

JACKSON PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES –November 8, 2018 – REGULAR MEETING

- UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

Call to Order: Bill Terry, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm. Attending were Members Bill Terry, Dick Bennett, Scott Badger, Sarah Kimball, Kathleen Dougherty, and Betsey Harding; attending Alternate member was Huntley Allan. Bill confirmed that all would be voting. In the audience were: Robert Cyr, and Hank Benesh, who was making an audio-visual recording of the meeting.

Minutes of October 11, 2018: Sarah moved approval of the minutes as distributed, and Scott seconded the motion; they were unanimously approved.

Minutes of October 25, 2018 Work session: Scott stated his understanding that, for regular subdivisions, we had proposed to mirror the frontage already offered for cluster developments, 150 feet, instead of the currently required 200 feet. Sarah moved approval of the minutes as corrected, and Kathleen seconded the motion; they were unanimously approved.

Public Comment: Robert Cyr had contacted Bill Terry about a possible change to a plan approved by the Planning Board on May 12, 2016. Mr. Cyr joined the table with copies of the approved plat, and indicated that he would like a change: not to rebuild a commercial structure at the site of the burned down Nestlenook Inn, and instead to be able to place a single family home near the southern border of that same lot, sharing a driveway with the home to be constructed on the (approximately) five acre parcel south of that lot. He clarified that he did not plan to propose a new subdivision. After that review, Board members concluded that the change was not substantial, and that it would simply be a building permit issue. Betsey requested that, when the location for the new structure is finalized, a new, as-built, plan be filed with the Board; she will contact Jim Rines of White Mountain Survey Co. about that.

Discussion of proposals for Zoning Ordinance Amendments (Added words are in **bold**; deleted words are omitted here for ease of reading):

Definitions: Wording for 3.31 was decided as, “‘Private Road’ means a **traveled** way not open to public use as a matter of right for vehicular travel, **constructed on a deeded right-of-way**, the maintenance and repair of which shall be borne by the subdivider, or landowners **using the Private Road.**” When the Planning Board approved proposals are sent to the Town Attorney, this part might be approved as a housekeeping change needed to comply with State law.

Wording for 4.3.1.3 was decided as, “Each lot shall have Frontage on a **State or Town highway with a Class I, II, III, IV, or V classification**, or Private Road **constructed to Town standards as required by the Planning Board. The minimum distance for Frontage shall be 200 feet**, except where....”(no other change)

Wording for Section 8, the Cluster development section, would include at 8.1 Purpose, a new phrase after “safety and enjoyment of residents”: “**to provide for a diversified housing stock**”. And, at 8.2.6, the following wording was agreed, “Open Space in developments approved under this Section shall be Common Land amounting to a minimum of **fifty (50) percent** of the total area of the lot or parcel being developed. **Developments creating Affordable or Workforce Housing units in compliance with Section 10 are only required to set aside a minimum of twenty-five (25) percent of the parcel as Common Land.**”

Sarah had prepared proposed wording for changes at Section 10, the Workforce Housing section, beginning at 10.3: “The Planning Board is authorized to review and approve plans for creation of Affordable or Workforce Housing **in two ways: “10.3.1 Creation of Affordable or Workforce Housing as part of a Cluster or Multifamily Development** in the same manner specified in Section 8 of this Ordinance....” (no other change) Members agreed to add a new “**10.3.2 Creation of Affordable or Workforce Housing through the creation of new lots.**” Then the current section 10.4.1 would become “**10.4.2 Minimum Number of Affordable Units created within a Cluster or Multifamily Development in compliance with Section 8.**” Current section 10.4.2 would become 10.4.1, with no change to that wording. A new section 10.6.2 would state, “The Planning Board is authorized to permit the following incentives **for Cluster or Multifamily Development....**” (no other changes). A new 10.3.6 would state: “The Planning Board is authorized to permit the following incentives **for creation of a new lot** provided that the criteria in Section 10.5 are met:

- i) **A lot created for an Affordable of Workforce Housing Unit may have as little as 125 feet of frontage along a public or Private Road.”**
- ii) **Approval for placing a dwelling unit on said lot shall be determined by utilizing current NH Department of Environmental Services standards for the quantity of land necessary to provide a proper and adequate community water supply and septic disposal system.**

Kathleen inquired about Section 10.8.3, indicating that the requirement may be unfair to a family working to improve its income; Betsey explained that the clause refers to a tenant permitted to occupy a dwelling unit based on an income of up to 80 percent of the county’s median income; at this time, that 80 percent is approximately \$58,000 for a family of 3. With the current wording, the family could earn approximately \$98,000 before needing to vacate the home within a year from filing the new income amount.

Dick moved to adjourn the meeting, and Kathleen seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:55.

Respectfully submitted by Betsey Harding, Secretary

(Note: an audio-visual record of the meeting may be found on Jacksonflicks.com)