



Home of Waterville Valley Resort

WATERVILLE VALLEY PLANNING BOARD
Summary of the Minutes for the
Regular Planning Board Meeting
Held on Thursday June 9, 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, Bob Guilbert
 - Alternate Members in Attendance: Ray Kucharski, John Recine
 - Members Absent: Ex-Officio Bill Larsen, Cheryl Saenger
 - Alternate Members Absent: Richard Rita
 - Alternates Seated: John Recine
 - Public in Attendance: Tina Koppel (Wig-Wag reporter), Michael Koppel
- **Review and Acceptance of Minutes from May 12, 2016 Meeting**
 - Mr. Notowitz made a motion to accept the regular meeting minutes of May 12, 2016 as amended.
 - Mr. Guilbert 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 July meeting.
 - At the May meeting the board had determined the extension to the June meeting would be the last one; renoticing abutters would be required. A letter was mailed to John March to this effect. He answered via email that this would be fine.
 - Mr. Waite reiterated the design review will be renoticed and Mr. March will start over again in July.

- **Old Business**

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

- Tax Map 105-010.25 Brownstone Way

- Mr. Waite said they have reviewed and accepted the site plan contingent on the developer meeting four items the board asked for. The developer has completed two of the four remaining items.
 - Applicant had requested several extensions which were granted. He has requested another extension. During the May meeting they determined they would extend to the June meeting. It is not necessary to act on this now. The applicant has been informed of this.
 - Mark said they will reach out one more time to John March via email and the board will be voting on it in July. The remaining two conditions will be reiterated.
 - Item tabled until July.

- **Old Business (continued)**

- Definition of condo/hotel

- Ms. Rathgeber supplied the board with a definition:

- *Condotel: A hotel-style building, or group of associated buildings, comprised of individual condominium units sold to individuals and investors for their personal use or use as a rental property, and in which units are operated under a single management providing the occupants the usual hotel services and facilities.*

- Discussion on which "condo/hotel" style facilities would fall under this category.

- Mr. Notowitz found the following definition online:

- *A condo hotel, or contel, is a building which is legally a condominium but which is operated as a hotel, offering short-term rentals, and which maintain a staffed front desk.*

- Mark asked if they were still going to determine if this was a C1 zone usage.

- Town counsel will be asked to look over both definitions.

- This item will be placed on the July agenda and Mark suggested the board discuss this with North Country Council when they meet with them.

- C1 zone discussion

- Mr. Waite said he believed the intent was to not have condos allowed in the C1 zone if there are more than two (Mark). They need to strike multi-family or increase the density. Multi-family units were allowed as use-by-right and there had been discussion to allow this as accessory use-by-right. The discussion was never conclusive but appeared to be the direction they were going.

- Mr. Kucharski said there isn't any number – could be three units. Mr. Waite said yes that is something that came up.

- Ms. Knight asked if they should put something down regarding having a staffed front desk. Define it so it's not feasible for three units.

- Mark said this is a question for town counsel. Put it simple and then ask the question - are they covering things like staffed front desk.

- Mark said they already have recommendations to pick a number of units per acre to get the density they want. Since there is no minimum zoning size for the lots if that only takes a 3rd of an acre (i.e. boutique) they can still get the density they want. Who cares what they build as long as the density requirement is met. Property values per acre that is sustainable for the long-term should be their most dense area. North Country Council will come in and talk to them about how they do that.
- Mr. Waite said this whole thing revolves around if they want to eliminate multi-family housing by use-of-right. Ms. Rathgeber added perhaps they should allow the rim area/create the special zoning? Mr. Waite said as long as it remains on the list all they can do is define it.
- Ms. Rathgeber wanted to have someone help them see the big picture. Should they go for an average density in the area? She wanted how to best word this.
- Mr. Waite suggested a list of items they need to discuss with North Country Council
 - Should they keep multi-family housing as a use-by-right?
 - Should they be looking at minimum density by area?
 - Should they be looking at special rim zoning?
 - Should they be looking at multi-family housing being an accessory use, or perhaps special exception?
 - Should they have a separate C2 zone?
 - What do they do about parking (on-street, parking structures, underground)?
 - Incentiving development in these areas. Mark said there are several things that can be done within state law to encourage development.
- Discussion follows on attracting developers. Michael Koppel stated developers would not wait for the Board to decide what type of development they wanted.
- Mr. Guilbert said the board is trying to get something done. Mr. Koppel added he didn't know what the resort/mountain had gotten done but they have severe issues as to their future development. What the town does affects them and what they do affects the town, and he doesn't see representatives from the mountain at the meetings.
- Ms. Rathgeber said although the mountain is a very important business in town the town should not be dependent on what they are doing. The town's goal should be that of being self-sustaining. As a town they need to have their regulations correct and see what is best for them in the long term.
- Discussion on attracting developers continued.
- Discussion on how to attract people into the Valley.
- Mark said they need to be ready with regulations being ready to go for developers. Everything should be clear for potential developers with incentives being in place. Everything they have discussed is important but the planning board can't pick one thing to focus on. Their regulations can be supportive of that but this is not their decision to make. North Country Council and professional municipal planners are available to help. The Planning Board has to give developers the frame work as to what the municipal plan is. Prior decisions are now coming back to haunt the town. They don't have a strong tax base due to

lack of density. They need to take the tax base for the future into consideration. It is not the Planning Board's purpose to pick something for the Valley to focus on to bring in developers. The Planning Board sets the frame work for businesses to come in and have the necessary regulations available so what they want to build can be built.

- Mr. Waite said there has to be a reason to develop in an area. The Planning Board needs to be there to corral the ideas of a developer. They should be looking at the regulations again (stack regulations) and it's a massive undertaking. This would be something they should bring up with the North Country Council.

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

- Ongoing request for Planning board's Ex-Officio to the Conservation Commission.
- Mr. Notowitz would like the Select Board to disband the commission and start over with the two members who do show up at meetings.

- **Committee Reports**

- June 2nd Town Core Group met with two representatives from the North Country Council on transportation ~ Mary Posse and Kevin McKinnon. They reviewed different grant possibilities to continue work on implementing the study.
- They are moving forward with TAP(transportation alternative program) which runs every other year. Main focus will be to assist with funneling bicycle paths.
- Looking at the NH Dept of Resource Land and Water Conservation grant funds to help with clearing land between the Athletic Club and the school. These are federal monies that come into the state for land/water projects. This project would be developing recreational fields.
- The Select Board has looked into the option of contesting the ranking of the dam. It's possible they can contest how it was rated and not have to go through the process.
- Mr. Waite asked about the crosswalks. He thought they were going to be ladder style. Mark said before the 4th of July they will be covering existing icons and then will be putting larger ones on the roads. Sidewalks will have pedestrian icons. The crosswalks have intersection issues so they need to be selective in how they do the crosswalks. Public Safety and Public Works need to determine what is safe for pedestrians. They need to make sure the crosswalks are all where they are supposed to be.

- **New Business**

- Mr. Waite asked if there were any topics for new business.
- Mark said he had a question regarding developers bringing in plans. If there was development at the ski area on White Mtn. Nat'l Forest land – if they were to move forward with Green Peaks; what would be the expectation of the Planning Board of what the ski area would have to do. There would be no change of use with Green Peak. They don't have zoning control of the use of the

land (White Mtn. Nat'l Forest). What would they expect if there were major development up there?

- Mr. Waite asked if they have site plan review of that area. Mark replied for the buildings yes. National Forest regulations take precedence over the planning board. They would be asking for "XYZ" to happen but the final decision would be with the National Forest in regards to what they are allowed to do there. From a life safety standpoint the Planning Board would have control of that.
- Mr. Waite said if the White Mtn. Nat'l Forest has precedence why would they have to ask them to review and give their opinion. Doesn't make sense for them to go through the review if it just gets handed to someone else. Mark said they don't need an answer right now but he would like the board to have a consensus of what they would want them to do. The plan hasn't moved forward yet but they haven't talked about what their expectations are (as a town). Location of towers has been approved by the National Forest; trees that will be cut, location of towers, type of lift.
- Ms. Knight hoped they can review safety aspects.
- Add this to July meeting agenda.
- Mark suggested board members to go the White Mtn. Nat'l Forest website as the detailed plans are there.
- **Communications**
 - None
- **Tickler Files**
 - Research on lighting
 - (to Old Business September 2016)
 - Town Roads
- **Adjournment**

Mr. Guilbert made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 am
Ms. Rathgeber seconded the motion
All in favor

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Pelchat

Planning Board Assistant
Waterville Valley Town Office