall be designated so that the appearance of the building remains that of a single family dwelling. Any new entrances shall be located on the side or rear of the building. Where ADU are attached to the primary dwelling there shall be a connecting door”. He noted that typically a single dwelling unit has one driveway and asked if adding a second driveway takes away the appearance of the single family dwelling. The Board agreed that it does and makes it look like a duplex. T. Moore noted that typically a duplex requires another 50 feet of frontage, and there may be criteria for minimum spacing between driveways. Ch. Alberti asked if the Board wants to deal with the issue and say either second driveways are not allowed or can only be approved in a specific manner. J. Cashell said this issue comes up a lot and perhaps it should go to the ZBA as the body of appeal. Ch. Alberti asked if an ordinance saying no second driveways would have to exist to send a resident to the ZBA; the Board agreed it would have to be created. It was noted driveway permits need to be circulated among all the Town’s departments to ensure safety. It was noted there may be special cases where a second driveway may be needed. After more discussion it was agreed to change the new paragraph K to read as follows:

**K. The driveway for the primary residence and its ADU shall provide access to a Class V or better road via a single curb cut.**

And to change the Voters Guide Information to:

**Voter’s Guide Information:**

**Explanation Article Z-22-E: This amendment clarifies that a single driveway shall be permitted for a residential dwelling with an ADU**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-22-F:** Are you in favor of Amendment #6, as proposed by the Plaistow Planning Board, to the Plaistow Zoning Ordinance, Article IX, Signs, §220–58, All Districts, paragraph D as follows?

**Modify Paragraph D as follows:**

D. All freestanding signs are required to have a street address that includes the street name and number and that is a minimum of six inches for signs for commercial/industrial uses in the I1, I2, CI and ICR Districts; a minimum of three inches for commercial uses in the CII and VC District; and a minimum of three inches for signs for residential uses in all Districts. ***The address rider (street number and street name) shall be located at the top of the freestanding sign.*** The space required for the address *rider* portion of the sign shall not be counted as part of the required sign size.

**Voter’s Guide Information:**

**Explanation: Article Z-22-F:** The address rider was initially requested by the Fire Department for 9-1-1/Emergency Response purposes. The intent was to make addresses, particularly of plazas, easily identified for first responders. Recently, businesses have requested different locations for the address rider on their signage. Some have been more forceful than others in their request because the ordinance didn’t specifically state where the address rider needs to be located on the sign. Staff has spoken with the Fire Department and their preference is that the address always be at the top for consistency and so that there is no need to search the entire sign in hopes of finding the address rider.



Ch. Alberti asked for any needed changes to this amendment; it was agreed the language was fine.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-22-G:** Are you in favor of Amendment #7, as proposed by the Plaistow Planning Board, to the Plaistow Zoning Ordinance, Article IX, Signs, §220–59, Commercial I and Industrial Districts, paragraph B as follows?

**Modify Paragraph B.3) as follows:**

B. 3). The Building Inspector may grant a permit for a single sign for a single business, *on a standalone lot*, provided the sign is in keeping with the intent expressed in this article and provided its dimensions are the same as those required for an attached single sign of no more than 30 square feet, as stated in Subsection A above.

**Modify Paragraph B.4) as follows:**

The Building Inspector may grant a permit for a single sign for a single business, *on a standalone lot*, provided the sign is in keeping with the intent expressed in this article and provided its dimensions are no more than 50 square feet, if 20 square feet of that freestanding sign is permanently dedicated as a manual reader board.

**Voter's Guide Information:**

**Explanation: Article Z-22-G:** The intent of the current freestanding sign ordinance is that a business located in a plaza would have a single directory that would allow signs for all the business in that plaza. It also gives the option for the building inspector to issue a small freestanding sign (30 square feet, with an additional 20 square feet of manual reader board) for a single business. The intent has always been that single business be on its own standalone lot, however this is not specifically stated in the ordinance. This came up as a question from a business located in a plaza requesting a freestanding sign for their business. They noted that they were a “single business” even though they were in a plaza, and the ordinance was not clear that this should apply only to those single businesses on their own lot. Adding the standalone lot to the current ordinance would clarify that intent.

Ch. Alberti noted this is also about the signs. T. Moore said the language is ok but the interpretation is that if you have a single business in a shopping center you cannot have your own individual sign. The only way an individual sign can be had is if the business is on a stand alone lot. K. Robinson asked about putting the number on the business so it can be easily found by the fire department. G. Taillon said there is an ordinance that has the address on the sign. T. Moore said this change puts the street number on top of the sign. No changes were made.

## **Proposed Subdivision Amendments for 2022**

**Add a new subdivision section § 235-8A to be titled Driveways. Do not make any changes to the existing section § 235-8 Rights-of-way; reserved strips. In that section paragraphs A, B, C are designated as Reserved for Future Use.**

**Modify the language existing language that appears incorrectly in 235-8 as follows:**

**§ 235-8A. Driveways.**

1. Each existing lot; or new lot(s) created by a subdivision; for *a* single-family dwelling

unit must have a separate driveway that connects to a Class V or better road ***or to a proposed subdivision street.***

2. Each ***existing lot or new lot created by a subdivision for a*** duplex dwelling unit may have two separate driveways or may share one driveway for some or all of the driveway length, provided that each dwelling unit of the duplex dwelling unit has its street address clearly displayed on the mailboxes, as well as each dwelling unit. Each driveway (shared or unique) must connect to a Class V or better road ***or a proposed subdivision street.***
3. ***Each existing lot or new lot created by a subdivision for a*** ~~M~~ multi-family dwellings-unit may ***have*** shared driveways provided dwelling unit numbers or other address identifiers are clearly displayed at the driveway entrance/mailbox, as well as each dwelling unit. ***Each driveway (shared or unique) must connect to a Class V or better road or a proposed subdivision street.***

T. Moore said the reason for this change is that the current language states that dwellings must have a separate that connects to a Class V or better road, and if you build a new subdivision that's not yet a road. Some applicants have gone to the ZBA to be allowed. The change is to say a Class 5 or better road or to a proposed subdivision street. Referring to the duplex mailbox requirement, G. Taillon asked if an ADU has the same address as the primary residence. M. Dobson said she has seen 52A and 52B for a primary and ADU. It was noted paragraph 3 talks about multi-family dwellings and that an ADU is the same thing. B. Coye said an ADU has the same number but with a letter after it, while a duplex is two separate numbers.

T. Moore noted that the Planning Board can hold a public hearing anytime of the year and change make changes to subdivisions. He suggested if the Board wants to make the change to do it right away because many applicants get tripped up on the Class V or better road when the subdivision hasn't yet been built. T. Moore noted it is not going to Town Meeting as the Public Hearing was already held and it was voted in.

## 6. NEW BUSINESS

Ch. Alberti read the following letter into the record:

Dear Plaistow Planning Board,

I am writing in hopes that you could address what I believe to be a "hole" in Plaistow's residential zoning with a new ordinance.

Presently Plaistow's residential zoning does not address either "style" or size of garages in the residential zones with the exception of them not being in setbacks. Generally this has proven OK, but recently a more "industrial" appearing garage was built in the LDR and I believe there are several other similar units awaiting building permits.

Please see the attached image to understand what I mean.

I believe these could be prohibited based upon size (height) or aesthetics (look and feel). Having a maximum height for a single story garage would keep the size down and make it difficult to store large commercial vehicles in the residential zones. Having an ordinance stating that these structure would be built with similar materials and outside finishes to the primary residences could also help. Plaistow

already has a sign ordinance in the Village District limiting materials and aesthetics, this could be seen as an extension of that.

I don't profess to have the answer, but I hope you folks can come up with one. Otherwise we will see a proliferation of industrial appearing buildings throughout our residential areas, and that can't be good for property values!

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss my concerns with you.

Ch. Alberti invited comment and it was noted it is always a bone of contention when these large structures go up. T. Moore said there was an ordinance that restricted the size of a garage dependent on the lot size. He believed an MDR lot allowed a 2-3 car garage at the most, and noted for some reason that went away. Ch. Alberti asked for discussion on why someone would want such a large structure: suggestions included to store an RV, tractor, dump truck, storage for renovating old cars. M. Dobson suggested the Board is not in the position to tell property owners how their garage is designed if it within the parameters of what is allowed and suggested the setback could be changed to the back of the property where it is less visible. T. Moore said the height restriction is 45'. G. Taillon said it looks like the property was a farm and with that much property to take care of it could be reasonable for equipment storage. M. Dobson noted it couldn't be put up without a permit so they have gone through the proper channels. K. Robinson said if they have that much land there should be restrictions on where it is placed.

J. Cashell noted that a lot of towns require any shed structure to be behind the primary dwelling and accessory structures are not allowed in the front yard. It was noted there is no ordinance for this now. G. Taillon said he believed T. Moore said that had been tried and voted down by the Town. J. Cashell said it could be a citizens' petition brought to the Town Meeting. Ch. Alberti said the issue is if this was used for business or commercial purposes it is not allowed. K. Robinson suggested the position is also a problem.

Ch. Alberti said the issues seem to be with size and location and possibly appearance, and asked if the Board wanted to attempt an ordinance or push it back to the citizen. Ch. Alberti asked about a potential zoning amendment such as any unattached storage unit such as a shed shall be placed to the rear of the primary dwelling. L. Milette said there was a recent zoning amendment on the placement of garages within the last three years and they were allowed. T. Moore suggested there would be some merit in a new ordinance but doubted the Board could come up with a good one in such a short time period. It was agreed there is not enough time to deal with this in the current year, and that the citizen may want to bring it before Town Meeting himself.

Stormwater Management Regulations: Ch. Alberti said this was added late. T. Moore said these were the Task Force suggestions for additional criteria for the MS4 requirements. He said the actual changes to the existing text are in red, but there are three different stormwater ordinances and a lot of duplicates in the language in the three and he thought it would be a good idea to combine them.

J. Cashell said these are amendments that need to be made relative to MS4 language, and that all the southern towns in New Hampshire are MS4 and this language has to be introduced into the Town's Zoning Board relative to compliance to the Federal Guidelines. This will be another Zoning Amendment as a Warrant Article.

Ch. Alberti gave a big thanks to Tim Moore, Dee Voss and John Cashell for working hard behind the scenes taking a lot of the Board's shoulders throughout the year. He asked if the Board was comfortable with the changes made by Tim and Dee and they were.

## **5. OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS/ COMMUNICATIONS/UPDATES/ FYT'S AND OTHER**

Ch. Alberti reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule. The Public Hearing on the Zoning Amendments will be held on December 15, 2021, as will be the continuation of one site plan and another urgent care site plan. As well as a preliminary review for another plan.

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 8:34 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charlene A. Glorieux  
Minute Taker