

# **TOWN OF WOLFEBORO**

## **PLANNING BOARD**

**November 16, 2021**

### **DRAFT MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order:** Chair Kathy Barnard opened the meeting at 7:00 PM.

**Members Present:** Kathy Barnard, Chairman, Mike Hodder, Vice-Chairman, Brad Harriman, Selectmen's Representative, Vaune Dugan, Member, Peter Goodwin, Member, John Thurston, Member, Susan Repplier, Member, Julie Jacobs, Alternate.

**Staff Present:** Tavis Austin, Director of Planning and Development

**I. Discussion Items:**

#### **(a) Architectural Design Standards**

Vaune Dugan said there have been very few applications coming to the board for architectural design review. We need to have a process in place because we do not want to ambush anybody. It would be unfortunate to have somebody come to a meeting with their drawings where they had already selected windows and materials and they are looking for approval and then we have a list of things that we may or may not like. This really came to mind during the Charrette. I met the Town of Durham planner Michael Behrent. He approached me when I was handing out the design standards for those who were participating. He wanted to know how we were doing with them. I said they were brand new, we had just adopted them and, so far we have not really had much of a process of review. He regaled me for a while on what they do. I went to the Town of Durham website to see if they have something online that I could compare to, I could not find specifics as to the process; so I called him today and we discussed it. He said that there is really nothing written but what they do is they have him, an architect or an architectural professional review with the architect or the designer for the project at an early stage the documents. They work to make them better before they come in for a formal hearing to the board.

Kathy Barnard asked if the architectural review board would come in with a recommendation.

Vaune Dugan said it is either an architect that you would hire or somebody who was an architectural expert. He said that I should do it. I said I do not know if that is a good idea. Other towns I have looked at sometimes will hire architects. They do have volunteers; in his case he happens to have an architectural degree. I can go through what he said if you are interested. He said there should be one person leading, it could be staff they should be familiar with architectural design issues. If it is a huge project, they sometimes hire a consultant to work with the architect to make suggestions and then hopefully not make anything new significant in the way of changes but make sure that they are meeting

the guidelines before they come into the board. He likened it to the storm water regulation and that it is a sort of a technical review in our case I think we do use engineers to review those criteria. So, he is suggesting it is applicable the same idea is applicable. It is it is a process it would be a process that whenever they go into the planner, the planner would say it look you know we have somebody who is offered to meet with you to guide you through regulations and to recommend the project for the planning board or not, but that is their method.

Kathy Barnard said we worked with an architectural review committee, and it was made up of three architects, it is the same thing.

Mike Hodder asked if we are contemplating making the current process more complicated than it is. The applicants coming here are responsible for adhering to the zoning ordinances. The presenter of the application is professional and should know enough to read the ordinances. When they have questions, they need go to the planner. I would hold with architectural design with guidelines that we have in site plan review currently. They are self-explanatory and tell what they can and can't do. With the Kingswood Golf course situation, the prohibition of the portion of that project was clear. It also provides a business, in the site plan review process a mechanism for applying for a waiver from the planning board. I'm a little bit concerned about establishing an architectural review board, whether it's just Vaune or whether it's other members of the planning board because then we're putting an additional layer in for architectural review standards. We have other sort of reviews or in addition to when we do stormwater regulations, they must have calculations made by the engineer or least verified by engineer. We cannot expect applicants to adhere to architectural standards as published and if they find that they either cannot or would prefer not to, they will file for a waiver and argue that waiver with the board at the time of presentation.

Vaune Dugan said Michael did go down that route and what he suggested is that we offer that service for free and if they would like to take the opportunity to meet with somebody prior to coming to the board, that way we could guide them. What comes to mind is the architect that came here for GALA he seemed to believe since there was no historical structure in the Back Bay that did not really apply. Something as simple as that argument could be alleviated.

Mike Hodder said he understood that by bringing the standards into site plan review it gave us the flexibility to objection or consider a request for an alleviation of a requirement.

Vaune Dugan said we could have a group or a person. A volunteer if anybody is willing or an architect. I could do it, certainly I could not meet with the applicant, but I could meet with the architect.

Peter Goodwin asked if this was not this a question of education if we are dealing with stormwater runoff there is a mechanism to have questions answered by the planner. This is another regulation which we are trying to have the applicant adhere to and I would believe there is a mechanism for them to ask appropriate questions and get answers before they arrive here. Then we say no you cannot do that. I just think there needs to be some mechanism to do that.

Mike Hodder said perhaps Vaune and others on this board would be willing to serve as independent architectural review board, prior to the application coming here, in the ordinary course of an application the planning board, recourse is to the planner. He is expected to understand the ordinances. He is here

to work with or to enforce the regulations and to help the applicant get through the minefield of putting in application.

Peter Goodwin said he is saying that a person dealing with water quality may not be as familiar with the architectural standards, the Planner can assist with both so “if you have questions about architectural standards, please ask the Planner.”

Kathy Barnard said one point about Kingswood Golf Club I do not believe we asked for waiver. That was on us we really should have. When they present something, we need to go through the criteria and say it is either OK or why we do not think they have to comply with them.

Mike Hodder said when they submit the waiver, I agree we were lax in applying our own ordinance. We have a pre application process in which an applicant can come here and get an opinion from the planning board prior to making a formal presentation; that gives them an opportunity for someone who has architectural concerns which the planner might alert them to can come here and get a sense of how the board feels on whether the architectural standards one applies.

Kathy Barnard said then everyone would participate.

Tavis Austin said one of the reasons this is on the agenda is because this is the first year that the architectural design standards became mandatory. He would also suggest that the board members have a refresher on them.

Mike Hodder he agreed, the planning board needs to review the architectural review guidelines as well as the parking regulations.

Tavis Austin said that prior staff reviews I included first the entire design review standards section to assist the board. They didn't get a lot of attention at the meeting, so the next iteration review, I said design standards and commented multiple times on what are, and they how do they apply. There not long ago was a Commission reviewed projects. It is my understanding that the commission became rather arduous. That committee which was ultimately voted out at a subsequent town meeting. There are many applicants that come in and say I just need to get the site approved, I want to know what size building I can facilitate on the property. They haven't even thought about the architecture yet but, now you are not letting me apply until I've designed the entire building.

Mike Hodder said we can't impose conditions of approval for architectural design, but we can handle it case by case. The architectural design standards are in our site plan review, can apply them, if we have the benefit of a professional architect on this board currently who can look at a set of plans, we can take advantage of that.

Kathy Barnard asked when they're proposing new buildings or additions do, they get this the architectural standards do we make them aware of them. Where we can start is have them look at those standards and determine if they need a waiver or not.

Tavis Austin asked to what extent the board does want to push the regulations. As an interim step I can put together a separate checklist, so as applicants are going through the application, they must do design standards.

Kathy Barnard said why don't we start doing that and if someone runs into a situation where they said there is no way they can comply then that person could come to the board for an informal review.

Tavis Austin said there is an optional pre application for site plan review. The question would be optional planning board review prior to TRC.

Peter Goodwin said he had a few points I'd like to make. Vaune, who is architect, is in a position where she must decide it may or may not be a good thing. It may end up being that she has a conflict of interest, and she says I can't do it. She may not stay on the board forever so how do we deal with that.

Tavis Austin said my thoughts would be a way to come up with a way that the design standards could be formulated to work with on the project.

Kathy Barnard said we want a check list that.

Tavis Austin said he would much rather work on a checklist than trying to establish a new committee yes

Peter Goodwin said the master plan committee has four members and there seems to be a problem with getting data for us to analyze. Some of it seems to be associated with the fact that the various people in charge of the areas are working on are working on budget issues and therefore they are more concerned about that.

Kathy Barnard asked what had been done so far.

Tavis Austin had put together the email to the EDC and I asked for the top three priorities, I have had very limited feedback. I will say that EDC this morning brought up the topic and they are going to plan on discussing this at the next meeting.

Peter Goodwin said there's progress but there are reasons why there has not been a lot of progress.

#### **(b) 79-E Update**

Kathy Barnard said next item on the agenda is an update on 79-E. The PB asked her to send a memo to them about the adoption of 79-E. Basically to help with affordability housing issue. Basically, three places in the master plan the economic development chapter, the community at the housing chapter, and in future land use chapter. I think we need to work on one of them. The memo that I sent to the selectman said that the statute says that must be done they must propose the warrant article and we would be working on a zoning ordinance at the same time.

Tavis Austin said I think the critical point is that the BOS know we are open to hearing the proposal. The BOS had a couple of questions on the proposal. I think it's important that the board know that we are here if they need further advice for before they move forward.

Mike Hodder said did the board of selectmen have a particular reason why they weren't prepared to put this warrant article 79-E on the warrant in March.

Kathy Barnard said they felt that it was premature that we really should wait until this spring. They wanted more information from us. We talked about looking at density in the Central Business District, Bay Street and Wolfeboro Falls districts.

Tavis Austin said noted there was some confusion about what has been enacted. BOS believe it would be premature to put something in front of the voters that would enable the board to do something that hadn't yet been authorized at the state level. There is a paragraph that applies a month after town meeting, there are many municipalities in New Hampshire that have already based enacted this.

Mike Hodder pointed out that 79-E 4 B has been enacted the governor has signed it and the effective date is April of next year. The town governments can adopt 79 E now with the understanding that it can't be applied until it comes into effect.

Tavis Austin said really if you think about the tax year, that is exactly why that's happening.

Mike Hodder said the longer Wolfeboro waits to enact 79 E 4B falls behind other towns who will enact the legislation because it's designed specifically to let towns attract development into areas. This is a current warrant article the planning board should be working towards the density requirements. If in March of next year, we have an effective 79-E we will have the incentive for developers to come in to do what they need to without obstructions from zoning. Otherwise, we will have another year to play catchup.

Brad Harriman said Kathy & Tavis pretty much covered it, the gist of the meeting was that the board really wanted to get more information of 79-E and to let some other towns do it would first see how it works out. I guess the question is can we adopt one small section or do you have to adopt the entire 79-E.

Mike Hodder said that is a question for your lawyer.

Brad Harriman said he assumed we would probably reach out to the attorney.

Tavis Austin said and that's really where the rubber hits the road all of 79-E is an economic revitalization tool that the town can avail itself to the extent that the town wants to avail itself.

### **(c) Residential Densities**

Tavis Austin sorted CBD parcels by acreage, this took a lot longer than residential densities (map was handed out). There are 168 parcels in the CBD the largest parcel is 6.25 acres the smallest parcel is .047. On that handout next to 168 the table here is for those that are less than 1/10 of an acre there are 29 parcels in the CBD with an average size of .07 acres 79 which in total those 29 parcels are 17% of the district if you expand to a whopping .2 acre there are less than 1/4 acre you pick up another 59 parcels and you've already exceeded 50% of the district and more than half of the district is less than 1/4 acre in size would become relevant too between .23. There are .21 point three you pick up another 29 parcels another 17% of the district. Going down to the narrative only 15 parcels in the CBD or one acre in size or larger and they represent less than 10% of the district 153 parcels of the 168 are less than an acre with an average size of less than 1/4 acre anyone see why I'm going through this number the way I am if you look down at that .23 acres which is the 153 parcels at the current density those parcels are allowed to have 1.38 units and they wonder why there are no residential units downtown and not even have two if you take the same .23 and that the last meeting and last workshop meeting there was a discussion of going to 30 units per acre those same quarter acre parcels could support 7 units 7 units is not the 30 units that got everyone scared about the last time I said 30 units per acre. I didn't write this down because it looks scary but if you take all those parcels at .23 acres 153 parcels with an average size of .23

and you multiply it out you get 1500 units. That's a scary number but that also requires the complete removal of everything else commercial in the CBD, no more ice cream, no Donuts, no more Law Offices or real estate offices. This opens the door to 30 units per acre. By only allowing a parcel of at least 1/4 acre, that's less than 40% of the district, having maybe 7 units the justification behind going to 30 units per acre and getting that number up to seven is very specific because when you look at 79 E and others a third of the units need to be affordable to qualify for programs. You must get mathematically high enough so you can have a third of something.

Kathy Barnard said according to the minutes were asked to look at the 30 per acre and 20 per acres that was the suggestion.

Tavis Austin said the short answer of that is a function of the size of the units in the building. At the last meeting you looked at the building across the street and if you're doing 500 square foot units, four units in the building go down to 250 square feet, the units themselves are by size structurally nothing changes they can still apply all the design guidelines instead.

Mike Hodder said allowing 30 units per acre doesn't mean they have to build up to 30 units per acre.

Tavis Austin said no because what the board had talked about is it remains 6 units per acre, but if you were to do workforce, elderly affordable, non transient housing and agreed to a project, that way you could avail yourselves of up to 30 units acre.

Mike Hodder asked do you have a sense looking at this for businesses with the historical use of these properties which properties which would be most likely to adopt the density if it was changed to 30 units acre. I don't mean by a lot size, but historically some of these parcels are not likely to change their current use because they are either successful long-established churches or shopping centers, take them out of the mix what is this X here which of these properties but possibly become the site for a housing project.

Tavis Austin said I was convinced the board would be able to orient itself as to which one the shopping Plaza and the liquor store and B'S Restaurant. You have Hunters, Harvest Market then you take out town hall take out the school playground an alternative property all the realistic structures that are left are the older residential structures.

Susan Repplier said it would be nice to know specifically once we're talking about.

Tavis Austin continued the point, my recommendation to the board would be looking to permit people to put units in any of the structures.

Mike Hodder said I think that one just given that the board adopts the idea of 30 units per acre maybe will require us to really feel that selling it to the town. One of the ways of selling it to the town is to show where it would impact, and which properties would be impacted by the change. Showing them on a map with the density.

Tavis Austin said that it is very tricky to guess where the market is going to go. I will make a simple assumption of known properties that are most likely going to remain as town owned properties. Hunters, Harvest Market are more than likely are going to remain. Tavis said one the suggestion that was made in EDC this morning was 30 units acre was to think about how many half acres you need to get a unit.

Kathy Barnard said suggested we look at 20 units per acre. I think we need to look at that.

Tavis Austin said where it changes is if you get out to the RA zones you can get into the 50 and 60 acre parcels vast majority of it so it's going to look like ridiculous density but then you have to subtract from that the cost of your water and septic systems for that density of the cost is going to go way up which is inversely going to impact the density is it's not going to be marketable.

Tavis Austin said that's one thing that we hadn't put in at the last discussion talk about workforce, elderly affordable or non-transient housing if you throw in the HUD definition you only get this density.

Kathy Barnard said it must be a long term.

Tavis Austin said he needed some consistency on numbers if the board believes that the town is going to have pushed back because of the planners talking about these giant apartments downtown, maybe the board's intention is to say we're thinking about 300 to 400 square feet one-bedroom units. And you can whittle it down that far in the regulations but I also see this as an option 79-E or B is very specific to a target population.

Kathy Barnard said we're not talking about 79-E.

Tavis Austin said that the language is talking about a very specific part population. There's also a disparity in people needing housing that that don't qualify for affordable, but they also can't do the mansions. You know young working couples with their first child or two and their gross is \$60 or \$75,000 a year, they're not moving here.

Vaune Dugan said let's talk about the liquor store on the bottom and now you have two layers of apartments on top of that. We need to consider this because that is the normal way that towns like ours develop.

Tavis Austin said the places where they're going and it should be encouraged, with parking management plans, they are going to be working in town which means these people can be walking or biking to work. Tavis said one thing to be clear on was also something that came up at the selectmen's presentation on 79-E. The public opinion might be much more receptive to more workforce housing if we can guarantee that it is Wolfeboro employees.

Brad Harriman said in looking at another perspective if we take these three categories that you spelled out on the sheet. The 29 parcels average .07 acres 59 at .14 do the math and who knows how many units should get in there on those 29 units that are less than 1/10 of an acre that only lets you put two units per acre per lot there which isn't really going to work very well and the 59 parcels that are between the 10th and 2/10 of an acre you're allowed up to about 4.2. You want units per acre that covers 3/4 of the district there were talking about is going to have between two and four units maximum allowed.

Tavis Austin said I picked this number to suggest, I'm perfectly willing to raise that number.

Brad Harriman said just wanted to look at this a little bit differently because he was thinking with 30 units per acre that's just huge density. These types of numbers are how they're going to apply here, most developers aren't going to even go look at this and they're going to say it's not high enough.

Mike Hodder said a petition warrant article to put drive through restaurants one acre or more in size. When I looked at the lots of one acre or more, I found only five of them qualified, they were currently in use, the other lots in that district are where long-established lots of churches or parks. It turned out that of the five, four of more are owned by one individual who has an interest in the drive through restaurant, point being, this is where we should focus on.

Tavis Austin said right the way the zoning has been put together over the years only CBD talks about single family, duplex and multifamily (up to six units per acre) in every other zoning section the zoning is silent on multifamily, or if it says multifamily it doesn't prescribe a density and you have to fall back to a section of the ordinance that which captures some others and all commercial districts other than Wolfeboro Falls and CBD say 2 units per acre and then Wolfeboro Falls and CBD are at 6 units per acres.

Kathy Barnard said that's why we're looking at this.

Susan Repplier said this is easier to digest until the impact of this map is adapted to the clickable properties that could be affected. It's great that we understand but what's the deal with Clark Plaza. This is a potential issue.

Tavis Austin said I don't know of any actual 100% reliable data the town has about how many units exist on any of these parcels, I know that there are apartments in some form or function above the liquor store.

Susan Repplier said I think the bigger ones those are the ones that we must pay attention to because they could make a real impact on the town. If we could have specific information about some of these bigger lots that could really make a huge difference.

Tavis Austin stated willing to take a couple of broad strokes and pick up the town owned properties or those that don't really seem ripe for transition.

Susan said it absolutely isn't about Clark Plaza, but what about this big red BLOB what is that.

Tavis Austin said it's mostly parking lot and the car wash. Tavis said for example you have a manufactured housing overlay, and it says any manufactured housing project needs to meet the basic zoning requirements.

Mike Hodder by way of apology the zoning ordinance is what we're arguing about, now we need to fix or make changes to the things that were in place at a time.

Peter Goodwin said he disagree with what you are talking about, we need to look at regular ownership of a particular piece of property because that is not going to be eternal. It is really the precedence used, in other words if you have a Dunkin' Donuts on a piece of property that probably is not going to change, the particular ownership is irrelevant because that can change tomorrow.

Vaune Dugan asked how we address mixed use and how do you figure out units per acre.

Tavis Austin this would be residential units per acre in addition to what's already there equals. I with the parking management, if you have 3000 square feet of retail on the first floor and then 6000 square feet of apartments it's not 9000 square feet of parking it's 3000 at the retail calc. and then the parking requirement for 6000 sq. ft. for the apartments.



Kathy Barnard questioned our height requirement now 30 or 35 feet.

Susan Repplier said for the smaller lots I am not that concerned about because the zoning changes are not going to hurt the town the larger lots that have potential to make a real impact on the town that's what we need to focus on.

Tavis Austin from that point if there are five or six .07 acre pieces next to each other, and someone was to purchase them all and then put a project on it, you look at the cost per acre in Wolfeboro that's not happening. We don't need to worry about that as much but, if suddenly people in Wolfeboro were to do workforce housing you might have someone but then you have your design standards that help you address that.

Susan Repplier said what I am is concerned about the Avery building as well as the huge parcel like Clark Plaza that could potentially become a monstrosity. The worst-case scenarios are that I believe we must start with and work our way back just to make sure that we avoid evil happening here.

Tavis Austin said the red parcels 3.1 to 6 acres there's one at about 3.1 and two at just over 6 which is obvious in the image .06 acres 6 acres at 30 units would be 180.

Susan Repplier which of the big units are town owned.

Tavis Austin said there is an office complex Foss and then this is Clark Plaza.

Susan Repplier so there's so one out of the three.

Tavis Austin said two maybe, but you'd have to evict the whole condo complex over here. One out of three if it as simple as terms is 180 affordable housing units and the other way the other way to address it would be residential units not on the first floor and the density not to exceed their 30 units per acre, if workforce, affordable or non- transient 40 per under HUD guidelines.

Vaune Dugan asked about this piece over here, it's called the Mill Street Plaza, whatever that is, isn't that deed restricted against residential. We are down to one piece.

Susan Repplier said so this is our biggest area of exposure right here.

Vaune Dugan also looked at it as an opportunity.

Susan Repplier said absolutely I think this should be a big area of focus to make sure that if this is the pathway, you're going down this is our biggest area of exposure.

Tavis Austin said in going back to the example of the drive through restaurants on an acre or more etc. you could put 60 units an acre but it's only applicable on half an acre or less. All we are really doing is trying to micromanage with the total number of units you're trying to create.

Mike Hodder said it is our job to make the case to if we decide to come up with a proposal.

Tavis Austin said in addition to augmenting the map I'm going to flush out this table a little bit more.

Julie Jacobs asked is the Wolfeboro Falls is the only zone it says business is on the bottom floor and only Bay Street Business District allows multifamily not on the first floor.

Susan Repplier said it would help if we had more of visual rendering of some examples. If you take Clark Plaza it's easy to fear what could potentially happen there if we change the density, but it could be wonderful and a lot more attractive than it is now so we must consider that.

Tavis Austin stated he didn't know if someone decided to buy Clark Plaza if it would even make any financial sense whatsoever to tear down everything that's there renegotiate the states lease for the liquor store and simply put 180 units in. The third of which are market rate that's an expensive project to contemplate.

Tavis Austin said right now multifamily requires one parking spot per unit it's one for every 3 you need one parking spot per unit and one guest space for every three unit.

Peter Goodwin said in some ways what you're saying is the number is reduced to 20 with really no change in the number of units in a bigger place we can look at what the numbers are.

Tavis Austin said practically speaking even at 30, all the other requirements of somebody has to meet with 35 you're not going to get close to 30. That's why one of the reasons the number 30 to provide the incentive. I will play with the map and add some more details. What it could look like is hard to describe. I had three or four phone calls in the end of last week and yesterday about five different properties on Lehner Street that simply want to add 1 unit. If you look at what color Lehner street is, and they can't some of the lots are mathematically so small you can't have one unit.

Kathy Barnard said we need look at the definition of affordable workforce housing and nonprofit and elderly housing.

Tavis Austin said if you get into the federal level of elderly housing 20% of it don't have to be a 55 and over project with federal funding, I believe 20% of the units don't have to be elderly.

Kathy Barnard said but that's not what we're talking about.

Tavis Austin said that's not in our zoning, but we need to be careful which terms we apply to make sure we get the required or the anticipated result.

Kathy Barnard asked do we want another definition for workforce housing.

Tavis Austin said there is a HUD definition that or we could come up with our own.

Kathy Barnard said I'm happy with the one we have.

Mike Hodder said I think that everybody needs to take a look at the housing definitions for elderly.

Tavis Austin said I anticipate coming back to the next work session with more details of definitions.

Kathy Barnard said we talked a little about inclusionary zoning that's the one where they just required to have a certain number of units.

Tavis Austin said one of the projects that board has asked me to investigate is revamping the elderly affordable inclusionary zone, probably the easiest way to do that is to come up with the direction. The existing zones get modified into a new version and again part of that becomes very critical because if you look at some of affordable and elderly sections now, if somebody comes in at 30 units per acre and then apply the elderly, they get more units.

Mike Hodder said that some of the ordinances go back in some cases years, if nothing else they need to be looked to see if they applicable today. I like the idea of bundling them all together and having one single ordinance.

Kathy Barnard I'm not sure if I do. Everybody seems to agree with having a zoning district where it's not just for workforce.

Mike Hodder said I would like to hedge that by saying I'd like to see what the planner comes up with.

Peter Goodwin said I would think we need more information before we continue discussion.

Tavis Austin said the reason I bring up the HUD definition is for those that qualify for those financing options the ratio a third of the project and can be market rate. If the only mechanism for somebody to take a lot of a certain size and make it affordable is to qualify for other funding then that program comes with stipulations.

Vaune Dugan said that's a discussion of definition to work together to decide but so the way to work through how many housing groups can be provided for the density change and if such a density change were made and how do we lay that out.

Kathy Barnard said come back to us through with something.

Peter Goodwin said I have a comment on last meeting about the class 6 roads. We've made a recommendation which wasn't unanimous about not having development on Class VI roads. I think one bit of information which I was not aware of at the time was that basically across the street there was another house on the Class VI Rd. Therefore, the Select board allowed this thing to occur, but I don't think it is an incursion into the master plan's statement, that we don't want to have development on Class VI roads. I don't think it's a major issue and I don't think it really sets a precedent which says we're going to allow somebody half a mile up the road to build and so therefore I would have liked it. I don't think that this really affects the end of master plan.

Tavis Austin said there were some other details that came out. Just passed the property in question, at the last meeting regarding the waiver, was Police Department has a gun practice range.

Peter Goodwin said I think that was discussed the last time and if they have access to it, if they were maintaining the road to get there and that in fact says that the town is in some way maintaining that property, so I think it's not that if incursion I would worry about or that the recommendation it wasn't right and the recommendation by the master plan is we're not really offending that, so I think it's OK.

Tavis Austin stated he believed the board new that you knew there was the structure there and it had been inhabited, so in this case literally the waiver was required to get an electrical permit so there could be electricity provided to the property.

John Thurston stated after going to my house and reflecting on that request I think everybody needs to understand that the water reservoir is on the backside, and I think one of the things that we want to do is going to have containment of an unbuildable area around the reservoir. That piece of land that goes past that property we talked about butted up to the back of the reservoir and the brook that comes out is the outlet from the reservoir. I think that a was critical piece of information that wasn't rarely

divulged. But, you know seeing other properties built past that one would affect my thoughts on anywhere near the water reservoir and that's where I stand on that one

Peter Goodwin said one of the recommendations of the master plan is to have all the property around our reservoirs conserved and protected because that is a resource which appeared by the town. That is a long-term project I would make a wager if the select board could do it with a magic wand it would do it tomorrow, but it is a costly adventure and something that is long term project rather than and yesterday

## **II. New/ Other Business**

Kathy Barnard said we will open the public hearing for comments from members of the public.

John Sandeen of Wyanoke Gate Lane in Wolfeboro said several times it's has been mentioned that this discussion of affordable housing was in the master plan, but there are also several other things in the master plan like the character of the town, a rural character of the town, the parking and the traffic in town all those factors seem to me to apply. When you're thinking about density and that in the business district particularly secondly spoke about this density discussion affecting Bay St and Wolfeboro Falls, but I did not see that on the map. The map only goes as far as up to those properties, we're not talking about what's happening on Bay St or what's happening or Wolfeboro Falls. So, I think you need to expand the map, if you're thinking about 30 units her lot because there are a lot of bigger lots just outside of what's on that map. My second point is that many of you went to the Charrette on planning about the district I did not hear one person that lived a long Lechner St saying they wanted more housing. They said they wanted sidewalks, that they wanted other pieces of property to attract tourists they did not say they want more housing on Lechner St. The other point I would like to make is that you're talking about putting very small units into the downtown district and you're missing the point, there are short term rentals in many of those places that you would put 300 or 400 square foot there like a motel room. So, what are those going to turn into you're going to turn into Airbnb's or short-term rentals those are the questions that I would ask.

Anne Blodgett said of Brook Crossing and Pleasant St. I've been listening to this and I'm thinking we are putting the cart before the horse. I haven't seen an analysis of the inventory of the population and the housing in town, including those that are now short-term rentals that could possibly be converted into long term rentals. Why not give an incentive to people who currently owned properties that are rentable instead of giving incentives to developers. With no data right now and the prognostications I've heard the town's going to grow right now we're coming out of COVID people have moved here I bet they're going to start selling. I think things are going to change I think to react to the everybody's mantra of workforce housing puts you in a position of not being long-term and thoughtful planners. Do you want to be the ones that people look back at and say oh there was this big scare that there wasn't workforce housing but, we had plenty of houses we just didn't allocate it the right way without numbers. What the hell are we doing, we have a lot of residential properties here, we have X population. How can us as humans predict the future of what the real estate market is going to be. We could end up putting a glutton Wolfeboro and screwing up the whole housing market. I totally disagree with Mike Hodder lorking at the whole town, I think that defeats the purpose of workforce housing and the ability to walk to work. I have nothing against workforce housing, absolutely nothing, but it's got to be thoughtful in the end. They talked about thoughtful workforce housing, they talked about ways to do it thoughtfully and attractively without sprawl. I don't know, I'm just I'm just thinking in the world I came

from you need data points. How could you sell this to the town without saying we have a workforce housing problem. We don't have the numbers, nobody's shown anybody anything what you know if you say we end up with 180 do we need 180 or do we need 500. Anyway, so that's my frustration and I know that from fellow citizens that the word density is going to set off a lot of alarms. So, it's got to be presented thoughtfully, the long-term plan not a knee jerk reaction and short-term rentals are going to be a subject that's going to get in the way, because it's there it's the elephant in the room. Thank you

Kathy Barnard said we asked Tavis is to look at the central business district, which is what this map is.

Tavis Austin said coincidentally for the board to keep in mind that short term rentals could be curbed with the help of the 79-E 4 B. If it were in the appropriate zone, it could be what is addressed, you could provide incentives for people to consider long term over short term right

### **III. Approval of Minutes**

#### **Minutes - October 19, 2021**

Kathy Barnard said we have two sets of minutes for corrections and approval. Are there any corrections if not, I am asking for a motion to approve the minutes.

**Peter Goodwin made the motion to approve the minutes from October 19, 2021, seconded by Kathy Barnard. A vote was taken 6 to approve with Mike Hodder abstained. The motion passed.**

#### **Minutes – November 2, 2021**

Mike Hodder – Page 3- Tavis Austin line - 8<sup>th</sup> line change I to He.

Tavis Austin Line –27<sup>th</sup> line change my to is.

Mike Hodder Last line – Add Motion to Approve. Change motion approve on last line to Mike Hodder made the motion and Vaune Dugan seconded it.

Page 6- Tavis Austin line –8<sup>th</sup> line change I to he.

Kathy Barnard – Page 1 – 5<sup>th</sup> line from bottom – add She opened the Public Hearing and closed the Public Hearing.

Page 3 – Above the last paragraph add a line- Kathy Barnard opened the Public Hearing and closed the Public Hearing.

Page 7- 1<sup>st</sup> Kathy Barnard line – Add Brad Harriman stepped down and Julie Jacobs was appointed a voting member.

Page 13 – Peter Goodwin 8<sup>th</sup> line from bottom- Add Future Lane Use.

John Thurston – Page 3- 25<sup>th</sup> Line – change line to read- John Thurston said is this a transportation corridor or is it more of a recreation trail for the people at Harriman Hill.

Vaune Dugan – Page 3-12<sup>th</sup> line from bottom- Add “and” after Bike.

Page 5 – 4<sup>th</sup> line -Change is to are and remove look to be and insert are.

Kathy Barnard asked for a motion to approve the November 2nd minutes.

**Mike Hodder made a motion to approve the minutes from November 2, 2021, it was seconded by Vaune Dugan. A vote was taken all in favor the motion passed.**

Tavis informed the board we do not have a recording secretary and a tape of the meeting is being recorded on a flash drive. Terry and I will be completing the minutes.

Kathy asked for a motion to adjourn.

**Mike Hodder made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Vaune Dugan. Members voted all in favor. The motion passed.**

Respectfully Submitted,

*Terry Tavares*

Terry Tavares

**\*\* Please note these minutes are subject to amendments and approval at a later date\*\***