

PLANNING BOARD
Planned Unit Residential Development (PURD) Subcommittee
RINDGE, NEW HAMPSHIRE
September 10, 2020

DATE: September 10, 2020

TIME: 7:00 pm

CALL TO ORDER: 7:05 pm

Present: Jason Paolino, Kirk Stenersen, Holly Koski, Roberta Oeser, Deni Dickler, Jeff Dickler, Betty Comerford, Sharon Rasku, Julie Sementa, Roniele Hamilton, Larry Cleveland, Bob Hamilton, Daniel Aho, Judy Unger-Clark, Nathan Merrel, Christine Dipre, Ashley Saari

Jason Paolino called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Jason started the meeting by thanking all that had come.

Jason divined the intent: to revisit the PURD ordinance and regulations and to examine inconsistencies with other zoning ordinances. The subcommittee will consist of 9 members but all that have interest and attend will be heard. He also mentioned that the proposed Navian development on Rt 119 would be exempt from any changes proposed by the subcommittee. The make-up of the committee will be 2 Planning Board members, 1 Selectman, 1 from the Conservation Commission, Kirk Stenersen will be a non-voting member and 5 residents. The plan is to be aggressive in scheduling to move forward quickly. He explained the process difference between implementing regulation changes which can be approved by the Planning Board and zoning changes which must be voted on at Town Meeting.

Kirk did an overview of the authorization of allowing PURDs by the ordinance language: allows for 'clustering' of homes on smaller lots and less road frontage. He also explained how the calculation for allowable development has changed over the years and reviewed the 'workforce housing' bonus. Larry Cleveland asked if the state had a definition for 'workforce housing'. Jason said that would be addressed later.

Kirk described the housing that is allowed: single family, 2-family and multi-family up to 6 units. Jason said that PURDs are not required to address workforce housing requirements set forth in RSAs 674:58-61, but that the Town has met 'the facia test' by tying them together in allowing this housing in all residential use zoning districts.

Deni Dickler asked if we can show that we have enough workforce housing, can we deny allowing more. Jason responded that we cannot deny what is already in the works (Navian) and the state has not provided guidance and this so we don't really know the answer.

Kirk said that if something is on the books and an applicant complies with all requirements, the Planning Board basically cannot deny as the applicant would most likely easily win in court.

Jason reviewed the state's requirements to qualify as workforce housing for our area for both rental and ownership. The rental (family of three) amount is \$1046 per month and ownership (family of 4) current purchase price is \$235,000.

Bob Hamilton asked Dan Aho if a house could be built for that amount. Dan said not with current land cost and building supplies.

Discussion ensued regarding the 30% bonus allowed for workforce housing and that is brings down the land cost. Roni Hamilton asked if the 30 year covenants are still required as in the sample covenants in the PURD regulations. Kirk answered – Yes. Judy Unger Clark asked if a 'workforce home' would always have to sell for less than market. Kirk answered – Yes. She also thought \$1040 seemed high for rent. Roberta Oeser said that local rents are much higher.

Someone asked how much workforce housing we have in town. Roberta said that there is quite a bit as Monadnock Park is considered workforce housing, as well as many smaller apartments in town. Kirk said they are not restricted to workforce housing by income standards. Roberta said she didn't think they needed to be, just available.

Deni asked how we compare to surrounding towns. Are we going to be the workforce housing provider for the area? Jason said that Jaffrey has many lower rent multi-family units although not restricted.

Jason read the allowed uses in Residential and Residential-Agricultural Districts as being predominately single family homes although 2-family units are also allowed in the Res/Ag District. Deni asked about the Village Plan Alternative. Roberta said that it had been adopted years ago as the old Meeting School had some thoughts about developing the property. She thought it should be removed.

Judy wanted to know if the workforce housing is for locals or are people moving into town? Bob said that we are not really very close to 'work centers' except for Millipore. Jeff Dickler said the state doesn't seem to care about Rindge. He believes we have water supply issues and is concerned about not just the Navian development but others waiting in the wings. Larry said that even without workforce, Navian could be 42 homes and asked about the lack of frontage. Kirk explained that it could be on a new road built within the development.

Discussion about development in town: Dan said that from an airplane, Rindge looks like all forest and doesn't look 'over-built'. Roni thought that growth would mean higher taxes for services. Judy doesn't think cluster housing is good environmentally without public water and sewer. Deni asked if there was a list of the present PURDs in town. Christine Dipre said that she was new to this and asked if the Planning Board takes all application in totality when considering impact. Kirk said that the Board can require studies such as impact on traffic, public safety and to the schools.

Bob spoke about pending legislation to create a housing appeals board, SB 306, secreted into the budget, which allows the State to override local zoning and dictates what is to be allowed.

Judy read a list she had compiled of present PURDs and wanted to know if it was complete.

Jason read a list of 'homework' for the next meeting: list of workforce housing stock, compare to neighboring towns both stock and their regulations, find out if only 'controlled' units comply and a list of PURDs in town.

Next meeting will be September 17, 7:00 pm at the Recreation Building.

Adjourned 8:40 pm

/Roberta Oeser