

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Planned Unit Residential Development (PURD) Subcommittee**  
**RINDGE, NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**October 29, 2020**

**DATE: October 29, 2020**

**TIME: 7:00 pm**

**CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 pm**

**Present:** Jason Paolino, Holly Koski, Roberta Oeser, Deni Dickler, Judy Unger-Clark, Roniele Hamilton, Dan Aho (via phone at 7:10 pm), Sharon Rasku and alternate Julie Sementa. Kirk Stenersen arrived at 7:06 pm

Also present: Jeff Dickler, Cheves Walling and Bob Hamilton.

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

Jason asked for the minutes to clarify that the consensus of committee was to Question #2. Holly motioned to approve the minutes as amended. Second by Sharon. Passed 7-0 (Dan and Kirk were not present yet).

Jason said we should return the remaining questions from last meeting. Deni made the comment that the Planning Board makes decisions on technical issues and compliance with the regulations and ordinances but it seems the 'Town' is seeking decisions based on the character of the Town with keeping the vision statement in the Master Plan in mind. Kirk said that due to the RSAs that would be difficult and that the Master Plan is a guide for creating the ordinances and regulations. Judy said that Planning Board members on this committee go by the regulations and ordinances and the others go by what they 'feel'. She went back to the petition warrant articles and that even though they could not be enacted they were about controlling growth. Roni agreed with the sentiments, but cannot blame the Planning Board because the RSAs seem to be biased in favor of developers. Deni said she was not faulting the Board but said that there was some confusion in the Regulations about the terms open space, common land and conservation land. Jeff said the Master Plan is the guiding principal, but there are no 'qualitative requirements' they only refer to technical requirements. He has an issue with the granting of waivers and thinks the Board needs to just say 'no' when requested.

Jason distributed some suggestions on changes (attached) and led the discussion on them. Regarding removing Workforce Housing from the PURD: Dan asked for clarity on taking it and if it would be addressed elsewhere to be allowed. If done separately it would have to allow for fairly high density to make possible. Holly was concerned if only allowed in one particular area it could possibly create 'projects' like in MA. It was also discussed if it was eliminated, it could be brought up by a developer. Roni was in favor of eliminating it as it seems that in higher density developments, crime follows. Kirk confirmed that as he had spoken with the Police Chief. Julie asked for clarification on enacting changes. Jason explained that he had broken the

suggestions into two categories: Regulations which can be adopted by the Planning Board and ordinance changes that have to be approved by the voters. Bob said that he thought we were on track and was in favor of removing Workforce Housing.

Discussion about changing PURDs to 'subdivisions': Roberta read her suggested language change in the definition of a PURD. Kirk asked if that would eliminate multi-family units.

Roberta said no, but it would mean one structure on a lot. Jeff asked how an ADU could be over a detached garage, if only one structure per lot. It was explained that garages are considered 'accessory structures'.

Jason asked if there was a consensus on changing to require individual lots: the consensus was 'yes'.

Roni wanted to ask again about 'vesting' and if it was possible to put a time limit on starting a development after approved. Kirk said this is governed by RSAs to protect developers from zoning changes after approval.

Jason asked how the committee felt about having a minimum lot size. Dan was concerned about having different sizes for different structures. Kirk reviewed the lot sizes on Amalia Drive (a PURD) which are all about 1.3 acres or more. Deni thought perhaps providing flexibility by having an 'average' lot size requirement. She also was in favor of requiring wooded 'buffers' between lots. Dan said that would lengthen the road frontage required and very hard to regulate 'buffers' between lots. It was mentioned that the land could already be cleared and not forested. Jason suggested that leaving a buffer could be part of a density bonus situation.

As time was getting late (again) it was decided to continue the discussion at the next meeting but Jason thought we had made good progress.

Next meeting, November 3rd at the Recreation Building.

Adjourned 9:20 pm

/Roberta Oeser