

Waterville Valley Planning Board
Summary of the Minutes for the
Planning Board
Public Hearing
Held on Wednesday, December 13th, 2023, at 6:00 pm

MINUTES

Video recording of the meeting is available on the Town website.

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER by Chair John Recine at 8:00 am.
ALL VOTES WERE TAKEN BY ROLL CALL

ROLL CALL for Board Members and Seating of Alternates

1. Full Members in Attendance:

Chair John Recine, Vice-Chair Nancy Knight (via Zoom), Rich Rita, Mike Koppel, Bill Spence, Morgan Diehm, Katherine Brennan

2. Alternate Members in Attendance: Alan Berko (via Zoom), Margaret Turner, Rob Wilson, Rick Smith

3. Members Absent: 0

4. Alternate Members Absent: 0

5. Public in Attendance:

Mark Decoteau, Alisha Harrington, Tara Bamford (via Zoom), David Noyes, Terri Stutzman, Tom Myrick, Janet Melon, Barry Fish, Darrell Fernandes (via Zoom), Ben (via Zoom), Thomas Jakut (via Zoom), Mark Wagner (via Zoom), Helen Rita (via Zoom), Paul Bardaro (via Zoom)

Unidentified Zoom Attendees: 19787, iPhone 5

Public Hearing-Proposed Zoning Amendments

Chair John Recine opened the Public Hearing at 6 pm on December 13, 2023. The meeting focused on discussing proposed zoning amendments six through ten. The meeting included participation from Board members, Tara Bamford the planning consultant, and community residents. The main topics of discussion were related to setbacks, parking, and cluster developments.

Amendment 6

Amendment 6 aimed to standardize side and rear setbacks across Village Commercial (VC), Higher Density Residential (HDR), and Lower Density Residential (LDR) districts to 20 feet. The amendment suggested removing the current requirement of a 35-foot setback in HDR and VC when abutting LDR. Residents had concerns about the impact on undeveloped lots, property values, and the character of LDR neighborhoods.

Amendment 7

Amendment 7 proposed varying the front setback in the Village Commercial (VC) district based on the zoning district across the street. The intent was to create a more vibrant town core and

support the town's economy. The discussion on this amendment was brief, with no significant objections raised.

Amendment 8

Amendment 8 sought to reduce the parking requirement for accessory dwelling units (ADU) from two spaces to one. The change encourages the development of ADUs by making it easier for homeowners to meet parking requirements. Questions were raised regarding the clarification of parking spaces, including whether garage spaces counted towards the requirement.

Amendment 9

Amendment 9 would allow the Planning Board to vary the number of parking spaces based on a parking plan provided by an applicant. This flexibility was aimed at addressing overbuilt parking and allowing for more efficient use of space. Concerns were expressed about the current parking situation during events and whether there was adequate parking in town.

Amendment 10

Amendment 10 focused on allowing more dwellings to be built in PUDs (Planned Unit Development), provided they were limited to no more than 1200 square feet and short-term rental use was limited to 30 days per calendar year. The amendment included design language to ensure neighborhood character and shared open space, promoting a community feel. Questions arose about the availability of land for PUDs and potential for redevelopment.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:12 pm.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: “To adjourn meeting”

Motion: B. Spence

Second: M. Koppel

Vote: 7 – Yes, 0- No

Respectfully submitted,
Alisha Harrington