

The regular monthly meeting of the City Planning Board was held on September 16, 2009 in the City Council Chambers in the City Hall Annex at 7:00 PM.

Present at the meeting were Members Drypolcher (who as Chair presided), Swope, Gross, Hicks, Meyer, Shurtleff (representing the City Council), and Alternate Member Kenison who was seated in the position left vacant by the resignation of Mr. Harrington. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Henninger, and Ms. Osgood of the City Planning Division were also present, as was Ms. Aibel, the City's Associate Engineer.

At 7:00 PM a quorum was present, and the Chair called the meeting to order and seated Mr. Kenison.

APPLICATIONS

Minor Subdivisions

1. Application by **Duprey Acquisitions, LLC, on behalf of Sanel Realty Company, Inc., and the State of New Hampshire** for approval of a subdivision and resubdivision of property located at **45A-49 South Main Street, 7 Theatre Street, and 49-53 Storrs Street. (#2009-33)**

Determination of Completeness

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal to merge the property that includes 45A-49 South Main Street, 7 Theatre Street, and 49-53 Storrs Street, with the passways owned by the State of New Hampshire, and then resubdivide the land to establish two parcels.

He reported this application was complete and ready for public hearing.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and open the public hearing. Mr. Swope seconded. Motion carried.

Public Hearing

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal to merge the property that includes 45A-49 South Main Street, 7 Theatre Street, and 49-53 Storrs Street with the passways owned by the State of New Hampshire, and then resubdivide the land to establish two parcels. He explained that the structures on the property will be demolished and the subdivision will facilitate the redevelopment of the property. The applicant has also submitted a site plan application for the construction of an office building on one of the newly created lots and a separate site plan application for the construction of a 45-unit apartment building on the other lot. The subdivision plan also includes the necessary easements for the proposed new developments.

A representative of the applicant was present but did not speak.

There was no one who wished to speak for or against this application and the Chair declared the hearing closed at 7:05 PM.

Deliberations and Action on Application

Mr. Swope moved that the Planning Board grant conditional final subdivision approval for the "Minor Subdivision Plat of Duprey Land Acquisitions, LLC" as prepared by Richard D. Bartlett Associates subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the applicant shall revise the plat drawings to address the minor corrections and omissions noted by City staff.
2. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the following easement documents, in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor and suitable for recording in the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds, will be provided to the Planning Division:
 - a. Conveyance of a pedestrian access easement for the benefit of lot 34-4-5.
 - b. Conveyance of a utility easement for the benefit of lot 34-4-5.
 - c. Conveyance of a loading dock, utility, and pedestrian easement for the benefit of lot 34-4-5.
 - d. Conveyance of a loading area easement for the benefit of lot 34-4-5.
 - e. Conveyance of an access easement for the benefit of lot 34-4-5.
 - f. Conveyance of a construction/grading easement on parcel 34-4-5 to benefit proposed lot #1.
 - g. Agreement to convey a drainage easement for the benefit of proposed lot #1.
 - h. Agreement to convey a drainage easement for the benefit of proposed lot #2.
 - i. Agreement to convey an electric/telecom easement for the benefit of proposed lot #2.

Mr. Gross seconded. Motion carried.

2. Application by **26 Centre Street LLC** for approval of a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 28-7-11(f), Driveway Separation Alternatives, of the Zoning Ordinance at **26 Centre Street**. (#2009-18)

Determination of Completeness

Mr. Woodward explained this application for a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 28-7-11(f), Driveway Separation Alternatives, of the City's Zoning Ordinance in recognition of the collector street status of Centre Street and the higher standards for driveway separation for collector streets.

He reported this application was complete and ready for public hearing, and suggested that the Board hear this application together with the next item on the agenda which is a recessed hearing on the related minor site plan application.

Mr. Swope moved that the Planning Board determine the application for a Conditional Use Permit to be complete and open the public hearing. Mr. Gross seconded. Motion carried. The Board agreed to hear this application together with the next item on the agenda.

3. Application by **26 Centre Street LLC** for approval of a site plan of property located at **26 & 26 ½ Centre Street** in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (**#2009-18**)

Public Hearings

The Chair opened the hearing relative to the Conditional Use Permit and the recessed hearing on the application for the minor site plan of the property at 26 and 26½ Centre Street.

Mr. Woodward explained that Twenty-Six Centre Street, LLC proposes to renovate the existing mixed use building to professional office space. The property is located to the east of the Green Street/Centre Street intersection. There is an existing residential structure at 26 ½ Centre Street which, together with an adjacent garage, are proposed to be removed in order to facilitate the construction of a parking area to serve the renovated office building. The parking area will include 17 spaces, with one-way circulation through the property, both entering and exiting on Centre Street, with the exit movement restricted to right turn out movements only. While the property includes rights to travel on Cedar Court, which is a private way off of North State Street, the narrowness of that passway has caused the applicant to focus on access and egress to and from Centre Street.

He explained that, at the regular monthly meeting on April 15, 2009, the Planning Board declared this application to be complete, opened the public hearing, and recessed the hearing to allow for a corrective notice to be given to the abutter at 28 Centre Street as well as notice to be provided to all property owners with rights of passage over Cedar Court. Since that time, the applicant, on a monthly basis, has requested postponement of the recessed hearing.

He reported that an application for a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 28-7-11(f), Driveway Separation Alternatives, of the City's Zoning Ordinance was submitted in August in recognition of the collector street status of Centre Street and the higher standards for driveway separation for collector streets.

Mr. Woodward reported that revised plans were recently submitted showing the egress shifted from Cedar Court to Centre Street. The site has been redesigned with a separate, one-way entrance and one-way exit on Centre Street, with the exit movement being restricted to a right turn out only. A landscape plan has been provided that complies with the City's requirements for parking lot landscaping. The plan includes ten new

trees around the perimeter of the parking area, and four existing trees will be saved. A six-foot high vinyl privacy fence will be installed around the perimeter of the parking area wherever fencing does not already exist. Freestanding lighting fixtures for the parking lot will be limited to ten feet in height to minimize any excess lighting to abutting backyards.

He reported that the applicant proposes to use pervious pavement in the parking lot (but not the entry and exit drives) to control stormwater runoff. The snow storage area is designed with a bio-retention swale. The parking lot includes three compact parking spaces and one handicap parking space. While the applicant is not proposing to use Cedar Court for access to the proposed parking lot, the connection from the premises to Cedar Court will be gated to preserve the landowner's right to utilize Cedar Court.

He reported that the exterior renovation of the building includes replacing the roof with asphalt shingles, replacement of the windows and doors, painting of the existing exterior siding, and construction of a handicapped access ramp. The details of these changes in terms of colors and materials have not been submitted or reviewed by the Design Review Committee. The Committee had reviewed an earlier site plan but has not yet reviewed the current plan. Sign applications have not been submitted at this time and will be reviewed by the Design Review Committee and Planning Board at a later date.

He reported that the applicant proposes to convert the second story of the existing building, which contains 1,099 square feet, to professional office use. This change of use is eligible for the assessment of an impact fee; however the applicant will receive a credit for the removal of the single family dwelling at 26 ½ Centre Street. The credit for the residential dwelling (\$1,767) exceeds the impact fee for the proposed new office use (\$1,725); therefore no impact fee will be charged.

Mr. Woodward explained that a Conditional Use Permit application pursuant to Section 28-7-11(f), Driveway Separation Alternatives, of the Zoning Ordinance has been filed to allow for two driveways where only one would be permitted on a lot with less than 350 feet of frontage on a collector street. The CUP application also requests permission to have less than a 200-foot separation between the driveways and the nearest street intersections (North State and Green Streets), and less than a 200-foot separation from driveways on the same lot and on adjacent parcels (28 Centre Street and 65-69 North State Street). The two proposed site driveways are a one-way pair, with the existing driveway to the east of the building at 26 Centre Street to be used as the entry drive, which shares a curb cut with a neighboring driveway to the parking area associated with an apartment building at 65-69 North State Street. The exit drive is a proposed new curb cut to the west of the building at 26 Centre Street, and it will be about seven feet from the edge of the neighboring driveway at 28 Centre Street, which contains two apartments. The exit drive will be limited to right turns out.

He explained that the original application was designed to have traffic enter on Centre Street and exit out Cedar Court, which was problematic due to the narrowness of Cedar Court and the abutting properties which already use it on a two-way basis. The

applicant attempted to negotiate with an adjacent church on Union Street to secure egress to Union Street. However, after due consideration, the church decided it did not wish to proceed in this direction. This led the applicant to propose the one-way access/egress system on Centre Street.

He explained that the principal use of 26 Centre Street will be professional office use with vehicles using the driveways primarily on Monday to Friday during typical office hours, whereas the neighboring properties at 28 Centre Street and 65-69 North State Street are residential uses with vehicular activity seven days each week with typical peaks of entry and exit movements on Monday through Friday that coincide with the residents' journeys to and from work. While the building at 28 Centre Street houses two dwelling units and has adequate on-site parking spaces for those units, the structure at 65-69 North State Street contains 11 dwelling units but it appears to have about seven parking spaces. The applicant has indicated a willingness to offer the owners of 65-69 North State Street an easement to exit through the proposed 26 Centre Street one-way egress to avoid the conflict of vehicles entering 26 Centre Street while vehicles are trying to exit from 65-69 North State Street in the existing common curb cut. The close proximity of the driveway of 26 Centre Street and the egress drive of 28 Centre Street would be mitigated by exiting movements from both driveways where no one is backing out, so that drivers may more easily observe each other during these vehicular movements. However, it appears that vehicles exiting from 28 Centre Street may have to back out as they may not be able to execute a turning movement on-site as they do today due to the installation of the privacy fence. The current turning movement at 28 Centre Street does encroach onto property at 26 Centre Street.

Mr. Woodward reported that the applicant had originally proposed to provide a sprinkler system but has become concerned over the cost for a relatively small building. The Fire Department has asked for a professional analysis of the need for a sprinkler system and fire alarm system so as to ensure the compliance of the renovated building with life safety and fire codes.

Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, a fence can only be up to 4 feet in height in the required front yard; however, given the need for visibility for drivers emerging from the adjacent driveways of 26 and 28 Centre Street, it is recommended there be no fence within the required front yard (15 feet in depth from the sidewalk).

Ms. Meyer expressed surprise that staff was recommending approval of the Conditional Use Permit and Mr. Woodward responded that the staff had spent a lot of time on this project and it had not been an easy matter to resolve some of the circulation issues involved with this proposal to renovate this building in the Civic District. The City's traffic engineer spent a lot of time reviewing traffic issues and the Engineering staff has also spent a great deal of time addressing drainage concerns.

Tim Golde from Golde Planning and Design and Terry Schnare, of 26 Centre Street LLC, were present to answer questions from the Board.

Mr. Golde indicated they will be turning off the parking lot lights at night. The lights will only be on during business hours. He also noted that a sprinkler system will be installed for fire protection purposes. He explained that the drainage design includes a reservoir under the parking lot to collect stormwater.

He reported that they have also made the offer of an access easement to benefit the property to the west but it has been declined. He also indicated they had met with the church council of the abutting church a number of times to try to work out access and parking but, after looking at a number of options, the church council decided they did not have enough property on either side of their building to allow for a cooperative effort. He also mentioned that they are accommodating a lot of runoff from other properties in the design of their own drainage system.

Diane Puckhaber, owner of 79-81 North State Street, explained that the original proposal probably impacted her property more than this one does. Cedar Court is very narrow and used mostly by residents of the abutting properties as well as employees of offices located on Maple Street. This is a very difficult situation, particularly during the winter in snow conditions. Her concerns relate mostly to the fact that this is a compact neighborhood with little green space and quite a few people crowded into a small area. There are a lot of competing interests in this situation. She felt that there is only a need for 12 parking spaces even though 17 spaces are proposed. If 17 vehicles are going to be using Cedar Court, it will be a large problem. If there were less parking, this proposal would be more compatible with the existing neighborhood.

Marian Sagona, owner of 28 Centre Street, had a number of issues related to these applications. Neighbors on this block have always gotten along, at least in the 16 years she has owned her property. Currently she has a young family as a tenant. The father is wheelchair bound and they have three children under the age of four. There is a lift for his access to the building and he also has a lift for his van. There are four vehicles typically parked on the property for the two residential units. Her first concern is safety. Because of the proposed fence, her tenants will have to back out of the driveway onto Centre Street. Up until now they have had a good relationship with the previous owner which allowed them to use some of the abutting property for turning around in order to drive out of the driveway. She explained the parking situation in her yard, particularly as it affects her wheelchair bound tenant.

She also expressed concerned about the drainage plan and how it will affect her property in the winter, possibly creating an icy situation. She cannot support any water coming onto her property and cannot understand how she will not have snow melt flowing onto her property. Not having a fence is a concern because of the three small children in her house, but having a fence then creates problems with driveway access. She does not know how they will be able to back out onto Centre Street. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic on Centre Street.

Ms. Sagona felt this particular plan would impact almost every property on this block. This particular property has a lot of possibilities and she wondered if this was the only use for the property.

She noted that there is already a driveway on this property. She felt that when the previous medical office was active, there were not 30 vehicles a day using the property. The idea of allowing an additional driveway on Centre Street is not practical.

Regarding demolition of the house in the rear of the property, she had been told that the house in the front has asbestos shingles and she wondered about environmental issues involving the demolition of the rear building that will need to be addressed during that demolition.

She also asked the Planning Board to continue to monitor the on-going litigation related to Cedar Court to be certain that any resolution does not affect this property.

She asked the Board to consider the existing neighborhood and the quality of the neighborhood as it exists today and the additional burden this will place not only on this property but on this block as well as further up Centre Street. She would like the property owner to consider other uses for the property.

Mr. Kenison asked Ms. Sagona if she would be willing to explore improving the driveway access for both properties. She responded that she had concerns about safety and liability in granting access rights to an abutter that she does not know.

Rick Angwin, abutter on Maple Street, reported that a plan had been presented to him about a year ago and that plan had a note that snow would be removed from the site after each storm. That was appealing to him because he has several sump pumps pumping water out of his cellar every winter as a result of snow melt. The current plan has the snow stored on site and the snow melting into a drain. That will be fine with him but only if it works. However, he expressed concern about whether it would actually work. He liked the idea of having the snow removed after each storm with some enforcement of that arrangement. He also explained that he was a party to the Cedar Court litigation with 26 Centre Street LLC and the previous owner of 26 Centre Street, Mark Ruddy, and that the focus of the litigation was the use of the west end of Cedar Court behind his home.

Mr. Golde responded to the concerns expressed. He explained that currently there is no place on site for water to go. The applicant proposes to use pervious pavement in the parking lot to control stormwater runoff. The snow storage area is designed with a bio-retention swale. Since the Board first saw this application, they have reduced the size of the parking area and created a grassy area where snow will be stored. That area will be slightly depressed and will allow runoff from surrounding lots to have some place to go.

Mr. Gross asked Mr. Golde about maintenance of the pervious surface and Mr. Golde responded that it will need to be vacuumed periodically. There will also be special considerations in the winter such not sanding the area since the sand will accumulate in the pervious surface and contribute to ponding of water.

Mr. Swope explained his major concern was with traffic flow and he felt that working with the abutters to the east and the west could enable a much better design.

There was no one else who wished to speak for or against this application and the Chair declared the hearing closed at 8:36 PM.

Deliberations and Action on Applications

Mr. Gross noted that this is a very tight area with substantial problems of access and drainage, and cooperative efforts to resolve this on a larger scale would probably generate mutual benefit. This current plan is an attempt by the applicant to try to deal with a difficult situation with some broader cooperation. On that basis he was not inclined to vote in the affirmative on this application tonight. He would rather see the parties sit down and have good discussion to see where their mutual interests lie and get something more like a redevelopment of that entire corner with better access and better drainage for everyone. He felt the best way to get that done was to keep this application alive.

Mr. Gross moved to table action on these applications and to strongly recommend to the interested parties that they have serious conversations. Mr. Swope seconded.

Ms. Meyer disagreed with Mr. Gross because she did not feel the Planning Board should recommend that they be granted the Conditional Use Permit. She was not in favor of granting 17 parking spaces when only 12 are required. This violates driveway separation from three different intersections. She indicated that she would not vote to approve this application as presented.

Mr. Gross noted that the public interest is in getting this derelict property in the civic and downtown area improved.

Mr. Woodward noted that the staff has seen a number of proposals for this property including one where the buildings would be demolished and a parking lot constructed on the premises. He also offered to try to find examples of agreements relating to shared driveways from past applications that were similar to the circumstances of this case. He thought perhaps staff could offer to try to help them find common ground on that particular matter.

Mr. Kenison agreed with Mr. Gross. He encouraged the parties to try to pursue the best result in this situation.

Motion to table carried.

Major Site Plan Applications

4. Application by the **Duprey Acquisitions, LLC, on behalf of Sanel Realty Company, Inc.**, for a site plan of property located at **45A-49 South Main Street and 7 Theatre Street. (#2009-34)**

Determination of Completeness

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal to demolish two buildings fronting on South Main Street, Theatre Street and Storrs Street, and to develop a portion of the site for a 91,500 square foot, six story office building. The lowest level will include a 21 space parking garage with access from Theatre Street.

He reported this application was complete and ready to be set for public hearing on October 21, 2009.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and to set it for the public hearing on October 21, 2009. Mr. Shurtleff seconded. Motion carried.

5. Application by the **Duprey Acquisitions, LLC**, and the **Concord Area Trust for Community Housing (CATCH)** on behalf of **Sanel Realty Company, Inc.**, for a site plan of property located at **49-53 Storrs Street and 7 Theatre Street. (#2009-35)**

Determination of Completeness

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal by the Concord Area Trust for Community Housing to construct a 45-unit apartment building at the corner of Theatre Street and Storrs Street. The application includes the construction of the building and associated drainage, landscaping, and utility improvements as well as improvements to Storrs Street and the Storrs Street/Theatre Street intersection.

He reported this application was complete and ready to be set for public hearing on October 21, 2009.

Mr. Gross moved that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and to set it for the public hearing on October 21, 2009. Mr. Hicks seconded. Motion carried.

6. Application by **St. Paul's School** for a site plan of property located on **Dunbarton Road. (#2009-29)**

Determination of Completeness

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal to demolish a 24,802 square foot classroom building and to construct a new 80,000 square foot Math and Science Classroom building. The application includes the removal of 46 parking spaces and the construction of 48 new parking spaces. The project includes the relocation of a portion of Dunbarton Road, as well as significant drainage improvements, and the shifting of the location of an existing recreation field easterly of Dunbarton Road.

He reported that the applicant has also requested a Conditional Use Permit to disturb wetland buffers for the drainage improvements, and the application will need to be

modified to address additional clearing necessary to shift the recreation field easterly towards Miller's Brook.

He reported this application was complete and ready to be set for public hearing on October 21, 2009.

Mr. Swope moved that the Planning Board determine this application to be complete and to set it for the public hearing on October 21, 2009. Mr. Shurtleff seconded. Motion carried.

Architectural Design Review

7. Application by the following for approval of signs at the following location under the provisions of Section 28-9-4(f), Architectural Design Review, of the Code of Ordinances.

- **A. Little Confection at 124.5 North Main Street** (1 hanging sign & 1 affixed sign)

Public Hearing

Mr. Henninger explained that no plan had been submitted showing placement of the sign on the building.

He reported that the Design Review Committee had found the design of both signs to be appropriate for the location and use and recommended approval of the graphics for both signs but requested that information be provided relative to placement in context on the building for the affixed sign. Inasmuch as the hanging sign will use the existing brackets, the Committee also recommended approval of the placement of the hanging sign.

He reported that a plan showing the location of the affixed sign has since been submitted. The intent of the owner is to place as closely as possible to the placement of the previous signs in order to reuse existing hardware.

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant and no one else wishing to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Gross moved approval as submitted and Mr. Swope seconded. Motion carried.

8. Application by **Tsunis Holding, Inc.** for approval of modifications to the previously approved exterior design of the Holiday Inn at **172 North Main Street. (#2009-37)**

Public Hearing

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal for modifications to the façade at the Holiday Inn. He explained that they also propose green floodlights at three locations. He explained this is Holiday Inn's prototype lighting as part of their signage. He explained

they propose to remove the existing exterior surface and to reapply new EIFS along with man-made limestone. Windows and air conditioners will remain where they are. Air conditioning units will be painted to match the background that they are sitting on. They also propose to remove the baluster cap and to replace it with a solid parapet wall. He explained there will be rough face brick along the lower edge of the building with smooth face above. There will also be two green floodlights facing down onto the entry canopy. No signage has been presented for approval at this time. They will submit the signage at a later date along with the proposal for the green lighting.

He reported that the Design Review Committee had recommended approval subject to some darker colors being incorporated into the scheme, especially at the ends of the building, and the entry redesigned to make it more balanced. The Committee also advised the applicant that the green flood lights on the building façade were not appropriate but reserved judgment on the green floodlighting underneath the main street canopy.

He reported that revised plans have been submitted complying with the recommendations of the Design Review Committee.

Mr. Gross asked if the City had in recent years pursued a policy of lighting that generally discouraged uplighting, particularly in the downtown and civic areas, to minimize light pollution. Mr. Henninger responded that was true.

Charles Landsman from BMA Architectural Group explained that the green flood lighting is the current Holiday Inn identity. As a result of conversations with the Design Review Committee, they are now showing white uplighting as a place holder for their future signage package. He also pointed out that this is a sophisticated lighting system that will allow them to limit exactly where it is aimed and its intensity. A signage package will be submitted at a later date along with the lighting proposal.

There was no one who wished to speak for or against this application and the Chair declared the hearing closed at 9:05 PM.

Deliberations and Action on Application

Mr. Swope moved approval of the modifications to the façade as revised, but not including any lighting or signage. Mr. Gross seconded. Motion carried.

REGULAR MEETING

Minutes

Mr. Gross moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of August 19, 2009 as submitted. Ms. Meyer seconded. Motion carried.

City Council Referrals

11. Further consideration of a request from John Jordan for a **rezoning of 51 Tanner Street in Penacook**, from an Urban Commercial (CU) to a Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Mr. Woodward reported that, at the request of the Planning Board last month, Planning staff had communicated with the petitioner and requested further information about his intentions for use of the property and his reasons for requesting a rezoning. He expected further information from the petitioner but had not received it as yet.

Mr. Gross moved to leave this item on the table. Mr. Shurtleff seconded. Motion carried.

Old Business

12. Further consideration of a review of a **Development of Regional Impact on North Pembroke Road in Pembroke** across from the City's wellfield.

Mr. Woodward reported that the Planning Board, at its meeting on August 19, 2009, considered a communication from the Planning Division to the Pembroke Planning Board in response to a notice of a Development of Regional Impact on North Pembroke Road in Pembroke across from the City's wellfield. The Board discussed the matter and directed the Planning Division to determine the status of this application and to report back to the Board as to the degree to which Pembroke had responded to Concord's concerns.

Based on the minutes of the Pembroke Planning Board meeting on July 28, 2009, the Planning Division forwarded an email communication to the Pembroke Board in time for its August 25, 2009 meeting to clarify that, contrary to the assertions of the applicant, there is indeed a wellhead protection area defined for the City's wellfield, and the proposed development is within that area. A copy of a map of the wellhead protection area, as had been displayed in the Aquifer Protection materials presented to the Board, was included in the transmittal.

He reported that the Interim Planner for Pembroke emailed following the August 25th meeting of the Pembroke Board indicating that the applicant had asked for submittal of a copy the study and documentation that supported the establishment of the wellhead protection area for the City's wells. The Planning Division responded that the wellhead protection area was established by NHDES, not the City, and indicated that NHDES would be queried as to the background studies that led to the wellhead protection area. That information has now been obtained and has been transmitted to the Pembroke Planning Board. The City's wellhead protection area was developed by the US Environmental Protection Agency.

He reported he had been informed that the Pembroke Planning Board has tabled action on this application for further consideration. They are meeting again next week and he reported he would continue to track their actions.

Mr. Gross asked what the City's remedy would be if the applicant receives approval in spite of the EPA's classification of the wellhead protection area. Mr. Woodward responded that the City's remedies are limited.

13. Any **other business** which may legally come before the Board.

Mr. Woodward reported that Concord 2020 has put out a Request for Qualifications to convene and facilitate a public process to examine the City's existing zoning ordinance and site plan and subdivision regulations within the context of the City's recently adopted 2030 Master Plan and the community's changing priorities. The goal is to create a draft set of zoning/land use revisions for consideration by the City.

He reported that Concord 2020 expected to have a consultant under contract by the end of October and the public process would occur from November through February.

Members expressed hope that the Planning Board will be invited to participate in this process.

INFORMATION

Mr. Woodward also mentioned the possibility that next month the Board may need a second meeting inasmuch as this evening the Board set three public hearings for October 21st as well as tabled action on an application to that date. He suggested either October 28 or November 4 as dates for a possible recessed meeting. Members expressed no preference.

There was no further business to come before the Board and the meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

Douglas G. Woodward
Clerk

o