Tilton Planning Board
Meeting Minutes – November 14, 2017

Agenda
6:30 PM Call to order.

Review the September 26, 2017 Minutes

Planning Board Workshop

Other Business:
● Correspondence
● Other business

Members Present:
Judy Tilton (Chair), Jane Alden, Deb Shepard, Juliet Harvey, Eric Pyra, Christine Dembitzky and Katherine Dawson (ex-officio Selectman)

Others Present:
Jeremy Perkins, Lauri Perry and Dari Sassan (Planning Board Staff)

Call to Order
Chairman Tilton called the meeting to order at approximately 6:41 PM. She said that two individuals have asked to speak with the Board regarding commercial activities they wish to undertake and she asked them to proceed with their presentations.

Mr. Perkins explained that he would like to headquarter a landscaping business at 30 Jacob Road. Board Members agreed that a variance would first be required before such a use could be conducted in the Rural Agricultural district.

* * *

Ms. Perry explained that she would like to operate a retail shop at 615 West Main Street. Mr. Sassan said that the Land Use office only asked that she come before the Board because of concerns that the
Planning Board might want to oversee potential changes in traffic patterns. Board Members agreed that any such potential changes would be insignificant and that Site Plan Review shall not be necessary.

**Review the September 26, 2017 minutes**

*MOVED* by Ms. Alden to *approve the minutes of the 9/26/17 Planning Board meeting*. **SECONDED** by Mr. Pyra.

All in favor, none opposed: **MOTION APPROVED**.

**Planning Board Workshop**

Ms. Dawson presented a definitions document that she had compiled. Board Members discussed the document and agreed to review it further. Definitions related to dwelling units and health care received particular attention.

Mr. Sassan presented the following list of amendment concepts proposed by himself and Code Enforcement Officer Al LaPlante:

1. **Home Business (Article 11.11):** Because this provision is so limiting, and because it requires that any home business not have the outward appearance of a business, we believe that home based businesses should not be required to undergo Site Plan Review, but should instead be required to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy from the Code Enforcement Officer who shall ensure that the business meets the requirements of the Ordinance.

2. **Self Storage Facilities (Article 6):** There is no line designated for such uses in the Chart of Permitted Uses, so the land use office has been categorizing them as “personal and business services with floor area 3000 square feet or greater.” We propose that a new line be added to the Chart specifically addressing self storage facilities. We recommend that this use be permitted in the RG, GC and IN districts at a minimum. Other possible districts could include MU & RC, but we do not believe it should be permitted in the RA, VR, MR and DN districts.

3. **Parking (Article 3.5):** As discussed previously, we recommend expanding the parking requirements table. We believe that a new category for shopping centers is appropriate as a way to allow for
infill of existing facilities without increasing impervious surfaces in the already highly developed RG district.

Also in regards to parking, we recommend that Board discuss downtown parking provisions. As discussed previously, the Zoning Ordinance does not currently account for publicly available shared parking that exists downtown.

4. Dwelling Unit Density (Articles 6 & 7): The Chart of Permitted Uses indicates that “apartments, condominiums and multi-family” uses are permitted in the MU and VR districts, however the Table of Dimensional Values sets that dwelling unit density at a maximum of 2 units per lot for both zones. The Zoning Ordinance defines “multi-family” as housing for “three or more families,” thus one chart is telling citizens that multi-family is allowed, while the other one is limiting density to the extent that multi-family is not allowed. We recommend that the Board discuss what densities and housing types shall be allowed in these zones, with the intention that the Planner will compile the Board’s comments and draft regulatory language reflecting the Board’s desires.

5. Certificate of Occupancy/Certificate of Inspection (Article 10.4): The Planner is currently drafting regulatory language which will clarify when a Certificate of Occupancy is required. We propose that any projects requiring a building permit, but not requiring a Certificate of Occupancy, be required to obtain a Certificate of Inspection upon completion.

6. Adult Care Facility (Article 6): We recommend that the Planning Board consider whether Adult Care Facilities should be redesignated as “not permitted” in the RA district.

Mr. Sassan agreed to conduct additional work on potential zoning amendments prior to the next meeting.

*   *   *

MOVED by Ms. Alden to adjourn this meeting. SECONDED by Mr. Pyra.

All in favor, none opposed: MOTION APPROVED.
The meeting adjourned at 8:06 PM.
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