

1 **PLANNING BOARD**

2 Minutes of August 20, 2014

3
4 **ATTENDEES:** Arnold Rosenblatt – Chairman, Sally Wilkins – Vice Chairman, Gordon Leedy, Cliff Harris,
5 Michael Dell Orfano, Richard Hart – Conservation Commission, John D’Angelo – Ex Officio, Marilyn
6 Peterman – Alternate, Colleen Mailloux – Community Development Director

7
8 **ABSENT:** Allen Merriman – Alternate, Eric Hahn – Alternate

9
10 Arnie opened the worksession at 7:30 and asked the Affordable Housing Subcommittee to begin the
11 discussion.

12
13 **DISCUSSION:**

14 The goal of tonight’s worksession is to gain consensus on questions generated by the subcommittee’s
15 work and to agree on draft ordinance language.

16
17 Sally explained that the materials prepared by the subcommittee represent a new process being
18 proposed where workforce housing, elderly housing, mixed use development, planned residential
19 developments (PRD) and open space developments come under an umbrella of an Integrated
20 Innovative Zoning Ordinance (IIZO). The proposed process changes were simplified as:

- 21 - Amend the ordinance so that elderly housing is subject to a Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
22 rather than a Special Exception.
23 - Create a mixed use development CUP.
24 - Provide density bonuses for projects that incorporate workforce housing.

25 Draft IIZO language has been provided along with a draft Workforce Housing Ordinance. Language has
26 also been drafted for conversion of existing structures to workforce elderly or mixed use. The
27 proposed ordinance is intended to allow flexibility and negotiation with the Board on allowed density
28 and is based upon economic viability. It was noted that NHHFA has reviewed and provided comments
29 on the draft language. Arnie stated, and the Board agreed, that once we have consensus on a draft
30 amendment, it must be reviewed by legal counsel to verify compliance with state law.

31
32 Sally asked if the Board agrees with the concept of one umbrella of IIZO with these innovative uses
33 under it. Arnie agrees with the concept but is concerned with including mixed use. Board members
34 generally agreed that they like the idea of pulling the CUPs together and bringing elderly housing under
35 the Planning Board review process. Mixed use is important, but it might be best to focus on the other
36 existing uses for 2015 zoning amendments and hold off on mixed use. There was a consensus of the
37 Board that the IIZO process is good.

38
39 There was a consensus of the Board that elderly housing developments should be allowed by CUP.

40
41 There was a concern regarding mixed use and if the draft is less sharp than it should be. Have the
42 consequences of mixed use been fully examined? A discussion followed regarding what people
43 consider mixed use- horizontal, vertical, village, Route 101A? It was noted that mixed use is currently
44 allowed in commercial zones. There was a consensus that mixed use should be delayed for now to

45 focus on the other amendments, and Colleen suggested taking time to educate the community on
46 what is intended by the Board for mixed use. Rich suggested that using the Village Strategic Plan as an
47 avenue for discussing mixed use would be effective.

48

49 Language regarding conversion of existing structures to workforce was discussed. The Board agreed
50 that they need to review the language further and think about possible consequences and if
51 conversion of existing buildings should be addressed.

52

53 Sally pointed out that the workforce ordinance allows a workforce accessory apartment, which has
54 different standards than a conventional accessory apartment.

55

56 John stated that he needs to know what is different about what is being proposed in this ordinance,
57 and why is it a good thing. It was agreed that Board members need additional time to further review
58 the proposed changes.

59

60 Currently net tract area has different definitions throughout the ordinance. There was a discussion
61 regarding the definition and creating one definition that is consistent throughout the zoning ordinance
62 is preferable. The Board discussed inclusion of severe soils in the calculation of net tract area. Gordon
63 stated that NRCS is possibly phasing out its soils program. The general consensus was that a consistent
64 definition should be used which excludes wetlands, steep slopes and floodplain to calculate the net
65 tract area.

66

67 Mike gave an overview of the Workforce Housing process. The first step is a discussion with the Board
68 to determine preliminary density. The Board will have the ability to negotiate density based upon
69 features of the development, infrastructure improvements, etc. A discussion followed regarding
70 incentive bonuses for other housing types. Mike stated that by including workforce housing in a
71 project, a development could take advantage of the density incentives. Mike explained that the
72 proposed workforce housing ordinance is based upon economic viability. A question was raised what
73 Return on Investment does the Board find acceptable?

74

75 The Board would like incentive bonuses for other housing types that do not include workforce. Pose
76 the question to Bill Drescher, under the innovative zoning RSA, is the Board able to offer density
77 bonuses for other housing types? Does the Board have the ability for density flexibility, can we offer
78 higher or lower density than what is permitted by right? What is the mechanism to permit this
79 flexibility?

80

81 Sally asked the Board what is the appropriate baseline density? She proposes a density of 1 unit per
82 acre. 1.5 units per acre might be appropriate for other housing through a CUP for a project without
83 workforce included. Arnie suggested 1 unit/acre for senior housing, but PRD is very different density
84 and has bonuses from the bedroom calculation. Gordon suggested that reasonable expectations of
85 density should be set and the Board should allow for flexibility if someone comes up with a creative
86 idea.

87

88 In exchange for density, what is the Board asking for? Public space, open space, infrastructure
89 improvements, etc.

90

91 Arnie recommended that the Board review the materials presented by the committee and come back
92 with what density each member feels is acceptable. Cliff states that the ordinance needs to measure
93 the value of an improvement, what it is worth to the Town and to the developer in terms of additional
94 density.

95

96 John asked Colleen to provide language samples for an Elderly Housing CUP. He recommended that if
97 the Board can address the elderly housing ordinance, and workforce, do we want to address the PRD
98 as well or wait and review that in the future.

99

100 Sally asked if elderly housing should be allowed in zones other than the rural residential? If so what is
101 the appropriate baseline density in other zones?

102

103 Arnie asked the Board to review the materials and send comments to the Subcommittee.

104

105 **OTHER BUSINESS:**

106 **Village Strategic Plan** – The Planning Board has been asked to select a representative to serve on the
107 Village Strategic Plan committee. Gordon Leedy volunteered and was unanimously nominated as the
108 Board’s representative.

109

110 **Community Development Strategic Plan** – Colleen has reviewed the 2013 Office of Community
111 Development Strategic Plan and is updating and adding another year to the planning horizon. John
112 and Sally indicated that the Board had provided comments on the plan earlier this year and directed
113 Colleen to the minutes of that previous meeting.

114

115 **Southern NH Medical Center** – Colleen updated the Board regarding the Southern NH Medical site
116 plan. In June the Board approved the site plan for the Southern NH Medical Center. The Applicant has
117 requested a minimal change in the footprint of the building that will not increase the total square foot
118 area of the structure and does not encroach further into any setbacks. The consensus of the Board
119 was that the building change does not require further action by the Board. The Applicant has also
120 asked to relocate parking spaces from the north side of the building to the southern end of the
121 proposed parking area, and to relocate the septic system to accommodate a possible future building
122 expansion. The Board agreed that the proposed site improvements were substantial enough to
123 warrant an application to the Board for an amended site plan should the Applicant wish to proceed
124 with those changes.

125

126 Arnie asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

127 Gordon made the motion with Rich seconding; all were in favor and none were opposed.

128 Meeting was adjourned at 10:20pm.

129