



Home of Waterville Valley Resort

WATERVILLE VALLEY PLANNING BOARD
Summary of the Minutes for the
Regular Planning Board Meeting
Held on Thursday May 12, 2016 at 8:00 am

- **Chairman Terry Waite called the meeting to order at 8:00 am**
- **Roll Call and seating of alternates**
 - Full members in attendance: Chairman Terry Waite, Vice-Chair Nancy Knight, Wendi Rathgeber, Harry Notowitz, Cheryl Saenger, Bob Guilbert
 - Alternate Members in Attendance: Ray Kucharski, Richard Rita
 - Members Absent: Ex-Officio Bill Larsen
 - Alternate Members Absent: John Recine
 - Alternates Seated:
 - Public in Attendance: Cheryl Moak (Wig-Wag reporter)
- **Review and Acceptance of Minutes from April 14, 2016 Meeting**
 - Ms. Rathgeber made a motion to accept the regular meeting minutes of April 14, 2016 with amendments (as follows):
 - *Lines 76 & 77 road should be plural*
 - *Line 61 Planning Board should be Town Core group*
 - *Line 104 should be Mr. Notowitz*
 - Ms. Knight seconded the motion

Motion carried by unanimous vote
- **Public Hearings:**
 - **SUBDIVISION DESIGN REVIEW ~ Waterville Valley Realty Trust**
(cont'd from December 2015; request continuance until June 2016 meeting)
Tax Map 104-40/041 ~ Snow's Mountain Rd. 4-lot subdivision
 - John March requested an extension to hear this at the June meeting.
 - The Board granted the extension. This will be the final extension. Notice will be sent to Mr. March that in order to grant further extensions after June renoticing abutters will be required at the expense of the developer.

- **Old Business**

- **Site Plan Application~ Moose Crossing Townhouses**

- Tax Map 105-010.25 Brownstone Way

- John March requested an extension to hear this at the June meeting.
 - Mr. Waite explained they are waiting for four requested items to be completed. When the Planning Board is shown this has been done they can approve this.
 - ~ *Letter for drainage easement (received)*
 - ~ *Letter from water & sewer department (received)*
 - ~ *Letter promising to pay for inspections if required.*
 - ~ *Letter stating the owner understands a performance bond will be required in order to obtain a building permit. The Bond amount is to be determined by Chris Hodges.*
 - Mr. Kucharski asked about issuing a time table on the extension. The Public Hearing has been closed and they are waiting to approve dependant on the above requested items.
 - Mr. Waite stated since they have given several extensions on this already it is at the point where it isn't fair to the abutters.
 - Mr. Kucharski suggested a 60-day deadline giving them until the July Planning Board meeting to meet the four requirements.
 - The Board agreed with extending the request to the June meeting but the developer will be notified, via the applicant, that the Board will be issuing a 60-day notice to have the requested items supplied to the Board or a new Public Hearing will be required. Developer will be responsible for the expense of renoticing a Public Hearing.

- **Request for Conservation Commission Planning Board Ex-Officio**

- Ongoing request for Planning board Ex-Officio to the Conservation Commission.

- **Old Business (continued)**

- From the Tickler Files C1 Density; Shared Parking; Restricted Parking; Extension of Boulder Path
 - Mr. Waite said they should determine what needs to be addressed in regards to Zoning.
 - Mr. Kucharski gave the history of why the C1 density should be revisited.
 - Mr. Waite read what is allowed in the C1 zone. Does not allow single-family usage. Single-family homes and duplexes are disallowed. Ongoing discussions in the past few years have been to go back to allowing duplexes.
 - The market is the argument as to what should be allowed in C1. What will sell? The Valley only has about 8-10 acres of developable land left. This leads to the problem of the affect on the tax base in the future. Currently the market is all lower density single-family homes.
 - Ms. Rathgeber asked if they wanted more single-family homes or businesses.
 - Mark Decoteau said in regards to Moose Run, the original subdivision the developers were talking about contained stores, condo units, and additional

houses, along with a mini Town Square type complex in Moose Run. This has all been replaced by approx. ten single-family homes.

- Mr. Guilbert said this is something they have to think about...what they want it to look like. Sometimes things do not end up with what they are supposed to be or planned to be.
- Mark suggested adding incentives to bring developers in but they have to protect that property. If they don't they will end up with single-family homes or triplexes.
- Mr. Guilbert said all they have now is the Town Square for commercial and retail. It is tough to attract people to purchase here. Mr. Notowitz said it's great to discuss this but without the ski area being moved to another level of success it impacts everything. Ms. Rathgeber said they have to continue to help the Valley succeed without worrying about the mountain. Mr. Guilbert added they can't control the market but they can control what an area of town is going to hold.
- Mr. Kucharski said this where a developer has to follow what zoning allows. This is what happened in Moose Run. They couldn't say no because the zoning allowed what the developer proposed.
- Ms. Knight asked if there was a particular question in front of them regarding C1 density. Mr. Kucharski said the discussion is about making it more restrictive so it wouldn't be all townhouses. They need incentives. This is a very difficult area of discussion.
- Mark said they would have to allow new zoning and make C1 more restrictive. He suggested having Mark Kane come back to discuss this.
- Mr. Waite said what seems to be the issue is use-by-right, the fact of multi-family dwellings is one. He wanted to know if that was the line item they were focusing on. If they are looking at C1 zoning what is it they focusing on. Item C multi-family dwelling could be made more restrictive such as adding more acreage per dwelling. Should they be looking at making C1 require more acreage per dwelling? Mark suggested going back to multi-use buildings rather than multi-family dwellings (stacked...business on bottom with residential on top).
- Ms. Knight said C1 is commercial and if something not commercial is being built it is simply not right. She feels residential doesn't fit into that zoning. It should be the business core. Perhaps adding wording "C1 is the business core".
- Mr. Waite said having just businesses in C1 isn't going to happen.
- Discussion on excluding/including hotels and/or condo-hotels.
- Mark said VC became village but no commercial. Intended use was commercial.
- Mr. Guilbert said when it comes time to protect sections they know what will happen. Developers build what they think the market needs at that time. This is why they are having the discussion now. Terry said they need to be realistic. The only commercial spot in town is Town Sq., which was built in support of the ski area. They are talking about a commercial area which isn't the case for Waterville Valley. They simply don't have the clientele to support it. He doesn't feel they will be able to currently fill a bunch of commercial spaces. C1 as it is now allows the developer to have a commercial portion as part of what is going to be built but the major part of it will be housing. No developer is going

to devote a key area to commercial. Ms. Knight added they need to think long term.

- Mark said they will have to pick that spot. They need to offer incentives to a developer to come in and build what they want on there. Letting a developer determine what is going to be built there doesn't help the tax base. Do they want to have a C2 zone and leave it empty and wait for a developer to build what they want there?
- Mr. Waite asked what the next step would be. Ms. Rathgeber said they need to be sure their wording doesn't allow for loopholes and if it would help to take out the word "multi-family". Mr. Waite suggested making multi-family an accessory use which would allow the dwelling.
- Discussion on "condo/hotel" concept and where they are in town versus hotels (i.e. Silver Fox, Snowy Owl). There is no definition for these (condo/hotel) in zoning. It is determined they should define the concept of these in zoning.
- Mr. Guilbert asked what would happen if the condo/hotel units no longer get rented due to market conditions. He asked about the percentage of units that are rented. Ms. Rathgeber responded it fluctuates. These issues need to be taken into consideration Mr. Guilbert responded. There are no real protections. Ms. Knight said what it does offer is flexibility and her concern is people let them go if the market declines. If they can't rent them they make no money off them and then there are a lot of hotel rooms that are in decline.
- Mark said from a tax stand point there is more value in the condo/hotel set up.
- Mr. Guilbert wondered if the condo-hotels could be in a certain area. He was asked why he would want to do that. He answered to keep the triplexes more organized. Ms. Rathgeber answered isn't that why they are looking at a "rim-type" set up.
- It is determined they need to define condo/hotel for zoning purposes.
- Mark asked if they would be open to having a professional planner come in with an opinion. They could discuss zoning and what has been proposed over the past couple of years (changes to ZO). The planner would then have a conversation with the Planning Board regarding items they would like to try to formalize. Mr. Waite said he hopes they aren't getting into a situation where they design by regulation. Mark replied isn't that what they are supposed to be doing.
- Mr. Guilbert asked what would happen in the future if the developer decided to build triplexes and with such little land available they would be stuck with that. Mr. Waite said they can't contain the whole thing. They have a vision based on the Master Plan but it is general. They need to look at the zoning and make it help them to put limits on development in particular zones, with the Master Plan in mind.
- Ms. Knight said that isn't what they are saying. Ms. Rathgeber added they aren't getting that specific.
- Mark said they allowed too much lower density housing (example being Moose Run). He continued with this was the wrong development for that area but it had to be allowed due to the way the regulations were written.

- The Board decided it would be beneficial to have a professional planner meet with them.
- Mark said the town has not done a good job of telling developers what they are limited to building.
- It is decided Ms. Rathgeber will work on wording for defining condo/hotels (review June 2016 meeting).
- Mark will try to get a planner to meet with the board at the June meeting.
- Mr. Waite said to summarize discussed density with purpose being saving the core with an increase or dealing with density requirements for C1; one way would be eliminate multi-family as a use by right. Clarifying definition of condo-hotel. They will revisit these items, under old business, in June.

- **Committee Reports**

- Town Core group met the previous Thursday (May 5th). Guest was Jayme Simoes, PR person working with Resort Association; he spoke about branding and Concord Main Street Revitalization which he was a part of. Without the Our Town Grant they need to move forward on the signage. There are foundations that do provide grants for signage needs. They are putting out an RFP to signage companies. The Mountain and the Town are awaiting each other to see what each plan on doing. They plan on having the design ready when they are able to move forward.
- Tiffany is working on funding for the dam repairs. BOS authorized moving forward with the design on rearmouring the dam. DES won't extend the repairs out to 2021. They will get DES approval on their plans for the dam. Mark explained the product they will use on the dam.
- Discussion on the dam and when it was declared hazardous which was a combination of the building in the dam structure combined with downstream dwellings and threat to Snows Brook Rd. added together increased the hazard rating. This took effect in 2007. If plan is approved they could probably go out to 2018 to do construction, but all this does is make the construction more expensive. Estimated cost is \$600,000 to \$700,000. Grant is \$300,000.
- North Country Council will meet with Town Core Group June 2nd. They have grant writers on staff. They are transportation/planning experts. Planning Board is welcome to go to that meeting to listen to them.

- **New Business**

- **Communications**

- Save the Date from North Country Council.

- **Tickler Files**

- Research on lighting
 - (to Old Business September 2016)
- Town Roads

- **Adjournment**

Mr. Notowitz made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 am

Ms. Knight seconded the motion

All in favor

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Pelchat

Planning Board Assistant

Waterville Valley Town Office