

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



**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**November 18, 2020**

**Workshop Meeting**

**Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:32 PM**

Vice Chairman T. Moore explained the Ch. J. Peck was sick and excused from attendance and that he would chair the meeting and appointed G. Adams a voting member.

- 1. ROLL CALL:** James Peck, *Ch.* - excused  
Tim Moore, *Vice Ch.* - Present at Town Hall  
Laurie Milette- Present at Town Hall  
Francine Hart, *Selectman's Rep*- Present at Town Hall  
Karen Robinson - Present at Town Hall  
Tom Alberti, Alternate – Present at Town Hall (non-voting)  
Geoffrey Adams, Alternate – Present at Town Hall  
Greg Taillon, *Selectman's Alt*- Remote (non-voting)  
John Cashell, *Planning Director* – Present at Town Hall (non-voting)

**2. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 4, 2020 MINUTES:**

Draft minutes were included with the meeting materials. C. Glorieux noted that a correction was needed for Agenda Item 6 and that the question marks should be replaced with the ProQuip suit and Attorney Cleary.

***K. Robinson moved, second by F. Hart to approve the minutes from November 4, 2020 as corrected.***  
There were no other changes.

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

**3. ZONING AMENDMENT REVIEW:**

T. Moore noted that the amendment had been put into proposed ballot-ready language and the action would be that if the language was acceptable to either make minor corrections or send it back for rewording, or to make motion to post it for public hearing.

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-21-1** was reviewed. T. Moore noted that by this amendment the long footnote to Table 220-32 would be moved to the definition for Personal Service Business in Article II of the Zoning Ordinance, and to change any later references to the footnote to the definition.

J. Cashell suggested that “Should the site plan be approval be granted” be modified to “Should site plan approval be granted.” This was agreed to. He also noted that “Statutes” should be lower case, or refer to the particular RSA. T. Moore said the particular RSA could be referenced as Revised Statutes Annotated (RSA). G. Taillon suggested using the lower case statutes.

F. Hart asked if we would vote on the amendments that night and T. Moore said a consensus to post it for the public hearing would be fine for now.

J. Cashell noted that Dee Voss would like to have the amendments for the second December meeting due to public hearing posting timeline constraints. It was agreed that this was already the Board’s preferred date.

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-21-2** was reviewed. The amendment corrects a housekeeping error by adding the CI-Danville Road Overlay District to the list of districts in Paragraph A.

L. Millete said she could not find the function hall in the definitions. T. Moore said the CI-Overlay was not mentioned in the list of Districts, and function hall should be added to definitions. J. Cashell suggested the last two sentences of the Voter’s Guide information read: “There are examples of function halls in the CI district though none have the phrase “function hall” in their name. Several of the existing uses have the capacity to host functions.” There was discussion of function halls and whether these always were restaurants and whether there should be a definition of what we are calling a function hall and then add that as a use. T. Moore noted that not all function halls have restaurants attached and are sometimes just used to meet. F. Hart asked if the Board was going to provide a definition of a function hall and T. Moore said that a definition could be provided for the Dec. 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting and be modified. J. Cashell suggested the guide information be changed by changing the third sentence to read “This amendment adds a single use, ‘function hall,’ to the list of permitted uses on the Commercial 1 (CI) zoning district” and striking out the remaining two sentences to simplify the wording.

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-21-3** was reviewed. On adding new § 220-17.5 J. Cashell suggested changing ‘visual barriers’ to ‘screening. It was noted that these changes would not be enacted if approved until the following year unless there was a health and safety concern, and not to pertain to existing waste dumpsters.

J. Cashell suggested changing the last sentence to read “The placement of dumpsters used on a temporary basis associated with active onsite construction are exempted from this ordinance.”

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-21-4** was reviewed. There was no change suggested to modifying § 220-6, D. Permitted Uses.

For § 220-6, E. Conditions J. Cashell suggested changing the last sentence to read “Signs shall not be illuminated from within ...”

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-21-5** was reviewed and changing “Motor vehicle and trailer sales – Fee Schedule” to “Motor vehicle and trailer sales – Fee Schedules” was suggested for clarification.

**Proposed Plaistow Zoning Amendment Z-21-6** was reviewed. T. Moore reference the small map which is inadequate in size and should be changed. K. Robinson asked if a red dot could be inserted at the beginning and end of the section to make it clear. It was agreed a better graphic would be used.

K. Robinson cited B. 19. Storage of equipment/vehicles used to service a product suggested that be eliminated since that is exactly what she did not want to see in C3. T. Moore suggested eliminating that would also eliminate uses that would be fine. L. Millette said this wording is not in CI and she agreed it

should be removed. J. Cashell suggested that if an applicant came in and wanted to have those vehicles it would be part of a site plan review by the Planning Board and at that time the Board should do, perhaps screening or making sure there is no visual impact and it stays in character and scale with the surrounding area. It was agreed to strike that and deal with it during the site plan review.

Tim noted a suggested change to C. Areas and dimension 7 that would set the maximum building size for housing multiple businesses at 60,000 sq. feet which could allow three full-size businesses. F. Hart noted this would allow three 20,000 sq. feet businesses rather than 2 at 20,000 sq. ft. and one 10,000 sq. feet.

J. Cashell asked if (3). Maximum lot coverage: 75% meant the building or the building and parking area, and it was explained the latter was the intent, which is the same as CI.

After discussion of the potential traffic draw of businesses of the proposed size, it was agreed to lower D. (2) from 5,000 to 3,000 vehicle trips per day.

**CI Mixed Use Overlay District** was reviewed. §220-32. Add a new district to Table 32 as Table 220-32M “CIOD” – CI Overlay District. It was agreed it had been discussed thoroughly before. T. Moore noted that we still need to find out what the post office would require for mail box placement guidelines are if there were 15 apartments or so in a development. J. Cashell said this could be addressed during a site plan review and usually the post office will work with the developer.

C. Taillon asked if the overall concept of the overlay district is defined by the developer or could it be predefined by the Planning Board. Tim suggested it would be the developer’s option to develop or redevelop under these guidelines but they could use the CI options. He noted that should be inserted into the language. J. Cashell said the Overlay District would be restricted exclusively to the existing CI District. T. Alberti noted there was no Voter’s Guide commentary on the Overlay District.

T. Moore suggested changing all the use of Roman numeral numbers in the Districts to Arabic, others preferred the Roman. He noted that could be done by consensus and the Board suggested it needs to be consistent. J. Cashell noted Roman Numerals are used in statutes.

## **5. NEW BUSINESS:**

**Bond Reduction Request – Carli’s Way:** T. Moore noted that the staff recommends it would be appropriate that the bond be reduced by \$178,918.75.

***K. Robinson moved, second by G. Adams that the bond being held for the 14-lot subdivision, known as Carli’s Way, be reduced by \$178,918.75, leaving a bond of \$45,250.00 per the recommendation of Keach-Nordstrom Associates.***

***The motion to reduce the bond passed 5-0-0***

K. Robinson had a comment about Heritage Commissions and noted that they are not like a Historical Building or Historical Society but are offered as a means for municipal governments in New Hampshire to recognize, manage and protect their historical and cultural resources. They are not there to tell the people in a district what the details of a building have to be and are non-regulatory. She thought some people have misunderstood this. F. Hart noted there was a sticking point with the BOS wanting to know the extent of their authority, and that this needs to be clearly stated in their charter.

F. Hart reported that they are looking for a volunteer or representative to be on the task force for the Traffic Calming Study and are looking for someone from the Planning Board. She noted T. Moore has expressed interest and if it is alright she will make sure his name and email address get forwarded.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charlene A. Glorieux  
Minute Taker