

**Regular City Council Meeting
July 5, 2022
Council Chambers
6:17 PM**

COUNCILORS PRESENT

Councilor Beaudoin
Councilor Berlin
Councilor de Geofroy
Councilor Desrochers
Councilor Fontneau
Councilor Gilman
Councilor Gray
Councilor Hailey
Councilor Hamann
Councilor Larochelle
Councilor Malone
Deputy Mayor Lachapelle
Mayor Callaghan

OTHERS PRESENT

Blaine Cox, City Manager
Katie Ambrose, Deputy City Manager
Terence, O'Rourke, City Attorney
Mark Sullivan, Deputy Finance
Peter Nourse, Director of City Services
Michael Scala, Economic Development

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Mayor Callaghan called the City Council Regular meeting to order at 6:17 PM.

2. Opening Prayer

Mayor Callaghan asked all present to observe a moment of silence.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

The Council rose and Councilor Hailey led all assembled in the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. Roll Call

Deputy City Clerk Cassie Givara took the roll call attendance. All Councilors were present.

5. Acceptance of Minutes

5.1 Correction to the April 5, 2022 Regular City Council

Minutes

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ACCEPT** the correction to the minutes of the April 5, 2022 Regular City Council meeting. Councilor Malone seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

5.2 Regular City Council Meeting: June 7, 2022

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ACCEPT** the minutes of the June 7, 2022 Regular City Council Meeting. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. Councilor Lachapelle stated that he had one correction to the minutes; on page 30, there is discussion of a motion made by Councilor Beaudoin for a \$100,000 budget reduction. The minutes indicate that the motion carried by an 8-3 vote; however, the motion actually failed. Additionally, Councilor Gray's name is repeated in the vote when the second reference should be to Councilor Hamann. Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ACCEPT** the minutes as corrected. Councilor Hamann seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

5.3 City Council Special Meeting: June 14, 2022

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ACCEPT** the minutes of the June 14, 2022 Special City Council meeting. Councilor Hamann seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

6. Communications from the City Manager

City Manager Cox welcomed Dennis Dube, the City of Rochester's newly appointed Fire Chief, back to Rochester.

City Manager Cox announced there had been the following public input received from the online portal:

- Wanda Boston, Winter Street resident, in regards to speed limit issue on her street. Mr. Cox reported that this issue had been referred to the Public Safety Committee.
- Ramona and Ray Osborne, Chestnut Hill residents, regarding the extension of the fence on Lambert Court. Mr. Cox reported that this item is currently in the Public Works Committee. The Osbornes also submitted an email regarding the purchase of land on the agenda this evening.

- Jennifer Caswell, Cocheco Avenue resident, regarding the need for a noise ordinance.

6.1 City Manager's Report

City Manager Cox stated that there are no changes to his written report, which is in the packet as follows:

Contracts and documents executed since last month:

- **Department of Public Works**
 - Engineering Services Agreement, WWTF – Brown and Caldwell
 - Scope of Services/Estimate, Pearl St Drainage – S.U.R.
 - Project Agreement Tebbetts/Old Dover Intersection – NHDOT
 - Change Order – D & C Construction
 - ARPA Grant Application, Sewer System Master Plan
 - Engineering Services Agreements(2), Sewer System Master Plan – Weston & Sampson
 - Award of Bid, Betts/Cross Intersection – Northeast Earth Mechanics, LLC
 - Contract amendment & Engineering proposal, Betts/Cross – Greenman Pedersen, Inc.
 - Task Order, water transmission pipeline – Weston & Sampson
 - Revision of the Stormwater Management Program
- **Economic Development**
 - MOU, 32 Wakefield Parking – Troxi Properties LLC
- **Government Channel**
 - Video on Demand contract/Live Streaming services
- **Recreation and Arena**
 - Entertainment Agreement – Larry Cushing Enterprises, Inc Performance contract – Strafford Wind Symphony

Standard Reports

- **Personnel Action Report Summary**

Councilor Lachapelle asked if the contract for the Tebbetts Road/Old Dover Road intersection had been signed and inquired when work would begin on the project. Peter Nourse, Director of City Services, stated that the contract with DOT was just signed and there has been a project manager assigned to the project. He stated that the timeline is out to 2024 and is a 90/20 split, with Rochester paying 10% and Federal funds handling the remaining 90%. Mayor Callaghan asked how the intersection will be changed. Director Nourse stated that he did not have specifics at this point. He reported that there had been a road safety audit done on the intersection, following which several options were presented. Director Nourse said that due to the volume of traffic, a 4-way stop would not be plausible. The best option is to install a roundabout, and two relevant concepts were presented. He explained the considerations to be taken for each of the roundabout options. Director Nourse stated there would be updates through the Public Works Committee as they become available.

7. Communications from the Mayor

7.1 Mayoral appointment – Vice Chair of Public Safety Committee

Mayor Callaghan announced that he had appointed Councilor Gilman as Vice Chair of the Public Safety Committee.

Mayor Callaghan announced that he had formed an ad hoc committee with Councilor Malone as chair and Councilors Fontneau and Berlin serving on the committee. The Committee is tasked with finding uses for the funding coming to Rochester as a result of the opioid litigation.

Mayor Callaghan reported that he had met with Governor Sununu along with several other Mayors from neighboring communities to discuss workforce housing. He stated that the Governor had some positive things to say about how Rochester has been handling affordable housing over the past several years.

8. Presentation of Petitions and Council Correspondence

9. Nominations, Appointments, Resignations, and Elections

9.1 Election: City Council Ward 5, Seat A

- a. **Alexander de Geofroy**
- b. **Karen Stokes**
- c. **Susan J. Rice**

Mayor Callaghan nominated Alexander de Geofroy, Karen Stokes, and Susan Rice for the Ward 5, Seat A Council seat. Councilor Lachapelle seconded the nominations. Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** that nominations cease if there are no further nominations. Councilor Malone seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Mayor Callaghan suggested that there be a hand count vote for each candidate, starting with Alexander de Geofroy. The hand count for Alexander de Geofroy passed with 8 votes. No further votes on the remaining candidates were taken due to the first candidate receiving the required majority.

9.2 Oath of Office: City Council Ward 5, Seat A

Attorney O'Rourke administered the oath of office to Alexander de Geofroy and he was seated on Council immediately.

10. Reports of Committees

10.1 Finance Committee

- 10.1.1 Committee Recommendation: To establish the system development fee in the water fund and to revise the current sewer system fee *First reading, refer to the Codes and Ordinance Committee meeting on July 7, 2022, and refer to Public Hearing July 19, 2022***

Mayor Callaghan read the committee recommendation for a first time and referred to a Public Hearing on July 19, 2022.

- 10.1.2 Committee Recommendation: To adopt the water/sewer rate schedule as detailed by the Utility Advisory Board *First reading and refer Public Hearing on July 19, 2022***

Mayor Callaghan read the committee recommendation and

referred to a Public Hearing on July 19, 2022.

10.2 Planning Board

10.2.1 Amendment to Chapter 275 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester regarding Electric Vehicle Charging Stations *first reading and refer to public hearing July 19, 2022*

Mayor Callaghan read the committee recommendation for the Amendment to Chapter 275 regarding Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and referred to a Public Hearing on July 19, 2022:

Amendment to Chapter 275 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That Chapter 275 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester and currently before the Rochester City Council, be amended as follows:

Definition: (a) An electric vehicle charging station shall mean a public or private parking space located together with a battery charging station, aka Electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) which permits the transfer of electric energy (by conductive or inductive means) to a battery or other storage device in an electric vehicle.

An electric vehicle charging station installed as an accessory to a new or existing single family home or a unit within a duplex property and used for personal use and not as a means of income, is a permitted use in all zones and requires no site plan approval. *Only Level 1 and Level 2 electric vehicle supply equipment shall be permitted on residential properties.*

An electric vehicle charging station installed as accessory to a new or existing multi family home or a commercial property is permitted per the use tables located at the end of the Zoning Chapter. Site Plan review is required. *All Level 1 and Level 2 and Level 3 electric vehicle supply equipment may be permitted on multifamily residential and commercial properties.*

Electric vehicle supply equipment, as defined in the National Electric Code, shall obtain any required building permits, electrical permits or other applicable permits prior to their location, construction, installation, or operation.

Changes to the Use table:

An electric vehicle charging station is proposed permitted in all residential zones as an accessory use only for personal use.

An electric vehicle charging station is proposed permitted in the DC, OC, GR, HC, GI, RI, HS, AS Zoning Districts. It is permitted by Conditional Use Permit in the Neighborhood Mixed Use Zoning District.

These Amendments shall take effect upon passage.

10.3 Public Safety

10.3.1 Committee Recommendation: To reduce the speed limit on Grant and Common Streets at the technical discretion of the Public Works Department *consideration for approval*

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the reduction of the speed limit on Grant and Common Streets. Councilor Hailey seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

10.3.2 Committee Recommendation: To install 30 mph speed limit signs on Spring Street *consideration for approval*

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the installation of a 30 mph speed limit sign on Spring Street. Councilor Hailey seconded the motion. Mayor Callaghan clarified that Spring Street is the straightaway that runs by Keay field in East Rochester. Councilor Gilman stated that there had been complaints of people speeding by the baseball field, and there are not currently any speed limit signs in the area. Councilor Lachapelle stated that he had received another request for a speed limit sign in another area of the City, which would be going to Committee next month. He felt that if the City started authorizing speed limit signs whenever they are requested, it is going to cause more frequent requests throughout the City. Councilor Lachapelle inquired about the statute regarding speed limit in residential areas when there is no posted limit. Chief Boudreau stated that it is assumed in residential neighborhoods that the speed limit is 30 mph if not posted, and more rural areas increase to 35 mph if not posted.

Councilor Berlin said that the request on Spring Street is due to speeding in an area where young children are frequently playing, and

he did not see any issue authorizing a speed limit sign for this reason. Councilor Desrochers spoke about the high growth rate in Rochester and the effect it has on increasing traffic. She acknowledged that there may be more requests for speed limit signs, some more valid than others, however to ensure and maintain the safety of residents with the growth in the City, it is necessary to authorize some of these requests. Councilor Fontneau stated that the road in question has only the ball field, a cemetery, and a couple residential properties. He said that in the surrounding neighborhood, there are multiple streets where justification could also be made for speed limit signs. He cautioned against authorizing the request. Councilor Beaudoin agreed with Councilors Lachapelle and Fontneau. He speculated that those who are speeding are not going to heed a speed limit sign and cautioned against authorizing too many signs and causing sign pollution. The **MOTION CARRIED** by an 8-5 hand count vote.

10.4 Public Works

10.4.1 Committee Recommendation: To approve the requested pavement moratorium waiver on North Main Street for the service tie ins at 44-55 North Main Street with the condition that the pavement patch be made as directed by the Department of Public Works *consideration for approval*

Councilor Hamann **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the requested pavement moratorium on North Main Street. Councilor Gray seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

10.4.2 Committee Recommendation: To approve a forty-eight foot extension to the Columbus Avenue Parking Lot fence to the end of the property at 19 Lambert Court as requested by the property owner *consideration for approval*

Councilor Hamann **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the extension to the Columbus Avenue parking lot fence to the end of the property at 19 Lambert Court. Councilor Larochelle seconded the motion. Councilor Hamann explained that the fence that runs along the Columbus Avenue parking lot runs at the back of the property at 19 Lambert Court and ends, transitioning into a small rail fence. People have been stepping over the small fence at night into 19 Lambert Court's parking area. There have been complaints about damage to vehicles as well as trash

being left in the parking area. Councilor Lachapelle said that based on the minutes, the fence is on City property. He asked if there was damage to the fence due to snow plowing, if the property owner would be liable. Councilor Hamann said any damages would be the responsibility of the 19 Lambert Court owner. It was stated that the owner of the property does understand he is liable for any potential damages. Councilor Gray explained that there had been other options explored in Committee, including steps the owner could take; however, the option requested was determined to make the most sense. Councilor Beaudoin stated that he had the impression based on the minutes that, when the fence was originally installed, the intent was to extend it further at that time. Councilor Fontneau confirmed that when the fence was originally installed, the intent was for it to be extended behind the property on Lambert Court. However, at the time, the former owner of 19 Lambert Court came before the Planning Board and requested that the fence not be placed behind his property, with snow plowing being used as the reasoning for his request. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a majority voice vote.

10.4.3 Resolution Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation to the FY 2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Fund in Connection with the Strafford Square Project in the Amount of \$3,000,000.00 and Borrowing Authority pursuant to RSA 33:9 *first reading and refer to public hearing July 19, 2022*

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a first time as follows and referred to a public hearing on July 19, 2022:

Resolution Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation to the FY 2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Fund in Connection with the Strafford Square Project in the Amount of \$3,000,000.00 and Borrowing Authority pursuant to RSA 33:9

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:

That the amount of Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000.00) is hereby appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the FY2023 CIP fund for the purpose of paying costs associated with the Strafford Square Project. Two Million One Hundred Thirty Two Thousand Five Hundred Seventeen and 90/100 Dollars (\$2,132,517.90) of the supplemental

shall be derived from borrowing and Eight Hundred Sixty Seven Thousand Four Hundred Eighty Two and 10/100 Dollars (\$867,482.10) of the supplemental shall be derived from a Federal NHDOT Grant.

In accordance with the provisions of RSA 33:9 and in conjunction with this supplemental appropriation, the City Treasurer, with the approval of the City Manager, be, and hereby are authorized to borrow the sum of Two Million One Hundred Thirty Two Thousand Five Hundred Seventeen and 90/100 Dollars (\$2,132,517.90) through the issuance of bonds and/or notes, and/or through other legal form(s), such borrowing to be on such terms and conditions as the said Treasurer and City Manager may deem to be in the best interest of the City of Rochester. Such borrowing is authorized subject to compliance with the provisions of RSA 33:9 and Section 45 of the Rochester City Charter to the extent required, necessary and/or appropriate.

To the extent not otherwise provided for in this Resolution, the Finance Director is hereby authorized to designate and/or establish such accounts and/or account numbers as necessary to implement the transactions contemplated by this Resolution and to establish special revenue, non-lapsing, multi-year fund account(s) as necessary to which said sums shall be recorded.

Councilor Gray requested a statement from the City Manager regarding the need for this supplemental appropriation. He asked for information to be provided at an upcoming meeting giving background on the need for the request. City Manager Cox agreed to put information together for an upcoming meeting.

10.4.4 Resolution Authorizing City Manager to Execute a State of New Hampshire ARPA Grant Agreement for the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Secondary Clarifier Upgrade Project *first reading and consideration for adoption*

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a first time by title only as follows:

Resolution Authorizing City Manager to Execute a State of New Hampshire ARPA Grant Agreement for the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Secondary Clarifier Upgrade Project

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:

That the Mayor and City Council of the City of Rochester hereby authorize the City Manager to execute a State of New Hampshire ARPA Grant Agreement for the WWTP Secondary Clarifier Upgrade Project in the amount of Three Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$350,000.00). The Mayor and City Council previously accepted said Grant by a vote on April 5, 2022.

To the extent not otherwise provided for in this Resolution, the Finance Director is hereby authorized to establish and/or designate such multi-year, non-lapsing accounts and or account numbers as are necessary to implement the transactions contemplated in this Resolution.

Councilor Hamann **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Hainey seconded the motion. Councilor Beaudoin referenced a recent Supreme Court ruling regarding requirements being issued by the EPA without congressional approval. He clarified that this particular ruling had to do with clean air; however, he speculated that the implications could reach well beyond that. Councilor Beaudoin recommended tabling the motion until further review could be done on the implications of this Supreme Court decision. Attorney O'Rourke clarified that Council already accepted this grant in April 2022. The State requires the resolution to specifically authorize the use of ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funds. He stated that this resolution simply clarifies an action which was already taken by Council. Councilor Desrochers asked what the potential implications would be of delaying this grant funding. Director Nourse explained that the upgrade to these secondary clarifiers is not directly related to EPA requirements or the nitrogen permit; these are pieces of equipment that are aging and need to be upgraded. He said that he has concerns if the Council does not approve the grant funding, it would not be available in the future. Councilor Hamann called for a vote on the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a 13 – 0 roll call vote with Councilors Hainey, Gray, Malone, Gilman, Fontneau, Laroche, de Geofroy, Desrochers, Berlin, Beaudoin, Hamann, Lachapelle, and Mayor Callaghan all voting in favor.

11. Old Business

11.1 Resolution Adopting an FY 2023 Rochester CDBG "Action Plan for the City of Rochester, N.H." and Approving and Appropriating the FY 2023 Community Development Budget for the City of Rochester *second reading and consideration for adoption*

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a second time by title only as follows:

**RESOLUTION ADOPTING AN FY 2023 ROCHESTER CDBG
"ACTION PLAN FOR THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, N.H." AND
APPROVING AND APPROPRIATING THE FY 2023 COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF ROCHESTER**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:**

I. That the Mayor and City Council of the City of Rochester, by adoption of this Resolution, hereby adopt the one-year FY 2023 (July 1, 2022—June 30, 2023) "Action Plan for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program for the City of Rochester, N.H.," as prepared and presented to the Mayor and City Council by the City of Rochester Office of Economic and Community Development, in connection with the City's CDBG program, including the goals, objectives, and concepts set forth therein;

II. Further, that a twelve (12) month Community Development Block Grant budget for the Office of Economic and Community Development for the City of Rochester in the total amount of Two Hundred Forty Five Thousand Eight Hundred Seventy Five Dollars (\$245,875.00) be, and hereby is, approved and appropriated for fiscal year 2023 (July 1, 2022—June 30, 2023). Included in said approval and appropriation are expenditures set forth in the one-year action plan of the Office of Economic & Community Development for the City of Rochester for the Community Development Block Grant program, in the following categories and amounts:

Administration and Planning	\$ 49,175.00
Public Service Agencies	\$ 36,881.25
<u>Housing/Public Facilities/Infrastructure</u>	<u>\$159,818.75</u>

Total	\$ 245,875.00
--------------	----------------------

III. Further, that Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000.00) in prior year unexpended CDBG funds be reallocated to FY 2023 Housing/Public Facilities/Infrastructure activities outlined in the FY 2023 Annual Action Plan

IV. Further, that One Hundred Ninety Seven Thousand Eight Hundred Sixty One Dollars (\$197,861.00) in the Job Opportunity Benefit revolving loan fund loan fund, plus the principal and interest received monthly from existing loans' repayments, be appropriated for continued use in the FY 2023 Action Plan year in granting loans to qualified small

businesses that commit to the creation and/or retention of jobs made available to low to moderate-income Rochester residents.

This budget and the one-year action plan for FY 2023 may be reconsidered if federal funding is changed or if it is inconsistent with the total FY 2023 budget adopted for the Office of Economic and Community Development.

The sums necessary to fund the above appropriation in the amount of Two Hundred Forty Five Thousand Eight Hundred Seventy Five Dollars (\$245,875.00) shall be drawn in their entirety from the above-mentioned FY 2023 Community Development Block Grant from the federal government to the City of Rochester. The Finance Director is hereby authorized to create such line item accounts as shall be necessary to implement this Resolution.

Furthermore, in the event that federal funding for the above Community Development Block Grant budget is less than the total appropriation amount provided for in this Resolution, then, and in such event, the City Manager, or the City Manager's designee in the Office of Economic and Community Development, is authorized to adjust the amounts for the budgetary categories stated above, as well as for any planned grants and/or other expenditures made from within such budgetary categories.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Hamann seconded the motion. Councilor Hainey **MOVED** to **AMEND** the motion to revise the SHARE fund contract to specify that they include assistance towards mortgage payments and property taxes for low-income residents who own their own home. Councilor Larochelle seconded the amendment. Councilor Hainey clarified that the SHARE fund is not asking for any increases in funding, but rather just amending their contract. The **MOTION CARRIED** to **AMEND** the motion by a unanimous voice vote. The AMENDED **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

11.2 Resolution Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation in the amount of \$299,000.00 for the Purchase of 181 Highland Street, Rochester, New Hampshire *second reading and consideration for adoption*

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a second time by title only as follows:

**Resolution Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation in the
amount of \$299,000.00 for the Purchase of 181 Highland
Street, Rochester, New Hampshire**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:**

That the Mayor and City Council of the City of Rochester hereby authorized a supplemental appropriation in the amount of Two Hundred Ninety Nine Thousand Dollars (\$299,000.00) to cover the costs associated with the purchase of 181 Highland Street, Rochester, New Hampshire. The supplemental appropriation will be derived in its entirety from the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance.

To the extent not otherwise provided for in this Resolution, the Finance Director is hereby authorized to establish and/or designate such multi-year, non-lapsing accounts and or account numbers as are necessary to implement the transactions contemplated in this Resolution.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Hamann seconded the motion. Councilor Beaudoin stated that he would not be supporting the motion. He agreed with several of the constituents who spoke at the public hearing that this money could have been included in the budget that was just passed. Councilor Larochelle stated that he would abstain from the vote due to the owner of the property being a friend. The **MOTION FAILED*** by a 7-5 roll call vote with Councilors Hainey, Fontneau, de Geofroy, Desrochers, Berlin, Hamann, and Lachapelle voting in favor, Councilors Gray, Malone, Gilman, Beaudoin, and Mayor Callaghan voting opposed, and Councilor Larochelle abstaining. (*it was originally stated that the motion carried. However, the motion on a supplemental appropriation needed a 2/3 majority to pass).

**11.3 Resolution Pursuant to RSA 34:1-a Establishing an
Economic Development Reserve Fund *second reading
and consideration for adoption***

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a second time by title only as follows:

**Resolution Pursuant to RSA 34:1-a Establishing an Economic
Development Reserve Fund**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:**

By adoption of this Resolution, the City Council establishes a Non-Capital Reserve Fund pursuant to RSA 34:1-a for the purpose of encouraging economic development within the City, encouraging the development of industrial and commercial sites, promoting the City as an attractive location for businesses and residents, and acquisition of land related to the same. The name of such fund shall be the Economic Development Reserve Fund.

The City Council, at its sole discretion, may appropriate funds into said Economic Development Reserve Fund through supplemental appropriations or the annual budgeting process, however, in no case shall said annual appropriation be less than One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00). Revenue sources can be Waste Management Host Fee Revenues, or General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance. In addition, other unanticipated revenue sources, and proceeds from transactions that were originally derived from the Economic Development Reserve Fund, may also be appropriated into the fund upon a majority vote of the City Council.

Pursuant to RSA 34:6, the Trustees of Trust Funds shall have custody of all non-capital reserves transferred to the Economic Development Reserve Fund. The Trustees of the Trust Fund will hold the monies appropriated to the Economic Development Reserve Fund in a separate liquid investment account. Appropriations made to the Economic Development Reserve Fund will be submitted to the Trustees of the Trust Fund within the same fiscal year of the appropriation.

Pursuant to RSA 34:10, the City Council names the Economic Development Commission as its agent to carry out the objects of the Economic Development Reserve Fund. All expenditures made by the Economic Development Commission shall be made only for or in connection with the purposes for which said Fund was established and only in accordance with §7-38-40 of the City Code. All requests for expenditures shall be approved by the 2/3rds vote of the Economic Development Commission prior to being presented to City Council for final approval. Upon said 2/3rds vote expenditure requests may then be presented to City Council. Expenditure requests shall identify expense categories, or specific project scope detail. General administrative, travel and conference activities shall be ineligible expense activities. Expenditure requests can be presented as part of the annual budget process, or through supplemental appropriations. All approved expenditures shall follow the City's Purchasing Policy.

The City Council may dissolve the Economic Development Reserve Fund at its sole discretion. Upon dissolution of any portion of said fund appropriated from the General Fund said funds will lapse to surplus (General Fund Unassigned Fund balance) and cannot be repurposed directly to a different capital fund or project.

To the extent not otherwise provided for in this Resolution, the Finance Director is hereby authorized to designate and/or establish such accounts and/or account numbers as necessary to implement the transactions contemplated by this Resolution.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Beaudoin seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a 13 - 0 roll call vote with Councilors Berlin, Desrochers, Gray, Fontneau, Hamann, Hainey, Lachapelle, Larochelle, Beaudoin, Malone, Gilman, de Geofroy, and Mayor Callaghan all voting in favor.

11.4 Resolution Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation to the FY 2022 Sewer Fund Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Fund in Connection with Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Biosolids Dewatering Facility Project in the Amount of \$2,500,000.00 and Borrowing Authority pursuant to RSA 33:9 *second reading and consideration for adoption (requires 2/3 majority roll call)*

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a second time by title only as follows:

Resolution Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation to the FY 2022 Sewer Fund Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Fund in Connection with Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Biosolids Dewatering Facility Project in the Amount of \$2,500,000.00 and Borrowing Authority pursuant to RSA 33:9

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:

That the amount of Two Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$2,500,000.00) is hereby appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Public Works FY2022 Sewer CIP fund for the purpose of paying costs associated with the WWTP Dewatering Facility Project.

In accordance with the provisions of RSA 33:9 and in conjunction with this supplemental appropriation, the City Treasurer, with the approval of the City Manager, be, and hereby are authorized to borrow the sum of Two Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$2,500,000.00) through the issuance of bonds and/or notes, and/or through other legal form(s), such borrowing to be on such terms and conditions as the said Treasurer and City Manager may deem to be in the best interest of the City of Rochester. Such borrowing is authorized subject to compliance with the provisions of RSA 33:9 and Section 45 of the Rochester City Charter to the extent required, necessary and/or appropriate.

To the extent not otherwise provided for in this Resolution, the Finance Director is hereby authorized to designate and/or establish such accounts and/or account numbers as necessary to implement the transactions contemplated by this Resolution and to establish special revenue, non-lapsing, multi-year fund account(s) as necessary to which said sums shall be recorded.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. Councilor Beaudoin asked if this request was resultant from NHDES or EPA regulations, or if it was being done as general maintenance of the lagoon system in Rochester. Director Nourse stated that it is primarily spurred by necessary maintenance; but the EPA phosphorous requirements and PFAS regulations do factor in as well. He stated that biosolids dewatering is needed for sustainability, and spoke about the decades' worth of accumulation of sludge in the lagoon, which needs to be processed. Director Nourse briefly outlined the process that needs to be taken with sludge contained in the lagoons and the considerations therein. Councilor Gray spoke in favor of the resolution. He stated that the costs will not be reduced if the decision is delayed, and in fact, the requirements may become more stringent and the costs may rise. Councilor Beaudoin stated that he would reluctantly be opposing the motion because although it is a necessary project, he felt that this proposal should have been included in the budget. Councilor Hamann clarified that this is a supplemental appropriation to the FY22 budget, not the current FY23 budget. Councilor Desrochers asked if there would be increased costs if this proposal were not approved. Director Nourse stated that in construction, costs typically increase as time goes on. It is likely the project will be more expensive if delayed. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a 12 – 1 roll call vote with Councilors Gilman, de Geofroy, Gray, Hainey, Larochelle, Berlin, Lachapelle, Fontneau, Hamann, Desrochers, Malone, and Mayor Callaghan voting in favor and Councilor Beaudoin voting opposed.

11.5 Amendment to Chapter 275-8 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester regarding the Granite Ridge Development Zone *second reading and consideration for adoption*

Mayor Callaghan read the amendment for a second time by title only (addendum A). Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT**. Councilor Hamann seconded the motion. Councilor Beaudoin stated that he would be opposing the amendment. He felt that the reason Rochester's TIF districts are doing so well is because they do not contain residential development. He stated that the purpose of the TIFs is to offset the loss of revenue from Turnkey landfill. However, he felt that adding residential development would increase costs to the City for resources. He stated that the revenue gained from residential units would not be nearly enough to counteract the costs for new students entering into the school system, amongst other costs such as water, sewer, and emergency services. Councilor Beaudoin also questioned the traffic that would be generated from residential development and whether the roadways in the area could support this increase. He spoke about the authority given to the Planning Board regarding the type of development being proposed and questioned what could potentially occur.

Mayor Callaghan asked how many units were currently being proposed at the Granite Ridge. Mike Scala, Director of Economic Development, stated that the only real proposal received so far is for a 214-unit development. Mayor Callaghan asked if the 10% discount for development in the TIF district referenced by Councilor Beaudoin is factual. Director Scala stated that there are no such incentives offered to build in the TIF. There was further discussion of examples of development and the TIF contribution towards these developments. Director Scala clarified that infrastructure is based on the public benefit associated; any development that would not have a public benefit and would only benefit the City would fall under the infrastructure investment. He said that the proposals he has seen so far have large portions for which the developer would be responsible.

Councilor Fontneau inquired about the 55/45 split (percentage of commercial versus residential units) and if it was true that these developments in the TIF would not need to adhere to these guidelines. Director Scala stated that a single, multi-use building does not need to follow the 55/45 ratio. If there are multiple standalone units on one lot, the overall ratio of the units combined does need to maintain the 55/45 ration. He further explained the reasoning for the 55/45 ratio and situations in which it applies.

Councilor Desrochers spoke about affordable housing versus workforce housing and market rate housing, and the influence that local codes, zoning, and ordinances have on these types of development. She inquired if the units being proposed at the Granite Ridge would fall under affordable housing and how they may assist in the housing crisis currently being experienced. Director Scala answered that there is a need for housing at all levels. He said that there are currently no requirements for mix of housing levels, but that the City would be open to proposals that include affordable units. Councilor Beaudoin reiterated his concern for the verbiage contained in the amendment and the ratios allowed for residential versus commercial development.

Councilor Fontneau stated that he would support the amendment, although he does have some reservations about the information being presented. However, he felt that any increased housing in the City would help with the housing crisis. He also referenced a presentation given to Council indicating that a percentage of the TIF funding would be reallocated into the General Fund to offset expenses to the City for resources such as schools and emergency services resulting from residential development. He expressed concern about the 55/45 commercial to residential split not being required, but said he had faith in the Planning Board to properly review and approve development, ensuring that it is true to the spirit of the ordinance amendment.

Councilor Gray inquired if the TIF funds would be handled according to the language in the City Charter. City Manager Cox referenced a perceived conflict in the language raised by Councilor Gray at a previous meeting and said Councilor could have further discussion on the matter if desired. He stated that since 2011, building permit numbers have been excluded from the tax cap calculations; if the Council wants to go in a different direction, it can be discussed.

Mayor Callaghan asked Director Scala if he felt comfortable with the amendment as it was being proposed. Director Scala stated that an initial proposal that had submitted to the City involves Phase 2 of the Granite Ridge Development, which would be a "Lifestyle Entertainment" phase supported by residential units. He gave further details on the type of development which could go into the area. Mr. Scala said that the Planning Board will be able to thoroughly review any applications and make determinations on height, density, etc. He clarified that any residential units proposed would be governed by the currently available water/sewer infrastructure.

There was further discussion in Council about the benefits and drawbacks of potentially adopting this amendment. Mayor Callaghan

called for a vote on the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a 10 – 3 roll call vote with Councilors Hamann, Desrochers, Malone, Fontneau, Laroche, de Geofroy, Berlin, Hainey, Lachapelle, and Mayor Callaghan voting in favor and Councilors Gilman, Gray, and Beaudoin voting opposed.

12. Consent Calendar

No Discussion.

13. New Business

13.1 Amendment to Chapter 275 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester Regarding Table 18-C *first reading and action*

Mayor Callaghan read the amendment for a first time by title only as follows:

Amendment to Chapter 275 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester Regarding Table 18-C

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That Chapter 275 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester and currently before the Rochester City Council, be amended as follows:

Within Table 18-C, Recreation, Indoor shall be designated as a Permitted Use within the General Industrial (GI) District.

These amendments shall take effect upon passage.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the amendment. Councilor Beaudoin seconded the motion. Attorney O'Rourke clarified that the amendment is not on the agenda for adoption. It is resultant from a petition for a zoning change and needs to be either sent to the Planning Board for further review and recommendation, or the petition for amendment can be rejected. Councilor Lachapelle **WITHDREW** his motion to adopt and amended his motion to refer the amendment to the Planning Board. Councilor Beaudoin seconded the amended motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

13.2 Resolution Approving Contract and Cost Items Associated with Proposed City of Rochester School Department Multi-Year Collective Bargaining

**Agreement with Rochester Federation of Teachers AFT
Local 3607, AFT-NH, AFL-CIO *first reading and
consideration for adoption***

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a first time by title (*addendum B*).

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Hamann seconded the motion. Councilor Hainey stated that she would be abstaining from the vote due to being part of the collective bargaining agreement referenced in the resolution. Mayor Callaghan inquired if he should abstain from the vote because members of his family are teachers. Attorney O'Rourke stated that he does not need to abstain because they are not immediate family members in the same household. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a 11 – 1 roll call vote with Councilors Larochelle, Gilman, Berlin, de Geofroy, Fontneau, Hamann, Lachapelle, Malone, Desrochers, Gray, and Mayor Callaghan voting in favor, Councilor Beaudoin voting opposed, and Councilor Hainey abstaining from the vote.

**13.3 Resolution Authorizing Acceptance of Health Trust
Wellness Program Benefit for the Police Department
and Appropriation in Connection Therewith in the
amount of \$625.00 *first reading and consideration
for adoption***

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a first time by title only as follows:

**Resolution Authorizing Acceptance of Health Trust Wellness
Program Benefit for the Police Department and Appropriation in
Connection Therewith in the amount of \$625.00**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:**

WHEREAS, that Health Trust Wellness Program Benefit in the amount of Six Hundred Twenty Five Dollars (\$625.00) awarded to the City of Rochester Police Department is hereby accepted by the City of Rochester;

FURTHER, that the sum of Six Hundred Twenty Five Dollars (\$625.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated to the Established Fund(s) Account:

FURTHER, to the extent not otherwise provided for in this Resolution, the Finance Director is hereby authorized to designate and/or establish such accounts and/or account numbers as necessary to implement the transactions contemplated by this Resolution.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Malone seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

13.4 Resolution, in accordance with RSA 674:39-aa, recognizing the "Involuntary Merger" of a Property Known As 5 Lois Street (Currently, Rochester Tax Map 115, Lot 8), and Acknowledging the Appropriateness of Restoration of Such Lot To Its Pre-Merger Configuration *first reading and consideration for adoption*

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a first time by title only as follows:

Resolution in accordance with RSA 674:39-aa recognizing the "Involuntary Merger" of a Property Known As 5 Lois Street (Currently, Rochester Tax Map 115, Lot 8), and Acknowledging the Appropriateness of Restoration of Such Lot To Its Pre-Merger Configuration

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS, the owners of property situate at a property currently known as, 5 Lois Street, Rochester, New Hampshire (Tax Map 115, Lot 8), have filed a request with the City of Rochester, and its City Council, pursuant to the provisions of RSA 674:39-aa, requesting that such property, which they assert was previously "involuntarily merged" by action of one or more administrative agency/official of the City of Rochester, currently known as 5 Lois Street, Rochester, New Hampshire, and currently depicted on Rochester Tax Map 115, Lot 8; and

WHEREAS, RSA 674:39-aa provides that under certain conditions the owner(s) of lots previously involuntarily merged by a municipality, shall, upon request, by the owner(s) to the municipality's governing body, be restored to its pre-involuntary merger status; and

WHEREAS, the owners of 5 Lois Street have filed a request to have the involuntary merger of such lot be restored to its pre-merger five (5) separate lot status configuration; and

WHEREAS, City officials in the Planning and Assessing Departments, as well as other City officials, have reviewed the facts surrounding the merger of the property currently known as 5 Lois Street, and have determined that the lot currently known as 5 Lois Street (Rochester Tax Map 115, Lot 8) was created by the involuntary merger by the City of Rochester and that no voluntary action by, or on behalf of, the current or prior owners of the unmerged lots was taken to bring about their currently merged single lot status;

NOW, THEREFORE, in accordance with the provisions of RSA 674:39-aa, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Rochester, in its capacity as the governing body of the City of Rochester, hereby acknowledges both the request by the owners to have the lot status of 5 Lois Street be restored to its five-lot pre-merger status and the accuracy of the facts set forth above herein, and therefore determine that the request to have the property known as 5 Lois Street (Rochester Tax Map 115, Lot 8) be restored to its pre-involuntary merger status is granted with Conditions. The Conditions are as follows:

- Of the 5 restored lots 4 of them will not meet the minimum zoning for the R1 Zone where this resides. Min lot size in this zone is 10K sf with 100 ft of frontage and these lots are approx. 3K sf with 40 ft of frontage. Because these lots do not meet minimum lot size, they cannot meet the criteria of 275-30.5 A and so under 275-30.5 B each one must obtain a Special Exception prior to building permit.
- By proceeding with this restoration, the property owner will be creating 4 non-conforming lots. These lots will not meet minimum lot size or frontage requirements. With the setbacks it leaves only a 20 x 50 ft building footprint on each lot. These lots will not be eligible for meeting the hardship criteria for a zoning variance based on size of the lot in the future, because the hardship of lot size will be self-imposed.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Malone seconded the motion. Councilor Beaudoin questioned the purchase history of this property and stated that based on the City's assessing software, the current owner purchased within the past few years. He asked when the merger of the lots took place. Attorney O'Rourke stated that the RSA under which this falls deals with lots that were involuntarily merged prior to September 18, 2010. Based on

research done by the City, this lot was involuntarily merged between 1968 and 1972. Councilor Beaudoin stated that the current owner purchased the property as-is, knowing what they were purchasing. He questioned the request to return the lot to a nonconforming status. He speculated that there may be a follow up request by the property owner to come before the Zoning Board to request waivers for use of the 5 small lots resulting from this adoption. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a 9 – 4 hand count vote.

13.5 Resolution Establishing Polling Places and Times for the September 13, 2022 State Primary Election *first reading and consideration for adoption*

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to suspend the rules to read the resolution in its entirety. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. Mayor Callaghan read the resolution in its entirety as follows:

Resolution Establishing Polling Places and Times for the September 13, 2022 State Primary Election

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the following polling places are hereby established for the City of Rochester for the upcoming September 13, 2022 State Primary Election.

WARD 1: East Rochester Elementary School
773 Portland Street, East Rochester

WARD 2: Chamberlain Street School
65 Chamberlain Street, Rochester

WARD 3: Gonic Elementary School
10 Railroad Avenue, Gonic

WARD 4: McClelland Elementary School
59 Brock Street, Rochester

WARD 5: James W. Foley Memorial Community Center a/k/a Rochester Community Center
150 Wakefield Street/Community Way, Rochester

WARD 6: Elks Lodge #1393
295 Columbus Avenue, Rochester

Further, that in accordance with RSA 659:4, and Section 47 of the City Charter – All polling places shall be open from 8:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M., on said Election Day. The Processing of Absentee Ballots shall begin at 10:00 AM on Election Day.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Larochele seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

13.6 Resolution Authorizing an Application for Community Development Block Grant – COVID-19 (CDBG-CV) Funding to Support Facilities Project *first reading and refer to public hearing July 19, 2022*

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a first time by title only as follows and referred it to a public hearing on July 19, 2022:

Resolution Authorizing An Application For Community Development Block Grant-Covid-19 (CDBG-CV) Funding to Support Facilities Project

WHEREAS: The 2020-2025 Rochester CDBG Consolidated Action Plan Documents priorities and areas of high priority need for supportive services and shelter assistance to extremely low, low and moderately low income residents of the City experiencing homelessness; and

WHEREAS: HUD Community Development Block Grant Covid 19 funds are available through the NH Community Development Finance Authority for CDBG-CV response; and

WHEREAS: A primary component of the CARES act is assistance to State, Local, Territorial and Tribal Governments with a direct impact of COVID-19 pandemic; and

WHEREAS: The Homeless Center for Strafford County owns the location at 202 Washington Street, Rochester NH 03839; and

WHEREAS: The Homeless Center For Strafford County proposes to install rooftop solar energy to supply electricity to the shelter building supplementing the electrical supply that provides specialized air circulation to the shelter building in service to extremely low income, Low income, moderately low income Rochester residents; and

WHEREAS: Shelter clients are specifically screened to ensure that they are HUD income qualified populations of the City of Rochester; and

WHEREAS: The Homeless Center For Strafford County services provide a shelter and programming benefit to a large proportion of Rochester clientele made up entirely of extremely low income low income and moderately low income city residents; and

WHEREAS: An application for CDBG – CV grant has been prepared by The Homeless Center For Strafford County on behalf of the city of Rochester in collaboration with City staff; and

WHEREAS: A duly noticed public hearing for the purposes of soliciting feedback from the public and meeting the requirements of the CDBG program was held on July 19, 2022.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:

I. The city of Rochester will submit an application for community development Block Grant COVID-19 funds of \$120,000 for the purpose of installing a solar panel unit on the rooftop of the building owned by the homeless center for Strafford County located at 202 Washington St., Rochester, NH 03839

II. The city of Rochester here by adopts a project specific energy response that incorporates and is subordinate to the pre-existing CDBG facilities energy plan(s)

III. The City Manager is authorized to apply for and accept and expand the CDBG – CV funds of up to \$120,000 and to officially represent the City of Rochester, New Hampshire in connection with the application including execution of contract on behalf of the city and any other related documents necessary or convenient to carry out the intent of said grant application including acting as the certifying officer for HUD environmental documents without further action of the City Council for the purpose set forth in the grant agreement

IV. The City Manager is here by authorized to enter into agreement with the Homeless Center for Strafford County as sub recipient for the Grant

13.7 Resolution Authorizing Acceptance of New Hampshire Department of Safety Grant in the amount of up to \$50,000.00 and Supplemental Appropriation to the FY

**22 CIP Police-Body Camera Account in Connection
Therewith *first reading and consideration for
adoption***

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a first time by title only as follows:

**Resolution Authorizing Acceptance of New Hampshire
Department of Safety Grant in the amount of up to \$50,000.00
and Supplemental Appropriation to the FY 23 CIP Police-Body
Camera Account in Connection Therewith**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:**

WHEREAS, that a New Hampshire Department of Safety Grant in the amount of up to Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) awarded to the City of Rochester Police Department is hereby accepted by the City of Rochester;

FURTHER, that the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated to the Police Department FY 23 CIP Police-Body Camera Account with the entirety of the supplemental appropriation being derived from the Grant; and

FURTHER, to the extent not otherwise provided for in this Resolution, the Finance Director is hereby authorized to designate and/or establish such accounts and/or account numbers as necessary to implement the transactions contemplated by this Resolution and to establish special revenue, non-lapsing, multi-year fund account(s) as necessary to which said sums shall be recorded.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

**13.8 Resolution Authorizing Acceptance of New Hampshire
Department of Justice (NHDOJ) Forfeiture Funds and
Appropriation in Connection Therewith in the amount
of \$1,288.80 *first reading and consideration for
adoption***

Mayor Callaghan read the resolution for a first time by title only as follows:

**Resolution Authorizing Acceptance of New Hampshire
Department of Justice (NHDOJ) Forfeiture Funds and
Appropriation in Connection Therewith
in the amount of \$1,288.80**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:**

WHEREAS, that NHDOJ Forfeiture Funds in the amount of One Thousand Two Hundred Eighty Eight and 80/100 Dollars (\$1,288.80) awarded to the City of Rochester is hereby accepted by the City of Rochester;

FURTHER, that the sum of One Thousand Two Hundred Eighty Eight and 80/100 Dollars (\$1,288.80) be, and hereby is, appropriated to the Established Forfeiture Fund(s) Account:

FURTHER, to the extent not otherwise provided for in this Resolution, the Finance Director is hereby authorized to designate and/or establish such accounts and/or account numbers as necessary to implement the transactions contemplated by this Resolution.

Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Malone seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Attorney O'Rourke announced that there was need for a non-meeting prior to adjournment of the meeting. Mayor Callaghan **RECESSED** the meeting at 7:30 PM for a non-meeting with legal counsel.

Mayor Callaghan called the meeting back from recess at 7:37 PM.

Councilor Malone **MOVED** to **RECONSIDER** the vote on agenda item 11.2 as listed below. Councilor Larochelle seconded the motion as follows:

**Resolution Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation in the
amount of \$299,000.00 for the Purchase of 181 Highland
Street, Rochester, New Hampshire**

**Resolution Authorizing Supplemental Appropriation in the
amount of \$299,000.00 for the Purchase of 181 Highland
Street, Rochester, New Hampshire**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:**

That the Mayor and City Council of the City of Rochester hereby authorized a supplemental appropriation in the amount of Two Hundred Ninety Nine Thousand Dollars (\$299,000.00) to cover the costs associated with the purchase of 181 Highland Street, Rochester, New Hampshire. The supplemental appropriation will be derived in its entirety from the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance.

To the extent not otherwise provided for in this Resolution, the Finance Director is hereby authorized to establish and/or designate such multi-year, non-lapsing accounts and or account numbers as are necessary to implement the transactions contemplated in this Resolution.

The **MOTION CARRIED** to reconsider the vote by a unanimous voice vote. Councilor Lachapelle **MOVED** to **ADOPT** the resolution. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a 10 – 3 roll call vote with Councilors Lachapelle, Larochelle, Hainey, Desrochers, Berlin, de Geofroy, Malone, Fontneau, Hamann, and Mayor Callaghan voting in favor and Councilors Gilman, Gray, and Beaudoin voting opposed.

14. Adjournment

Mayor Callaghan **ADJOURNED** the City Council Regular Meeting at 7:39 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Cassie Givara
Deputy City Clerk

ADDENDUM A

The following Code does not display images or complicated formatting. Codes should be viewed online. This tool is only meant for editing.

Article 8 Amendments to Chapter 275 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester Regarding the Granite Ridge Development Zone

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That Chapter 275 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester and currently before the Rochester City Council, be amended as follows (deletions ~~struck out~~ additions in RED):

Article 8 Granite Ridge Development (GRD)

§ 275-8.1 Purpose.

Well-planned commercial ~~Zones~~ districts provide many benefits. For the community, tax revenue is maximized, infrastructure burden is reduced, and traffic impacts are minimized. For landowners and developers good planning allows for a process that is coherent, flexible and easy to navigate. ~~The Granite Ridge Development Zone (GRD) is intended to:~~

The Granite Ridge Development Zone (GRD) is intended to:

- Provide landowners and Developers with flexible yet clearly defined requirements.
- Minimize infrastructure cost to the City through good planning for the Zone as a whole rather than based on individual lots.
- Maximize the developable areas on the parcels within the Zone through the development of both commercial and residential projects.
- Minimize traffic impacts to Route 11 through implementation of a service road and shared intersections with Route 11.

~~A. Provide landowners and developers with flexible yet clearly defined requirements.~~

~~B. Minimize infrastructure cost to the City through good planning for the district as a whole rather than based upon individual lots.~~

~~C. Maximize the developable areas on the parcels within the district through creation of flexible dimensional requirements.~~

~~D. Minimize traffic impacts to Route 11 through implementation of a service road and shared intersections with Route 11.~~

A. Purpose and Intent

1. Nonresidential Commercial development remains the primary goal of the GRD, but the addition of Multifamily, and Mixed-Use is designed to allow a mixture of residential and commercial uses on one parcel. Developers will be required to receive Conditional Use approval from the Planning Board prior to project construction. The Zone includes options that enable and encourage greater flexibility in the design of mixed-use projects. Developers will provide a Development Plan outlining the project and how it conforms to the regulations and design standards outlined in this document.

Formatted: Normal, Centered, Space After: 10 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0" + Tab after: 0" + Indent at: 0"

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

2. Developments are intended to be complementary of one another and to create a sense of community between the mixed uses. Housing and commercial uses can be developed to provide the appropriate use of land, facilitate the economical and efficient provision of public services, promote open space conservation, protect the natural and scenic attributes of the land, and expand opportunities for the development of, outside the traditional residential developments.

B. Conditional Use Permit

1. Conditional Use approval may be granted by the Planning Board after proper public notice and public hearing provided that the proposed project complies with the following standards:
 - (a) The Applicant demonstrates that the development complies with the design guidelines outlined in the Design Standards portion of this document, as well as, applicable Site Review Regulations and requirements of §275.21.4. These guidelines encourage components that act as one project and not as two adjacent projects.
 - (b) The Applicant demonstrates that the development poses no detrimental effects on surrounding properties. Potential areas of impact that need to be analyzed include, but are not limited to, vehicular traffic, noise, visual blight, light pollution, offensive emissions such as dust, odor, or smoke.

§ 275-8.2 Delineation of Granite Ridge Development Zone.

A. The Granite Ridge Development Zone includes those parcels of land so identified on the Zoning Map of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire, which accompanies this chapter and is on file in the offices of the Director of Planning, Zoning, and Development and the Director of Building and Licensing Services. The GRD includes parcels of land located on both the easterly and westerly sides of New Hampshire State Route 11/Farmington Road.

~~A. The zone includes those parcels of land so identified on the Zoning Map of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire, which accompanies this chapter and is on file in the offices of the Director of Planning and Development and the Director of Building, Zoning, and Licensing Services.~~

~~B. The Granite Ridge Development Zone includes parcels of land located on both the easterly and westerly sides of Route 11/Farmington Road. These parcels will benefit from any improvements to be made to Route 11/Farmington Road. Parcels located on the westerly side of Route 11/Farmington Road may have direct contact with, and benefit from, the service road planned to be built on the westerly side of Route 11/Farmington Road and intersections connecting to this service road, if and when opportunities for construction of this service road and these intersections develop.~~

§275 – 8.3. Permitted Uses

A. Principal Uses

1. Nonresidential uses are allowed as follows:
[1] Any use as allowed within Tables 18B-18E of §275, Attachments 2-5.

Formatted: Body Text

Formatted: Body Text

2. Housing: (Conditional Use)

[1] Dwelling, mixed-use

[2] Dwelling, development multifamily

[3] Dwelling, multifamily

B. Accessory Uses

(a) Recreational facilities

(b) Community center

(c) Maintenance Buildings

(d) Rental and Sales Offices

(e) Laundry facilities

(f) Co-working Space – A space where multiple tenants rent working space and have the use of communal facilities.

§275-8.4. Site Plan Process

A. The Developer shall prepare a Site Plan, which locates the proposed types of nonresidential and residential development, accessory uses, utilities, access roads, open space, and public ways. The parcels comprising the development may be under separate ownership, but shall be treated as one development and shall be bound by the approval granted for the entire Site Plan. If approval is granted, individual lots must be developed as part of the larger Development Plan and phasing outlined below, and not separately. A long term Maintenance Plan may also be required.

- (1) Commercial is the primary use within the GRD, with residential being considered a secondary use. As such, a minimum of fifty-five percent (55%) of total footprint of the project will be reserved for commercial/non-residential use. The remaining forty-five percent (45%) of the total project footprint may be utilized for residential development. By a majority vote, the Planning Board may adjust the final commercial / residential percent allocations subject to Conditional Use details in §275.21.4.
- (2) Dwelling, Mixed-Use (MU) providing that one-hundred percent (100%) of the square footage of the first floor is reserved for a commercial use. Accessory and support uses (e.g. mechanical, storage, etc.) are permitted on the first floor of a mixed-use building, and will be recognized as commercial use. Buildings classified as MU will be exempt from requirements outlined in §275-8.4.A.1 and §275-8.4.A.6.
- (3) A minimum of fifteen percent (15%) of the square-footage of the original parcel shall be reserved as open space and identified as such on the Development Plan. Fifty percent (50%) of the required open space must be usable uplands and reasonably accessible to all property owners/tenants in the project. Any open space provided above fifteen percent (15%) may be mixed wetlands and upland. Amenities constructed for use by the tenants (clubhouse, gym, ball courts, etc.) may be considered part of the “open space” calculation as determined by the Planning Board. The Planning Board shall have the flexibility to negotiate with the Developer when determining the final open space requirement.

(4) Residential uses require the submission of a plan outlining the number of proposed units achievable under current zoning allowances. This plan should be based upon maps that include plans for open space, parking, roadways, and all nonresidential and accessory buildings associated with the project. The final number of approved units will be subject to Planning Board review, and in some cases may require an analysis of the project's impact on existing city infrastructure prior to approval.

(5) The minimum size of a residential unit shall be 500 square feet.

(6) No more than fifty percent (50%) of the residential development may be occupied prior to the completion of between twenty-five to fifty percent (25%-50%) of the non-residential structures. By a majority vote, the Planning Board may adjust these percent allocations subject to Conditional Use details in §275.21.4.

(7) The Development Plan may be phased for a term of up to five years (5).

— For purposes of this section, development shall include:

- (a) construction of structures – to include proposed timeline, phasing, and ratio of commercial/residential construction;
- (b) schedule for proposed occupancy and leasing of commercial and residential uses;
- (c) environmental remediation;
- (d) site preparation or demolition;
- (e) roadway utility or recreation and common area design and construction; and
- (f) bonding or other security for site development

(8) Providing the Developer is making reasonable efforts to develop the site, the Planning Board may extend the initial five (5) year phasing period provided a request for extension is submitted before the expiration of the initial five-year (5) phasing term.

(9) Residential Development Plan Guidelines.

- (a) Dwelling layouts shall be so designed that parking is screened from external roadways by landscaping, building locations, grading, or screening. Major topographical changes or removal of existing trees shall be avoided wherever possible, and water, wetlands, and other scenic views from the external streets shall be preserved as much as possible.
- (b) Where possible, it is desirable and encouraged to mix residential and nonresidential uses. This may be achieved through situating the buildings close to each other, or through allowing structures to house residential – preferably on the second or above floor, and nonresidential on the first floor. Creativity and flexibility is encouraged and the development plan may offer another option for mixed-use.
- (c) All residential development must adhere to the architectural design guidelines outlined in section §275-8.5 of this ordinance.

(10) Nonresidential Development Plan Guidelines

- (a) The general character of the nonresidential structures within the development lot is intended to be a pedestrian friendly setting, with emphasis on the natural characteristics of the site. The

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.75", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.19"

site design should create a sense of character and cohesiveness through landscaping, façade treatment, and signage.

§ 275-8.5 Architectural and Design standards.

A. Architecture:

The purpose of these Standards is to promote flexibility in large-scale mixed-use developments by considering project proposals based upon a comprehensive, integrated, and detailed plan rather than the specific constraints applicable to piecemeal, lot-by-lot development under conventional zoning requirements. A mixed-use development should improve the quality of new development by encouraging attractive features and promoting quality site design.

B. Non-residential Site Layout

Planning for mixed-use development on a site encompasses items such as its relationship to surrounding uses, building orientation on the site, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, and efficiency of parking areas, screening of loading and utility areas, and the design of landscaping, signage, and lighting.

(1) Trash and Loading:

- (a) Trash and loading areas should be integrated into building design, and possibly inset and/or screened with architectural features. Orient support uses such as trash enclosures, compactors, truck loading areas, and outdoor storage away from residential uses to the extent practical.
- (b) Whenever practical, and not impeded by wetlands or other physical constraints, trash and delivery areas shall be located off a shared access driveway between sites. The access driveway may be located at/along the side lot line(s), with each lot having its own trash and delivery area located off this access driveway.
- (c) Trash, delivery, and loading areas shall be well screened from Route 11. The lots situated between Market Place Boulevard and Route 11 call for special treatment because they have double frontages.

(2) Building Design:

- (a) Facade treatment. Building facades fronting on a service road and Route 11 shall both be treated as front facades, both thereby meriting attractive treatment, under the architectural standards included in the City of Rochester Site Plan Regulations.
- (b) Outdoor seating. If applicable, restaurant proprietors are encouraged to include seasonal outdoor seating in their initial site plan. Seating should be screened from parking and roadways.
- (c) Signage. All provisions of Article 29, Signage, herein shall apply.
- (d) When practical, locate some parking and service functions behind the building. For multi-building projects, organize the site layout to provide functional pedestrian spaces and landscaping amenities.
- (e) All facades, including back and side elevations of a building generally visible from public view or adjacent to residential areas, should be architecturally treated.

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Body Text, Indent: Left: 1", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.5" + Indent at: 1.75"

Formatted: Body Text, Indent: Left: 1.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Body Text, Indent: Left: 1", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.5" + Indent at: 1.75"

Formatted: Body Text, No bullets or numbering

- (f) Design multi-building projects to include architecturally sensitive design elements throughout the project.
- (g) Building elevations should incorporate architectural features and patterns that consider a pedestrian scale.
- (h) Building roofs shall be uncluttered and when flat roofs are visible from public roads, pitched roofs or parapets are required.
- (i) Rooftop and ground- mounted mechanical units and ventilating fans are to either be integrated into the design of the building, or screened from view.
- (j) At least two of these elements should repeat horizontally. Buildings with facades greater than 150 feet in length should include several of the elements listed below, repeated at appropriate intervals, either horizontally or vertically:
- Color change. Recognizable, but not strongly contrasting.
 - Texture change.
 - Material change.
 - Architectural variety and interest through a change in plane such as offsets, reveals, archways or projecting ribs.
 - Wall plane projections or recesses.
- (k) Service and exit doors should be integrated into the architecture of publicly visible elevations.
- (l) Where practical, variations in rooflines or parapets should be used to reduce the scale of non-residential buildings. Roof size, shape, material, color and slope should be coordinated with the scale and theme of the building.
- (m) All exterior building walls and structures shall be constructed with attractive, durable materials such as textured concrete, masonry, stone, brick, clapboard, finishing wood, stucco or glass.
- (n) The exterior walls of buildings should not predominantly utilize the following materials, except as accents:
- Pre-fabricated steel panels.
 - Corrugated metal.
 - Asphalt shingle roofs, except for period architecture.
 - Highly reflective glass.
- (o) Buildings should have clearly defined customer entrance(s) incorporating appropriate

architectural elements

(3) Pedestrian Amenities:

- (a) Wherever practical, design attractive, safe, and convenient pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to streets, to include access to residential, commercial, and open space areas.
- (b) Design sites to minimize pedestrian and vehicular conflicts. Where pedestrian circulation paths cross vehicular routes, provide a change in paving materials, textures or colors to emphasize the conflict point. Where applicable, and to encourage outdoor seating, dining, and other amenities, sidewalks should be constructed of concrete and at least 10 feet wide.

(4) Vehicular Circulation and Parking:

- (a) To promote safe pedestrian access, create wide and well-lit sidewalks (concrete) and pathways.
- (b) Strive to minimize driveway cuts on arterial streets by providing vehicular cross-access easements and shared access driveways between adjacent commercial projects.
- (c) Traffic calming devices are encouraged in the interior of a site to enhance safety.
- (d) Landscaped parking areas shall be consistent with Section 5 of the Site Plan Regulations in order to break up the mass of large parking lots.

(5) Outdoor Display Areas:

- (a) On final site plans, identify the location of all proposed outdoor display and sales areas, including what type of items would be sold. Their location should not displace required parking, pedestrian, or landscaped areas.

(6) Signage:

- (a) Signage should refer to Article 29 of the City's Zoning Ordinance.

(7) Landscaping and Grading:

- (a) All landscaping and grading shall be consistent with Section 5 of the City's Site Plan Regulations, while complementing and enhancing project architecture.

(8) Lighting:

- (a) Design lighting to follow all site plan regulations and requirements, and where applicable, include pedestrian scale lighting

(9) Building Design/Architectural

- (a) Where practical, building mass should be broken into smaller elements, consistent with the proportions of the architectural style selected and surrounding uses.

(b) Reduction of building mass may be achieved by using a combination of the following techniques:

- Variation in the rooflines and form.
- Use of ground level arcades and covered areas.
- Use of protected and recessed entries.
- Use of vertical elements on or in front of expansive blank walls.
- Use of pronounced wall plane offsets and projections.
- Use of focal points and vertical accents.
- Inclusion of windows on elevations facing streets and pedestrian areas.
- Retaining a clear distinction between roof, body and base of a building.
- The City supports the construction of “Solar Ready” structures designed for rooftop solar arrays.

(10) Dimensional Requirements:

(a) Non-residential / Mixed-use Buildings

- (1) Minimum structure setback from external lot line
Side: 50 feet
Rear: 100 feet
- (2) Minimum structure setback from external ROW 300 feet
- (3) Maximum non-residential building height 75 feet.
- (4) Structures over 55 feet shall be placed as close to the center of the lot as practical.

(b) Residential Structures:

- (1) Minimum structure and parking setback from external lot line
Side: 50 feet
Rear: 100 feet
- (2) Maximum residential building height 100 feet.
- (3) Structures over 55 feet will be placed as close to the center of the lot as practical.
- (4) Minimum setback from Route 11: 200 feet

(11) Parking:

- (a) All dwelling units shall require two independently accessible parking spaces per unit, or as determined by Planning Board, and be consistent with Section 10.C of the Site Plan Regulations

(b) Non-residential uses shall comply with parking requirements defined by Site Plan Regulations.

(12) Utility Standards

- a) All utilities shall be underground.
- b) Utilities into individual sites shall be run from the common utility lines to be placed in the service road right-of-way.
- c) Service connections for utilities for pad sites, if any are created, shall be provided within the service road right-of-way.
- d) Transformer boxes shall be screened and utilize proper landscaping features.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Body Text, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

§ 275-8.3 Pavement dimensional regulations.

The setbacks shown in the table below shall apply to pavement used for parking and interior accessways. Driveways into the site from the service road are exempt from these setbacks. These setbacks guarantee a minimum ten-foot-wide area for landscaping around the perimeter of the site (five feet plus five feet for adjoining lots along the side lot lines). This section shall supersede perimeter landscaping buffer requirements (15 feet along the front and 10 feet along the side lot lines) established in the Site Plan Regulations.

	Minimum Property Line Setbacks (in feet)		
	Front	Side	Rear
Pavement	10	5	10

§ 275-8.4 Granite Ridge Development Study.

This article was created pursuant to the March 2009 "Granite Ridge Development Study, Farmington Road, Rochester, New Hampshire," prepared by CLD Consulting Engineers. This study should be referred to for reference in designing, reviewing, and approving proposed site plans and subdivision plans.

§ 275-8.5 Service road regulations.

The following requirements apply to those lots situated on the westerly side of Route 11/Farmington Road, on which the planned service road and access roads leading to or from the service road are to be situated.

- A. Rights-of-way. To the extent practical and appropriate, as determined by the Planning Board, as part of any proposed site plan or subdivision plan, each landowner/developer shall incorporate into his/her plan, on the subject land, a sixty-foot-wide right-of-way for the construction of the service road and/or access road(s). The right-of-way shall traverse the subject lot from the southerly lot line to the northerly lot line, as appropriate, and in the case of any access road, from the easterly to the westerly lot line, as appropriate, in accordance with the layout of the planned service road and access road(s).
- B. Temporary termination. Where the service road has not been built on the lot adjacent to the subject

property, a temporary cul-de-sac shall be built on the subject property to provide for an appropriate turnaround and future connection to the service road on that adjacent lot. Appropriate provisions may be established by the Planning Board to facilitate seamless connection of that cul-de-sac in the future to a service road on the adjacent lot, when that road may be constructed. The temporary cul-de-sac shall conform to the City of Rochester Subdivision Regulations.

- C. Route 11 intersections. As part of any site plan or subdivision plan, the landowner/developer shall incorporate predetermined Route 11 access points into his/her plan.
- D. NHDOT. Developers shall coordinate with the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) regarding the design of the access roads and any intersections with Route 11.

§ 275-8.6 Road design standards.
[Amended 3-5-2019]

- A. Service and access roads shall comply with the following standards:
 - (1) Right-of-way: 60 feet.
 - (2) Lane width (each): 12 feet.
 - (3) Paved shoulder (each): four feet.
 - (4) Sidewalk (bituminous): five feet.
 - (5) Grass strip: five feet (between road and sidewalk).
 - (6) Curb: granite.
 - (a) Sloped: side without sidewalk.
 - (b) Vertical: side with sidewalk.
 - (7) Cross-sectional requirements:
 - (a) Wearing course (minimum): one inch (NHDOT Item 403.11).
 - (b) Bearing course: two inches (NHDOT Item 403.11).
 - (c) Crushed gravel: six inches (NHDOT Item 304.3).
 - (d) Bank-run gravel: 12 inches (NHDOT Item 304.2).
- B. All materials shall be installed in compliance with NHDOT specifications and the City of Rochester Subdivision Regulations.

§ 275-8.7 Stormwater management requirements.

- A. Stormwater controls for each individual site plan shall be designed in compliance with the New Hampshire Stormwater Manual Volume 2. To ensure adequate stormwater control given the more

flexible dimensional regulations, these design guidelines shall be followed regardless of any requirement imposed as part of the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services alteration of terrain permitting (for 100,000 square feet +/- of disturbed surface).

- B. The Planning Board shall consider proposals for use of innovative stormwater control structures, such as porous pavement, bioretention areas, gravel wetlands, etc. If the Board concludes that use of these structures is in order, then:
 - (1) It may be appropriate to allow for interior landscaped islands within parking lots to be constructed without perimeter curbing if the curbing would interfere with the routing of the stormwater.
 - (2) The Planning Board is hereby empowered to adjust parking requirements specified in Article 26, Roads and Parking, herein.

§ 275-8.8 Utility standards.

- A. All utilities shall be underground.
- B. Utilities into individual sites shall be run from the common utility lines to be placed in the service road right-of-way.
- C. Service connections for utilities for pad sites, if any are created, shall be provided within the service road right-of-way.

§ 275-8.9 Parking lot interconnections.

- A. Where practical, and not impeded by wetlands or other physical constraints, parking lots shall be interconnected between sites.
- B. Appropriate cross easements shall be developed between properties to accommodate parking lot interconnections.

§ 275-8.10 Design standards.

- A. Trash and delivery areas. The lots situated between the service road and Route 11 call for special treatment because they have double frontages.
 - (1) Whenever practical, and not impeded by wetlands or other physical constraints, trash and delivery areas shall be located off of a shared access driveway between sites.
 - (2) The access driveway may be located at/along the side lot line(s), with each lot having its own trash and delivery area located off this access driveway.
 - (3) Trash, delivery, and loading areas shall be well screened from Route 11.
- B. Facade treatment. Building facades fronting on the service road and Route 11 shall both be treated as front facades, both thereby meriting attractive treatment, under the architectural standards included in the City of Rochester Site Plan Regulations.
- C. Outdoor seating. Restaurant proprietors are encouraged to include seasonal outdoor seating.

D. Signage. All provisions of Article 29, Signage, herein shall apply.

§ 275-8.11 Adjustments in requirements.

Since a number of the requirements specified in this Article 8, herein, are design oriented, the Planning Board may adjust any requirements of § 275-8.3, Pavement dimensional regulations, § 275-8.5, Service road regulations, § 275-8.6, Road design standards, § 275-8.7, Stormwater management requirements, § 275-8.8, Utility standards, and § 275-8.10, Design standards, on a case-by-case basis, where it reasonably determines that strict application of any requirement is impracticable due to particular conditions on a given site.

Primary Area of Granite Ridge Development			
PID	Address	Acres	Owner
0208-0001-0000	126 Farmington Road	82.50	Adamian Construction & Dev.
0208-0001-0001	116 Farmington Road	34.18	Infinity Properties Rochester
0208-0002-0000	0 Farmington Road	32.00	The Kane Co. Inc.
0208-0004-0000	148 Farmington Road	1.30	John & Carolyn Meader
0208-0005-0000	150 Farmington Road	0.63	Roslyn Stone & Carolyn Meader
0208-0006-0000	154 Farmington Road	1.05	Alkurabli LLC
0208-0006-0001	152 Farmington Road	0.94	Richard Ottino
0208-0007-0000	160 Farmington Road	1.33	160 Farmington Road Realty Trust
0216-0001-0000	20 Farmington Road	15.00	Robert Beranger
0216-0002-0000	22 Farmington Road	2.60	Robert Beranger
0216-0003-0000	0 Farmington Road	2.90	Robert Beranger
0216-0004-0000	36 Farmington Road	17.10	Northgate Investment Properties
0216-0005-0000	46 Farmington Road	1.24	Gene V. Roe
0216-0006-0000	48 Farmington Road	5.62	Casaccio Real Estate Holdings
0216-0007-0000	58 Farmington Road	7.60	Casaccio Real Estate Holdings
0216-0008-0000	60 Farmington Road	6.30	Packy's Investment Properties
0216-0009-0000	68 Farmington Road	20.00	Stratham Industrial Properties
0216-0010-0000	76 Farmington Road	21.00	PSNH
0216-0011-0000	92 Farmington Road	85.00	Stratham Industrial Properties
0216-0017-0000	5 Lydall Way	12.00	State of New Hampshire DOT
0216-0019-0000	0 Farmington Road	4.50	PSNH
0216-0020-0000	8 Crane Drive	6.09	Newport Partners LLC
0216-0021-0000	33 Crane Drive	4.80	Spinelli Realty Trust
0216-0022-0000	27 Crane Drive	6.35	Black Marble Realty Trust
0216-0023-0000	21 Crane Drive	3.16	Black Marble Realty Trust
0216-0024-0000	7 Crane Drive	4.01	Four Hidden Road Trust
0216-0025-0000	47 Farmington Road	2.80	Poulin Realty Acquisition
		382.00	

Secondary Area of Granite Ridge Development			
PID	Address	Acres	Owner
0208-0008-0000	174 Farmington Road	60.00	Diane Smith
0208-0008-0001	176 Farmington Road	11.61	Robidas Properties LLC
0208-0009-0000	178 Farmington Road	4.30	Rochester/Rural District
0208-0010-0000	180 Farmington Road	1.02	WAH Realty Corporation
0208-0011-0000	184 Farmington Road	4.00	Bonnie J. O'Shea
0208-0015-0000	0 Farmington Road	0.29	City of Rochester
0208-0016-0000	0 Farmington Road	1.66	Robert Rowe
0208-0017-0000	127 Farmington Road	8.90	Robert Rowe
0208-0018-0000	17 Sterling Drive	2.02	Raven Realty
0208-0018-0001	18 Sterling Drive	2.85	Raven Realty
0208-0018-0002	27 Sterling Drive	5.04	Axis Property Holdings LLC
0208-0018-0003	23 Sterling Drive	1.55	Raven Realty

Primary Area of Granite Ridge Development			
PID	Address	Acres	Owner
0208-0018-0004	0 Sterling Drive	0.64	Raven Realty
0208-0019-0000	123 Farmington Road	1.16	Black Dog Car Wash LLC
0208-0019-0001	115 Farmington Road	1.25	Hermitage Place LP
0208-0019-0002	131 Farmington Road	0.57	JMB Automotive Group LLC
0209-0001-0000	105 Farmington Road	1.70	Rudolph Tetreault
0216-0012-0000	4 Little Falls Bridge Road	1.89	Ralph Torr Rev. Trust
0216-0013-0000	0 Little Falls Bridge Road	11.80	State of New Hampshire DOT
0216-0018-0000	95 Farmington Road	3.50	Motiva Enterprises LLC
0216-0018-0001	83 Farmington Road	2.25	Joseph Blanchette
0216-0018-0002	77 Farmington Road	3.60	Rochester Hospitality LLC
0216-0019-0000	0 Farmington Road	4.50	PSNH
0216-0020-0000	8 Crane Drive	6.09	Newport Partners LLC
0216-0021-0000	33 Crane Drive	4.80	Rose Realty LLC
0216-0022-0000	27 Crane Drive	5.30	Black Marble Realty Trust LLC
0216-0023-0000	21 Crane Drive	3.16	Black Marble Realty Trust LLC
0216-0024-0000	7 Crane Drive	4.01	Four Hidden Rod Road Realty Trust
0216-0025-0000	47 Farmington Road	2.60	Poulin Realty Acquisitions LLC
0216-0026-0000	0 Farmington Road	68.00	Donald & Bonnie Toy
0216-0028-0000	23 Farmington Road	1.70	Miles Cook III
0216-0028-0001	25 Farmington Road	0.10	City of Rochester
0216-0029-0000	21 Farmington Road	2.41	Cardinals Seafarer Restaurant
0221-0154-0000	2 Farmington Road	20.80	Jean Edgerly Trust
0221-0156-0000	14 Farmington Road	1.20	Renee & Louanne Cardinal
0221-0157-0000	0 Farmington Road	1.20	Wayne Cardinal
0221-0158-0000	14 Farmington Road	1.30	Rene & Luanne Cardinal
0221-0159-0000	10 Farmington Road	2.45	Lawrence Shapiro Trust
0221-0160-0000	18 Farmington Road	1.32	Michael & Jean Garzillo
0221-0162-0000	18A Farmington Road	6.40	Richard & Phyllis Glidden
0221-0163-0000	20 Farmington Road	3.20	Robert & Karen Beranger
0221-0164-0000	17 Farmington Road	0.91	Rene G Cardinal & Cardinal Way
0221-0165-0000	11 Farmington Road	1.70	Seckendorf Real Estate
0221-0166-0000	9 Farmington Road	1.10	MIB LLC Greenwood Inn
0221-0167-0000	7 Farmington Road	0.30	Basel Alkurabi
0221-0168-0000	3 Farmington Road	14.00	Charles Karacas
		290.15	

ADDENDUM B

**RESOLUTION APPROVING CONTRACT
AND COST ITEMS ASSOCIATED WITH PROPOSED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
SCHOOL DEPARTMENT
MULTI-YEAR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
AGREEMENT WITH
Rochester Federation of Teachers
AFT Local 3607, AFT-NH, AFL-CIO**

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, AS FOLLOWS:

That pursuant to, and in accordance with, the provisions of Chapter 273-A of the New Hampshire Revised Statutes Annotated, the multi-year year collective bargaining agreement between the City of Rochester and the Rochester Federation of Teachers employee collective bargaining group, covering the period August 27, 2022 to August 24, 2025, as set forth in the proposed contract, a copy of which proposed contract has been made available to the Mayor and City Council, and with its financial impacts as more particularly detailed on the attached **“EXHIBIT A: RFT Teachers Tentative Agreement” dated July 5, 2022**, which includes a summary financial analysis of the annual costs of the contract to the City provided by the Superintendent of Schools, is hereby approved, including, specifically, the cost items associated therewith.

EXHIBIT A:

RFT Teachers Tentative Agreement

July 5, 2022

School Health Contribution	80/20	80/20	80/20	80/20
	SOS \$20/40 RX 10/20/45 DED \$1000/3000	SOS \$20/40 RX 10/20/45 DED \$1000/3000	SOS \$20/40 RX 10/20/45 DED \$1000/3000	SOS \$20/40 RX 10/20/45 DED \$1000/3000
Health Plan				
Projected Health Increase		FY 2023 Rates	5%	5%
	Current FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Wages				
Base Wage	\$ 24,253,154	\$ 25,396,955	\$ 26,156,326	\$26,931,776
Longevity	\$ 182,000	\$ 182,000	\$ 228,000	\$ 240,400
Total Wages	\$ 24,435,154	\$ 25,578,955	\$ 26,384,326	\$27,172,176
Dollar Change		\$ 1,143,801	\$ 805,371	\$ 787,850
% Change		4.7%	3.1%	3.0%
Benefits				
FICA/Medicare	\$ 1,869,289	\$ 1,956,790	\$ 2,018,401	\$ 2,078,671
Health Insurance	\$ 4,460,995	\$ 4,692,957	\$ 4,927,605	\$ 5,173,985
Opt Out				
Dental	\$ 70,310	\$ 69,265	\$ 70,996	\$ 72,771
Total Rollups	\$ 6,400,594	\$ 6,719,012	\$ 7,017,002	\$ 7,325,428
Dollar Change				
% Change		5.0%	4.4%	4.4%
Totals				
Total Wages Benefits and Rollups	\$ 30,835,748	\$ 32,297,967	\$ 33,401,328	\$34,497,604
Dollar Change		\$ 1,462,219	\$ 1,103,361	\$ 1,096,276
% Change		4.7%	3.4%	3.3%