

**SOMERSWORTH PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
APRIL 20, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Anthony Delyani, Vice Chairman, Dave Witham, City Council Representative, Bob Belmore, City Manager, Ron LeHoullier, Dan Proulx, Paul Robidas, Erwin Grant, Matthew Durkee and Paul Maskwa, Alternate.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bill Sweeney, Chairman.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Dave Sharples, City Planner and Tracy Gora, Planning Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

**1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

**Motion:** LeHoullier moved to accept the minutes of the meeting of March 16, 2011.

Seconded by Witham. Motion carried with a 7-0-2 vote with Delyani and Grant abstained.

**2) COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**A) ZBA Report**

Sharples referred to the attached report and stated that there were no new applications to review.

**B) City Council Report**

Witham stated that the City Council passed a resolution to establish a capital reserve fund for sidewalk rehabilitation. Stated that the Council passed the amendment to the Riparian and Wetland Buffer Ordinance, which allows the crossing of buffers for timber harvesting. Stated that the Council passed a resolution to encourage regionalizing efforts such as purchasing sand/salt with the City of Rochester. Stated that at the last meeting the Council voted to discharge an easement on Lake Street. Stated that there are two resolutions regarding the Hilltop School that are still ongoing.

**C) Site Review Technical Committee Report**

Sharples referred to the attached report and stated that Dalal, LLC applied for site plan approval to expand his business, Best Pawn and Exchange. Stated that it would just be for a small connection of the two buildings and that the SRTC determined the application to be minor and they have authority to take action on it. Stated that there is a meeting scheduled for tomorrow.

**D) Minor Field Modification Report**

Sharples referred to the attached report and stated that there were none.

**E) Strafford Regional Planning Commission Update**

Sharples stated that the Policy Committee met last Friday and discussed the NHDOT 10-year plan. Stated that Tapscott and Sprague were there as commissioners. Stated that there was some recommended cuts but that none of them included Somersworth projects.

Witham asked what projects are in the 10-year plan.

Sharples stated that the TE Grant and the Route 9 bridge are both in the 10-year plan and that they are not proposed to be cut by the Policy Committee.

F) Vision 2020 Report

Belmore stated that at the last meeting there was a presentation from students at the high school to design a logo. Stated that the Committee narrowed it down to two logos.

Witham verified that the branding is part of the Master Plan.

Sharples replied yes.

Delyani commended the Committee for using local high school students to design the branding.

**3) OLD BUSINESS**

A) Any old business that may come before the Board.

LeHoullier asked about the no trespassing fence that was erected at the pedestrian footbridge at the Mill.

Sharples stated that the building of the pedestrian bridge was completed and it was opened. Stated that the railroad put up a fence because they were worried about safety and that the fence was taken down. Stated that the fence was put back up and that Chinburg (the owner of the Mill) allowed keeping it temporarily closed while the railroad can get paperwork together. Stated that the issue with the crossing at Canal Street is also coming to a head and that it may be all wrapped up soon.

LeHoullier asked how this was taken care of when the shoe shop was open at the Mill.

Sharples stated that the lawyer for the Mill did extensive research and that his opinion is that the railroad came after development of the Mill area and that the Mill property still has the right to cross the railroad.

Robidas asked, regarding the Canal Street hearing, what the worst-case scenario would be.

Sharples mentioned a safety package that was agreed upon a couple years ago and that he thinks that is where it is going to go. Stated that part of the issue is cost and who is going to pay for what.

**4) NEW BUSINESS**

A) LDL Enterprises, Inc. is seeking site plan approval to renovate the existing structure and build a new structure for commercial and residential units on property located at 67 Elm Street, in the Business Historic (BH) District, Assessor's Map 10, Lot 174, SITE #05-2010.

Sharples reviewed his memo (see attached) and stated that the applicant is proposing to rehabilitate the existing building and to also build a second building. Stated that the existing building will have two commercial units at street level and 12 residential units while the new building will have three commercial units at street level and three residential units. Stated that the new building will have two stories tall and will look similar to the existing structure. Stated that the property is in the Business (B) District, where mixed-use is allowed. Stated that the

parking requirement is for two spaces per dwelling unit, which would be 30 spaces for this project, but that the applicant got a variance from the ZBA, although the Planning Board can still weigh in on the parking issue. Stated that he asked the applicant to identify off-street parking, but not to designate it for this property. Stated that the property is in the Historic overlay (H) District and that they went before the Historic District Commission (HDC) and got approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Stated that there is not a lot of area for drainage but that the applicant agreed to tree box filters (see attached handout). Stated that CLD Engineers will be reviewing this application and that an escrow account will be set up for that shortly. Suggested that the Planning Board schedule a site walk of the property.

**Motion:** Witham moved that the site plan application for LDL Enterprises, Inc. is complete for review purposes.

Seconded by Robidas. Motion carried with a 9-0 vote.

**Chris Berry** from Berry Surveying & Engineering represented the applicant and stated that the property owner, Dan Leap, and the Architect, Scott Coruth are also in attendance. Stated that currently at the property there is an existing structure and vacant areas to the north and south, with no assigned parking, just a gravel area. Stated that when Leap purchased the property he wanted to have a mix of residential and commercial uses like on Market and Main Streets. Stated that the new building will have commercial units on the bottom with town-house style apartments above, which could be condos in the future. Stated that the existing structure will have two or three commercial units on the bottom floor and that the only known tenet is a Laundromat. Stated that there will be standard one-bedroom and efficiency apartments above. Stated that they will be market-rate apartments with tenets that will work here in the City and use public transportation. Stated that they have to balance the parking needs and that he feels it is adequate for residential parking. Stated that he has an easement for two parking spaces on one of the abutting properties. Stated that in large cities there are no parking requirements and that they have keeping that mindset. Stated that there is a lot of parking downtown and that they looked at widening the street and having three or four spaces along the front. Stated that farther down Elm Street there is parking and that they worked with the Traffic Safety Committee to free them up and that they felt good about that. Stated that there is parking on Washington Street but that from a pedestrian management standpoint there needs to be more safety. Stated that he have been working with the City Engineer to modify the crosswalk but that it causes ADA and intersection issues. Stated that they will upgrade the sidewalks along Elm Street and wrapping around the corner. Stated that there are two parking spaces required for ADA accessibility and that they have been provided. Stated that they are still working on ADA access to the existing structure. Stated that Elm Street is flat with poor drainage but that moving onto the site is steep. Stated that to alleviate that, they are planning to drop the parking lot area to make the transition into the parking lot better. Stated that they are proposing to shed the parking lots away from the entrance and into catch basins. Stated that since the property is so close to the river, treatment is appropriate and that tree box filters is a perfect idea. Explained the details of tree box filters and stated that they allow water to flow through. Stated that the City's drainage system is outdated in this area. Stated that they don't want to tie into outdated infrastructure. Stated that they want to tie in on Washington Street but that it needs to be updated. Referred to an upgrade of the system shown on the plans and stated that they are able to reduce peak rate entry. Stated that the water system is also not in good shape and that the Department of Public Works (DPW) requested that they tie into it at Washington Street. Stated that it will all be done at once so there is only one patch in the road. Stated that they want to install a new hydrant because the existing one is worthless. Stated that the buildings will need to have a sprinkler. Stated that the lighting will be down lit and shielded but since it is a small site, the lighting will be simple. Stated that there will be no light trespass except for some spill onto Church Street. Stated that there will only be four lamps. Stated that they are proposing a lot of impervious area but that there will be plantings with trees and smaller shrubs

along the edging. Stated that there will be parking and a sidewalk between the two structures but that the front will remain vegetated.

**Scott Coruth** with Coruth Design Architects addressed the Board. Stated that the goal with renovating the building was to address the historic context and to limit excessive changes. Stated that they don't want the buildings to contrast significantly and that they want to preserve what is there. Showed proposed elevations. Stated that they want to focus on pedestrian movement in that area so the scale of the building reflects that. Stated that they are keeping the existing the existing building pretty much as is but taking the small single-story portion on the side down. Stated that they will rebuild it and adjust the roof slope. Stated that there will be small dormers.

**Public hearing opened 7:15 pm.**

**Giang Vu**, owner of 117 Main Street and other properties in the area, addressed the Board. Asked why they should be allowed to build if they don't have enough parking spaces. Stated that accidents happen and that recently a car hit the American Legion and the driver died. Stated that the deceased soul stays on Earth. Stated that in this country safety is first and it is very important. Stated that the next person in an accident could be you or me. Stated that public safety is very important. Stated that the applicant talked about more space to park cars but that he thinks he is wrong. Stated that when there is a lot of snow there is no room to plow and that cars cannot be parked. Stated that they go by summer standards for parking but that it snows in the winter. Stated that he would be good with the existing motel but that it is not good to build the second building. Stated that there needs to be a traffic light on Washington Street and Constitutional Way. Stated that two parking spaces for one unit is the law and that the new construction has to follow the law. Stated that the bottom line is that safety is very important.

**Jeff Francoeur**, owner of 10 Green Street addressed the Board and stated that he is not here to speak against the project. Stated that he owns the Greek Church, that was remodeled into apartments, and that his deed gives two parking spots for the subject property. Stated that Church Street is a through street and that it is in very poor shape. Stated that when driving down Church Street during foul weather you slip onto Elm Street like you are skiing. Stated that there could be an accident there. Stated that he is in favor of what they are doing because he is tired of looking at the building how it stands today. Stated that it would enhance the City.

**Ken Maple**, a representative from the American Legion at 45 Washington Street addressed the Board and stated that he is concerned with parking. Stated that he wants to know if the proposed parking is going to be adequate and not take away from other areas.

Witham asked if the parking lot on Constitutional Way is owned by the Legion.

Maple replied yes.

**Diane Griffith** of 52 Grove Street addressed the Board and stated that she has concerns with the project. Stated that there are enough rental units in the City. Stated that 56% of the units are owner occupied and 43% are renter occupied and that it is unnecessary to add more. Asked "efficiency unit" means and asked what the clientele will be. Stated that the commercial units are unassigned and asked what the prospect is of getting renters in the units. Stated that she would like an explanation of the comment made that the units could be condos. Asked how many more units the City needs. Asked why the HDC approved the application and if it is just based on the historic design. Asked for information on the escrow account that was mentioned. Stated that there are enough rental units and that she would like to see something else done.

**Public hearing closed 7:34 pm.**

Sharples stated that a traffic impact analysis is forthcoming and may help with traffic and parking concerns.

Witham stated that the regulations were recently amended so there are two levels of traffic studies and asked if this is at the less intensive study.

Sharples replied yes and stated that this is borderline but that he doesn't know yet. Stated that regarding snow storage, snow will be moved off site. Stated that the ZBA granted a variance from the parking requirement. Stated that 30 spaces are required and the applicant supplied 24 on site spaces.

Proulx stated that he thinks the abutter was talking about a precedence that was set and that he is concerned about having a double standard.

Belmore stated that each application stands on its own merit and that this Board can't answer why other Board acted as they did.

Sharples stated that an abutter mentioned that Church Street is in terrible condition and suggested that the Board look at that when they do their site walk. Stated that Maple mentioned that parking is a problem and that there is not enough parking onsite and that it will spill over. Stated that anyone has the right to use public parking and that it can't be designated. Stated that the purpose of the HDC is limited to architectural elevations and not site plan review. Stated that there are 12 residential units proposed for the existing building and three proposed for the new building for a total of 15 units. Stated that he cannot speculate what the prospect is to rent out the commercial units. Stated that efficiency apartments have no bedrooms. Stated that regarding clientele, the applicant stated that it will be market-rate. Stated that CLD Engineering is a third party consulting firm that reviews some projects for the City. Stated that the applicant sets up an escrow to pay for the review.

Delyani asked about having a traffic light.

Sharples stated that he needs to see a traffic impact analysis.

Delyani stated that Griffith mentioned a concern of additional rental units in this market and asked if that is more of a policy question that is beyond the Planning Board's review. Stated that the Planning Board just makes sure the proposals meet the requirements of the City.

Berry stated that this is the downtown area and that they would have the same snow issues as everyone else. Stated that snow will have to be removed.

Belmore asked if there were considerations for off site improvements like for Church Street.

Sharples stated that sidewalks and striping of Elm Street are all off site improvements. Stated that they will relocate the existing crosswalk and add tip-downs.

Belmore asked if there was any consideration for bump-outs.

Berry stated that the crosswalk is lined up with the stairs and that it is not the best place for it. Stated that they can look at having potential bump-outs.

Belmore asked if there will be any brick stamped in the sidewalk.

Sharples stated that it was not proposed and that the TE Grant that the City got does not extend down that far.

Witham stated that the brick is stamped concrete on the sidewalks in downtown. Asked how Church Street is identified. Stated that fire apparatus may have a hard time navigating that street and that he would like to hear from the Fire Chief if that street is necessary for safety.

Berry stated that Church Street is next to the subject property and that they are not proposing any changes there. Stated that he understands the concern but that it doesn't affect the applicant directly and that they are not proposing any changes. Stated that they are dropping the grade of the parking lot.

Witham stated that the tree box filters interests him. Asked if porous pavement can be used for this project.

Berry stated that there is an expense with that. Stated that they did two test pits and that the water table is very close to the surface and that there is angled ledge. Stated that there is no ability to perk water into the ground.

Witham stated that the applicant mentioned that use of public transportation and asked if the property is on the COAST Bus route.

Berry stated that they engaged COAST and that there is a drop off stop in front of the site. Stated that COAST is giving them a shelter and that the City seems to know where it will be placed.

Sharples mentioned where it is going to be placed by the intersection of Washington Street and Constitutional Way. Asked for a cut sheet on the shelter and for it to be shown on the plans.

Witham stated that regarding parking, he shares some of the concerns of the properties nearby. Asked if the applicant could put up a sign at the American Legion that it is for Legion parking only.

Berry stated that he doesn't think that the applicant would have a problem with that.

Witham asked what triggers an analysis for the impact on schools. Mentioned that in the Site Plan Regulations, residential projects needs to have recreational amenities.

Sharples mentioned that the applicant with request a waiver from the open space requirement. Stated that the Board discussed fiscal impact studies when reviewing the Site Plan Regulations and that the language was kept but that they are not sure what to do with the results from the study. Stated that the City doesn't have impact fees.

Witham stated that he thinks it is helpful from a planning perspective. Stated that if a project is going to put children in the school system then they should know what the triggers are.

LeHoullier asked if there will be a building manager.

Berry stated that he doesn't think so and that the owner will manage it.

LeHoullier asked if the property will be maintained.

Berry replied yes.

LeHoullier stated that there are other properties like this in the City that don't get maintained. Asked if there will be storage areas for each unit.

Berry stated that there are none proposed at this time.

LeHoullier asked if the owner is going to keep the property.

Berry stated that the owner plans on keeping it.

LeHoullier stated that he is worried that the property will be flipped and then they don't end up market rate and use tax dollars for municipal services. Stated that he would like Sharples to draw up something to guarantee these things.

Proulx stated that he would like to endorse having an impact analysis for the school system and Fire/Police. Stated that the ZBA granted a variance for parking and asked if that automatically gives the applicant the green light or if the Planning Board can mandate parking.

Sharples replied yes and no. Stated that the Planning Board can't take the variance away but that they can assess the site and can say that 24 spaces is inadequate.

Proulx stated that the two spaces per unit requirement just takes the residential units into consideration.

Durkee echoed Proulx's comments and stated that they are leaving off the commercial impact of this plan. Stated that someone says that the parking isn't adequate now. Asked what is behind the two spaces per unit requirement and asked how the Board should base adequate parking.

Berry stated that they did go before the ZBA and that if this project was outside of town they would need two spaces per unit. Stated that there are townhouse and efficiency apartments and that they will use public transit, which is what the project is promoting. Stated that the living style doesn't lend itself to two spaces per unit.

Durkee stated that he finds it odd that the assumption is that efficiency apartments mean that they are not going to need a car. Stated that it is dangerous to accept the assumption that they will not have a car.

Berry stated that regarding the commercial units; the idea is for the same outlook at the downtown business outlook. Stated that they are not trying to provide onsite parking for the commercial units because other downtown commercial units don't have that. Stated that they are not large commercial units but will be small for professional use.

Belmore asked how many bedrooms there will be per unit.

Coruth stated that in the existing structure, there will be three efficiencies, which have no separate bedrooms, six-one bedroom apartments and three-two bedrooms apartments. Stated that in the new building, there will be three townhouse style apartments with three bedrooms each.

Belmore stated that he just wants to know how many people will be living there is all residential units were filled.

Coruth stated that there are a total of 24 bedrooms, which is a reduction from what the existing structure could hold. Stated that they are reducing the total number of beds on site. Stated that they assume 21 cars total. Stated that there are 24 bedrooms, which includes the efficiency apartments.

LeHoullier stated that there will be 24 bedrooms but that there could be up to 48 adults.

Robidas stated that there has to be a happy medium.

Delyani asked if the Planning Board is permitted to have a condition for more parking, which essentially undoes the ZBA decision.

Sharples stated that the short answer is yes. Stated that he did a rough calculation and thought that 38 parking spots is what this site may demand, which was looking at commercial and residential units. Stated that the parking spaces at the end of Elm Street are from the Old City Hall.

Witham stated that Old City Hall is currently the Historic Museum and that it is a City-owned building. Stated that parking could be an issue there in the future. Stated that he is thinking of past practices of the Planning Board and asked about granting parking relief for Borderline Beverage on Market Street.

Sharples stated that the residential units weren't part of that proposal. Stated that it was just based on the commercial needs.

Maskwa asked if the Laundromat will be in the existing building or the new building.

Berry replied the existing building.

Maskwa asked if there is any parking for that on Elm Street.

Berry stated that they are creating four new spaces.

Maskwa stated that there are also some spaces on the north side of Washington Street. Stated that he is concerned with people looking to use the Laundromat and having to carry their laundry to the site. Stated that it could be problematic for the Laundromat.

Durkee asked if there has been any thought to assigning parking spaces for certain units or if this will be first come, first served.

Berry stated that it is easy to say that there isn't enough parking but that it has been reviewed a lot. Stated that they are trying to manage how people part and guide them to use public transportation. Stated that the parking lot on the property is for the residential use only. Stated that they are trying to require that the tenets stay within the two new parking lots on site. Stated that during the day, residents leave and the commercial units will use the spaces. Stated that they do have one lot for tenet parking so that they don't have to rely on street parking.

Belmore stated that the parking situation will required more information so the Board may want to move on to other issues with the site plan application. Stated that they need to plan a site walk.

Witham stated that it would be helpful for the Board to list out follow up items for the applicant. Stated that he would like feedback from the Fire Department regarding Church Street for equipment access for this project. Stated that he would like a cut sheet on the lighting specifications since the design has to keep in style with the surrounding area.

Belmore stated that regarding a fiscal analysis; he is not in favor of having one done just for the sake of doing one. Suggested that the applicant make a reasonable donation to recreation in lieu of doing studies.

Delyani stated that there are costs to the applicant to do studies and that he agrees with Belmore on that.

Sharples stated that he will do more research also and that there may be studies that have already been done for the area.

Witham stated that it would be a good starting point.

Sharples stated that for a list of thing to be done, he will examine parking and do an analysis and put it in writing and that he will talk with the Fire Chief about Church Street. Stated that the applicant mentioned a parking agreement with the tenets, supply a cut sheet on the COAST Bus shelter and add it to the plans, have an internal discussion on the stamped brick in the sidewalks and whether there will be storage units for each residential unit. Stated that CLD Engineers haven't done their review of the project yet.

Belmore mentioned sidewalk bump-outs also.

Witham mentioned that the applicant did a nice job on the architecture and that there isn't an issue with appearance standards.

Belmore mentioned looking into negotiations for a recreation waiver.

Berry stated that he appreciates the comment for financial consideration for studies. Stated that there will also be about \$2000.00 for CLD Engineering review. Stated that he would like to know the overall thoughts of the Board. Stated that parking seems to be the biggest issue and that he would like the Board's patience with them. Stated that they don't want to pay for all the extra stuff if the project isn't going to go through.

The Board discussed having a site walk of the subject property meeting at 5:00 pm before the next Planning Board meeting on May 18, 2011.

**Motion:** Robidas moved that the site plan application of LDL Enterprises, Inc. to renovate the existing structure and build a new structure for commercial and residential units be **TABLED** until the May 18, 2011 Planning Board meeting.

Seconded by Belmore. Motion carried with a 9-0 vote.

**The Board took a recess at 8:30 pm.**

**The Board returned from recess at 8:35 pm.**

B) Any other new business that may come before the Board.

LeHoullier mentioned the project in Rollinsford at the end of Tri City Road that Director Wheeler has been attending the meetings for. Asked if the Planning Board should take interest in that and asked if it is a project of regional importance.

Witham stated that months ago he attended a design review for the project and he indicated to the Rollinsford Planning Board that it should be a project of regional impact. Stated that it is destined to dump out on Tri City Road and that they talked about having a traffic light on High Street. Stated that there will be an impact on schools. Stated that he thinks the Planning Board should send a letter to the Rollinsford Planning Board.

Maskwa stated that he also attended the last Rollinsford meeting on this and that they talked about having 270 units with two access points, one from Tri City Road and one from Pinecrest Drive. Stated that they have looked into having a conservation area instead of building on it but that it depends on funding. Stated that there was talk of installing a traffic light.

Sharples stated that they presented five options and that the most intense of the options was for 270 units but it scales down to 100 units. Stated that the fifth option is for working with a trust for public land. Stated that he thinks that if there is any building out there they will have to extend the road and utilities. Stated that he thinks they would have to come before this Planning Board also.

Belmore stated that there is an RSA for development of a regional impact.

Sharples stated that the Regional Planning Commission gets involved.

Belmore asked if the Rollinsford Planning Board has to make that determination.

Sharples read from the RSA and stated that from what Director Wheeler has said, they agree that it is regional impact.

Belmore stated that he supports sending a letter to the Rollinsford Planning Board and the Strafford Regional Planning Commission encouraging and supporting their declaration of its impact to the City of Somersworth. Made a **motion** of his comment.

Seconded by Witham. Motion carried with a 9-0 vote.

Delyani asked Sharples about the Low Impact Development (LID) memo that was in the monthly packet.

Sharples reviewed his memo (see attached) and stated that at last month's Planning Board meeting he talked about the CTAP program and applying to it to develop a new conservation subdivision ordinance. Stated that he will keep going on that but that there was a miscommunication with PREP. Stated that there is money specifically for an LID ordinance that is available now. Stated that there is approximately \$8300.00 and that it is the City's if we want it. Stated that development of an LID ordinance is mentioned in the Master Plan. Stated that CTAP would still be funded and that the Board could work on that after. Stated that this one would start immediately. Stated that he thinks an LID ordinance should go in the Site Plan Regulations. Stated that the Board would need to make a motion to accept the offer for LID and that the Board make a good faith effort.

Witham asked what PREP stands for.

Sharples stated it stands for Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership.

Belmore stated that this doesn't need to go to the City Council because the City is not receiving any money. Stated that PREP pay directly.

Sharples concurred and stated that the City doesn't get any invoices or funds.

Maskwa asked if a consultant is chosen, the Board has workshop and a regulation gets created.

Sharples replied yes and stated that the finished product would be for low impact development regulation for stormwater management practices. Stated that it is the best for stormwater.

Maskwa asked if this was targeted in the Master Plan.

Sharples replied yes and stated that it was listed in the goals.

Robidas stated that this also allows for the Board's education on this topic. Stated that it is a no-brainer.

**Motion:** Maskwa moved that the Planning Board shall accept the offer to work with PREP to develop a Low Impact Development Regulation and the Board shall put forth a good faith effort to implement the results of the project.

Seconded by Durkee. Motion carried with a 9-0 vote.

5) **WORKSHOP BUSINESS**

- A) Discussion on amending the purpose statement of the Historic Mill District (Section 3.B.13 of the Zoning Ordinance).

Sharples reviewed his memo (see attached) and stated that at the last Planning Board meeting the Board forwarded three amendments regarding the Historic Mill District to the City Council for consideration. Stated that there was discussion on amending the purpose statement and that he had proposed a new one but there were some suggestions from Board members. Stated that he is waiting to send the other amendments to Council until this proposal is ready so that he can send it as one packet. Stated that it was suggested to add language about sustainability and, although a worthy purpose, it seems better suited for Section 2 of the Zoning Ordinance. Stated that another suggestion was to add language recognizing the district's location on the Salmon Falls River. Read suggested language from his memo and stated that he is not totally happy with it.

Witham asked if the language from the purpose statement can be used by the Board when discussing development.

Sharples replied yes and stated that most developers want to work with the City and that this language does carry weight.

Proulx asked if the proposed language is in addition to the existing language or replaces it.

Sharples stated that it would replace the existing language and that the language in bold print from the memo could be added.

Belmore stated that he likes the bold print language but that he would want to exclude the word "passive".

**Motion:** Belmore moved that the proposed amendment to the purpose statement of the Historic Mill District (Section 3.B.13 of the Zoning Ordinance) be **APPROVED** and include the language in bold print from the City Planner's memo dated April 14, 2011 but striking the word "passive".

Seconded by Proulx. Motion carried with a 9-0 vote.

- B) Any workshop business that may come before the Board.

None.

6) **COMMUNICATION AND MISCELLANEOUS**

Sharples stated that he has been meeting with Dave Salzar to keep the City's GIS system updated and that the City will be getting a GIS intern for the summer. Stated that there will be no charge and that they will be working in the field.

Belmore thanked Sharples for doing this work and for saving the City money at the same time.

Witham mentioned the stormwater management training that they offer at UNH and stated that it is worth going to.

**Motion:** Witham moved to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by Belmore. Motion carried with a 9-0 vote.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:



---

Tracy Gofa, Planning Secretary  
Somersworth Planning Board