

**TOWN OF BARTLETT PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING**

December 4, 2017

Members Present: Chairman Philip Franklin; David L. Patch; David A. Patch; David Shedd; Scott Grant; Kevin Bennett. **Members Absent:** Peter Gagne (with notice).

Also present: Victoria Laracy; Chris Doktor; Sam Harding; Betsy Harding; Norman Head; Kathleen Sullivan Head; Mark Dryjas; Leslie Mallett; Catherine Steesy.

The meeting was opened at 6:00 pm by Chairman Philip Franklin, who reviewed the agenda.

1. Presentation by Victoria Laracy of the Mt. Washington Valley Housing Coalition sharing the results of their latest charrette in Bartlett.

Victoria Laracy presented and introduced architect Chris Doktor who provided a sketch illustrating the final concept for their most-recent charrette site, which Mr. Doktor identified as being a thirteen acre commercially-zoned parcel just south of the Fields of Attitash on Route 302. Mr. Doktor said although the site consisted of suitable soils and was not encumbered by wetlands, it had presented limitations in that it dropped-off twenty to thirty feet at the back. This reduced the area suitable for buildings and septic to approximately six acres, which density calculations showed would support 129 bedrooms based on state standards, and 84 bedrooms under Bartlett's regulations. Mr. Doktor said if Bartlett was serious about encouraging affordable housing, one of the things they could look at was to relax their septic requirements. He felt 100 bedrooms, a number a little-less than midway between what the state and town allowed, could be a fair compromise. On this particular site, fourteen thousand square feet of the six acres of buildable area had to be set aside for an onsite community septic system.

Mr. Doktor said another important factor they took into consideration was to minimize cost. His design started with a single road down the middle of the property to minimize infrastructure, with little "villages" on either side and parking in the middle. He said our master plan spoke about not wanting to have a lot of sprawl, and sprawl was typically the result of mono-function, or one function, such as housing consisting of only one economic level or one type. Mr. Doktor said rather than simply providing a series of the same type of housing units, he wanted to mix it up by having a mixed-use development. He said, typical of workforce housing, the standard of living is less but the quality of life doesn't have to be less. Mr. Doktor said in order to achieve affordability, the development was designed as a planned unit development (PUD), in a configuration that minimized infrastructure costs. The design included a mix of 24 affordable housing units with two market-rate homes situated near the back. Mr. Doktor said the workforce housing had been designed for modular construction so as to decrease construction costs. The units were small with two or three bedrooms in each, and each was designed with the potential to accommodate an accessory dwelling unit. As well as the residential units, Mr. Doktor said his design included the possibility for a small grocery store or retail center.

Mr. Doktor said he had averaged the cost for each unit at \$192,000 a figure which included all infrastructure but did not include the cost of the retail store. This averaged out at a monthly cost of ownership of \$1,280. Victoria Laracy said they recognized that wages in this area, particularly in the hospitality sector, did not support most people being able to afford that kind of money and it could be hard for people to qualify for a mortgage. She encouraged the town to think about allowing a higher density. David Shedd asked what would prevent the units from turning into second homes or an Airbnb. Ms. Laracy admitted that was not the intent of affordable housing but acknowledged it could happen, but said deed restrictions can be put in place to prevent it. Betsy Harding, a Jackson official, said Jackson had a workforce housing ordinance which had deed restrictions in place to ensure the housing was always inhabited by local people. She said the guidelines were the same as those established by Habitat for Humanity. Kathleen Sullivan Head agreed there were ways to put safeguards in place and asked what the board's opinion was on what had been presented tonight. David L. Patch said the information was all very new and there was a lot to think about and it would be hard to offer an opinion at the moment. Kevin Bennett said he personally felt the cost was very high. He said people could do their homework, find a lot, and put a modular home on it for a lot less than that. He asked what the building cost per square-foot was. Mr. Doktor said it was about \$75. Ms. Laracy commented on how young families were not moving into our area and the current population was ageing. She said one of the primary reasons families were not moving here was due to the dire lack of affordable housing and stressed how this situation needed to change, not only to provide for a future workforce but also to keep our school established. David Shedd asked

whether these units could have an ADU. He was told they could. Mr. Doktor said the site's density was not maxed-out under state standards, but was under Bartlett's. Ms. Laracy and Mr. Doktor were thanked for their interesting presentation, and Ms. Laracy provided literature on affordable housing for the board's information before leaving.

2. Discussion with Mark Dryjas re his Red River development off Highland Road. Tax Map 6WSTRD, Lot 037HR0 .

Mr. Dryjas gave a brief history of the prior proposals for his 28-acre lot, which was originally approved for a 13-unit PUD, then reduced to 8-units and finally to four, which the subdivision is currently approved for. Mr. Dryjas said the 28-acre parcel is owned by Red River Property Development, a corporation owned by him and his wife, but they also personally-own an adjoining 5-acre landlocked parcel. Due to its landlocked status, the planning board had granted a waiver to allow the parcel to be accessed by one of the driveways off the larger parcel even though the driveway already served two houses. The waiver was not to allow an extra dwelling on the main lot, but merely to provide access to the landlocked parcel. Mr. Dryjas said he had recently dusted-off the plans for this subdivision as he was hoping to build his home on the 5-acre parcel this spring and realized the regulations had now changed to allow three houses on a driveway. He said since the waiver had only been granted to provide access and had nothing to do with the density on the main lot, which there is still plenty of, he wondered what he could now do to take advantage of the new regulations and have another house on the 28-acre lot. David L. Patch said his opinion was that a waiver was granted to basically allow a third house on the bottom driveway, but since the inception of the new driveway regulations, that waiver is no longer needed. He didn't believe Mr. Dryjas could now have it both ways by using the driveway as access as well as having a third dwelling on it. However, since there were only two dwellings on the upper driveway, that one could have another one on it. Mr. Dryjas asked how he would go about doing that. David L. Patch said he would need to submit an application to amend the last subdivision plan and go through a public hearing, abutter notification, etc. David Shedd asked whether the third dwelling on the upper driveway would be located on one of the locations previously approved. Mr. Dryjas said he wasn't sure, but he had a meeting planned with Alan Eastman to discuss how much it would cost to get a driveway up to their location. He said due to construction costs associated with getting a drive up that high, he would actually like to now have the units lower-down on the lot. David L. Patch informed him that if he amended the subdivision plan that he could have the units anywhere he wanted so long as it didn't affect density. Mr. Dryjas said he will speak with his engineer and will get back to us. He thanked the board for their help.

3. Review and Approve Minutes: The minutes of the November 6 meeting were reviewed. The Chairman said he was aware of two people who had been present at the meeting but were not listed as attendees, apparently not having signed in. He also noted several minor typos. On page 4, second paragraph, 6th line, change "not" to "no". On page 6, Item 6, change "Soules" to "Tsoules." On page 7, Item 8, Mail and Other Business, second bullet and 6th line, change "in" to "it". A motion was made by Scott Grant; seconded by David Shedd to approve the minutes as revised. Vote: All in favor.

4. Continuation/Final Approval: Attitash Mountain Service Co., (AMSCO), Block G, Stillings Grant: File: 2013-1187. This is an application to reconvene review of a continued application to subdivide Block G into 40 residential units. Tax Map 5STLNG, Lot G00.

This application has been continued indefinitely until a review by the town engineer review is completed..

5. Discussion on Zoning Amendments: The Chairman noted the board's previous discussions on possible zoning amendments which included maintaining residential frontage the entire depth of the lot and commercial PUDs. He said he had been thinking about the PUD situation and felt there was a lot involved with it and maybe there were regulations already in-place which the board had not had a chance to look at. This elicited a long discussion where items which had been talked about over and over at previous meetings were brought up again and people expressed concerns about different on-going projects in town as well as about the grandfathering status of certain lots, and gravel pits, etc. etc. A lot of the talk deviated from the original intent of discussing zoning amendments, and the bottom line was that, at this point, the only zoning amendment we will be going ahead with was to require the residential frontage to be maintained the entire depth of the lot, at least until we heard back from the Municipal

Association and Mary Pinkham-Langer. It was decided the public hearing will for this amendment will be held on January 3, 2018.

With no further business, a motion to adjourn was made by Scott Grant; seconded by David A. Patch. Vote: All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Bush
Recording Secretary