

## PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Hearing was conducted by the Planning and Economic Development Committee on Tuesday, April 2, 2002 at 7:00 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

Chairman Brian S. McCarthy presided.

Members of the Committee present: Alderman Scott A. Cote, Vice Chair  
Alderman Kevin McAfee  
Alderman Timothy B. Nickerson  
Alderman Lori Cardin

Also in Attendance:

Alderman-at-Large James R. Tollner  
Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane  
Alderman-at-Large Paula I. Johnson  
Alderman-at-Large Steven A. Bolton  
Alderman-at-Large Frederick Britton  
Alderman Marc W. Plamondon  
Mike Lowe, Planning Board Liaison  
Kathy Hersh, Director, Community Development

## PUBLIC HEARING

O-02-13

AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE BY ADDING A NEW PERMITTED  
PRINCIPAL USE, CITY OR NONPROFIT INDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITY  
ON CITY-OWNED LAND, IN THE PI DISTRICT ONLY

Chair McCarthy

Mrs. Hersh would you like to comment on behalf of the Community Development Division?

Kathy Hersh

The community facilities section of the Table of Use Regulations lists a variety of municipal and non-profit uses including religious facilities, daycare centers, membership clubs, schools, hospitals, municipal service facilities, and rest homes. Community facilities permitted in a PI zone include religious facilities, city government buildings, city outdoor recreational facilities, municipal service facilities, municipal parking garages, and hospitals primarily devoted to the provision of psychiatric or psychological services.

The proposal before you is to allow city or non-profit indoor recreational facilities. It is on city-owned land in the PI zone. City-owned parcels located in a PI zone, which would be effected by

this – there are four of them; one located just north of the Sheraton Tara (I can point them out to you if you like – referring to a map that was located in the Chamber), ... tape inaudible ...

Basically that covers from the Community Development Division standpoint. This proposal appears to be consistent with other municipal uses that are allowed in a PI zone.

Chair McCarthy

Are there any questions from the members of the committee before we take testimony?

Mike Lowe

What about the John Mansfield site? That is city owned now isn't it?

Kathy Hersh

I would have to look closely, but I don't think it is in a PI zone.

Alderman McAfee

I think it is GB.

Chair McCarthy

It is either GI or LB.

Alderman Johnson

May I ask Mrs. Hersh a question – can I get a copy of the list or can you tell me where it is in the zoning book of all of the areas that you can use?

Kathy Hersh

I would be happy to make a copy for you if you like.

Alderman Johnson

I guess what my concern is here that we are opening up these districts now. Once you open it up once you will open it up for anybody else to be able to use this – a non-profit in a PI district. Exactly how many more of these PI districts does the city own – to be exact?

Kathy Hersh

Those are the four locations that I just identified. The ordinance before you suggests that this

would be allowed on city-owned land, therefore, what we did was look at PI zoned land, which had city-owned properties in it of size enough that you could find them on the map and those are the four that I identified. The only one that really would be buildable would be the one that is being proposed for the skating facility.

Alderman Johnson

So there is only actually one piece of land that we own that is buildable in the city for the ice skating rink. There are no other pieces of land in this zone that could hold an ice skating rink – is this what I am hearing?

Kathy Hersh

No. What I am saying is that from a use standpoint of using city-owned land in PI this is the – we don't own a lot of land in PI right now as a city, and the piece of property that we own that are in PI are in those four locations. Three out of those four locations for different reasons there are constraints on the use of those properties. For example, the Westwood parcel we purchased with Land and Community Heritage Investment program money, which limits our use of that – we couldn't build a facility, nobody could build anything on that property – we can't even build a parking lot on that property. The limitations of the properties that we do own in PI are such that there is really only that one area in the vicinity of Stello's Stadium and Mine Falls Park that the city own in PI land.

Alderman Johnson

Let me get this right – there is only one piece of PI that is useable to build the facility on right now, but I guess my concern is, is there any other land in the city that can be used other than that one spot that you can build an ice skating facility on or does it have to be just the PI that the city can use? Can you build something on the general use for the city – why are we targeting – the question has been all along why are we targeting this one area – this one parcel – this PI zoning when there is land throughout the city that the city owns that probably could house something in a different area.

Kathy Hersh

The legislation before you talks about allowing indoor recreational facilities on PI zoned properties that the city owns. The question that you are asking is are there other locations where this skating facility could be located within the city. There may or may not be other locations I don't know – that it could be located in other zones, but with respect to the PI zone the only city owned properties are the ones that I identified.

TESTIMONY IN FAVOR:

John Parolin, Chairman of the Park & Recreation Advisory Committee for the City of Nashua

Charles Hall – 17 Hill Street, Nashua, NH

TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION:

TESTIMONY IN FAVOR

TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION

The Public Hearing was declared closed at 7:14 p.m.

Alderman Scott A. Cote  
Committee Clerk