



**Meeting Minutes**  
**Work Session**  
**North Hampton Planning Board**  
**Tuesday, November 27, 2012 at 6:30pm**  
**Mary Herbert Conference Room**

7

8

9

10 These minutes were prepared as a reasonable summary of the essential content of this meeting, not as a  
11 transcription.

12

13 Due to the Thanksgiving holiday the Work Session was postponed from November 20, 2012 to November 27, 2012.

14 Due to the fact that the regularly scheduled ZBA meeting was on the same night there was no Recording Secretary

15 at this meeting and the minutes were transcribed from a video recording.

16

17 **Members present:** Shep Kroner, Chair; Joseph Arena, Mike Hornsby, Tim Harned, and Phil Wilson,  
18 Select Board Representative.

19

20 **Members absent:** Laurel Pohl, Vice Chair and Barbara Kohl.

21

22 **Alternates present:** Nancy Monaghan

23

24 **Others present:** None

25

26 Mr. Kroner convened the meeting at 6:31 p.m.

27

28 Mr. Kroner seated Ms. Monaghan for Ms. Pohl.

29

30 **Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments:**

31

32 **I. Article V, Section 506 – Signs –**

33

34 **1. Add to Section 506.2 Definitions**

35 ***G. Feather Flag/Banner: A lightweight, portable flag which appear like a sail mounted on a pole and***  
36 ***typically range in size between 4 to 6 feet tall and 1 to 2 feet wide.***

37

38 Mr. Kroner explained that he came up with the proposed amendments to the Sign Ordinance based on  
39 the Building Inspector's desire to contemplate a broader definition for "flags" to include "banners". He  
40 said he went on-line to feather flag sites and tried to capture the wording they used to describe "feather  
41 flags".

42

43 It was a general consensus of the Board to remove the size (4 to 6 feet tall and 1 to 2 feet wide) from the  
44 definition.

45

46 Discussion ensued on whether or not the word "flag" should remain in the definition.

47 The Board agreed to change the definition to read: **G. Feather Flag/Banner: A lightweight portable**  
48 **advertising medium, mounted on a pole, that resembles a sail.**

49

50 **2. Replace Section 506.4.K from Flags with: “Flags and Banners”**

51

52 **3. Change Section 506.4.K.2. From “Open” Flags to: “Open Flags to Open Flags and Banners”**

53

54 Mr. Harned made a typographical correction by removing “Open Flags to”.

55

56 The Board agreed to change the amendment to Section 506.4.K.2 to read: **“Open” Flags and Banners.**

57

58 **4. Add to Section 506.5 Prohibited signs: H. Feather Flag/Banner.**

59

60 The Board discovered an error under Article V, Section 506.4.A – Small sign. The Board agreed to the  
61 following amendment. To remove the words “following conditions” at the end of the sentence and  
62 replace it with “conditions above”.

63

64 **Mr. Kroner moved and Mr. Wilson seconded the motion to take the proposed Zoning Ordinance**  
65 **Amendments to Article IV, Section 506, with the Board’s changes, to the December 18, 2012 Public**  
66 **Hearing.**

67 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

68

69 It was a consensus of the Board that the entire Sign Ordinance needs to be reviewed and updated.

70 Dr. Arena suggested that discussions and suggested changes to the Ordinance should be done with the  
71 entire Board involved, at Board meetings.

72

## 73 **II. Article IV, Section 418**

74

75 Mr. Harned explained the proposed changes to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. He said that once a  
76 Town adopts a Workforce Housing Ordinance, a Developer can put in a development that adheres to the  
77 Workforce Housing regulations regardless of whether or not the Town has its “fair share” of Workforce  
78 Housing. He explained that the first modification is to make the Workforce Housing Ordinance have a  
79 threshold; that if the Town is already doing its “fair share” of Workforce Housing, the rest of the  
80 Workforce Housing Ordinance doesn’t apply because the Town already has its “fair share”. If it is  
81 demonstrated that the Town doesn’t have its “fair share”, then the Workforce Housing Ordinance “kicks  
82 in”.

83

84 Mr. Wilson and Mr. Harned worked together and prepared the following language to add to the  
85 Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, Article IV, Section 418:

86

### 87 **PREFACE:**

88

88 **This Inclusionary Housing Ordinance shall be in force and effect if and only if the Planning Board has**  
89 **found that the percentage of housing units in the Town of North Hampton’s housing stock that meet**  
90 **legal and regulatory standards for classification as workforce housing does not equal or exceed the**  
91 **Town’s “Fair Share” of workforce housing.**

92 At least once per year, therefore, the Planning Board shall use the Rockingham Planning Commission's  
93 most up-to-date "Regional Housing Needs Assessment" and "Regional Fair Share Analysis," along with  
94 any other information deemed relevant, to determine:

- 95 1. The percentage of the Town's housing stock that should meet standards for  
96 classification as workforce housing in order for the Town to provide its Fair Share;
- 97 2. Whether the Town's actual percentage of workforce housing units equals or exceeds the  
98 Town's Fair Share of such housing; and
- 99 3. If the Town's actual percentage of workforce housing units is less than its Fair Share, the  
100 percentage of units, the "Development Fair Share", that must be guaranteed in any site  
101 plan or subdivision plan proposed under this Ordinance (cf. Section VI, B below).

102 The Board's determinations shall be on record and available for inspection by the public in the Planning  
103 and Zoning Department during normal business hours.

104 **Dr. Arena moved and Mr. Hornsby seconded the motion to approve the proposed amendment to**  
105 **Article IV, Section 418 – Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and to take it to the next Public Hearing on**  
106 **December 18, 2012.**

107 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

108  
109 Mr. Harned explained "part B" of the proposed changes to Section 418. He explained that the way the  
110 Ordinance is currently written there has to be a percentage of homes that qualify as inclusionary  
111 housing, but it is set in a way that the percentage of the development is identical to the "target"  
112 percentage for the Town. He gave an example that if the Town's "target" is at 46% and it is currently at  
113 44%, and if every development is only required to be at 46%, the Town will never get to 46%.

114 He said that if the perspective from the Town and State is to get to the "target" number, then every  
115 development that comes into Town has to have a number higher than that to get there. He said it is  
116 "tricky" thing to figure out. He gave an example that if the Town is 4% below its "target" and the  
117 development that is coming in is 4% above the Town's "target", the amount of development coming in  
118 has to be equal to the amount of development the Town already has in order to get to the "target". He  
119 said there isn't an easy answer for this. He suggested raising the percentage rate for Developers, such  
120 as, if the Town's "fair share" is at 46% then increasing the Developers percentage of 50% will bring the  
121 Town closer to its "fair share". He said that he doesn't know if that is a reasonable thing to do.

122  
123 Dr. Arena said that Mr. Harned's suggestion makes sense, but Developers will be thinking that if they  
124 need to include more workforce housing units their profits will be less. Mr. Harned agreed.

125  
126 Mr. Wilson said that he believed that the relief from the dimensional requirements would enable the  
127 land value in North Hampton to be sufficient to make it economically viable for a Developer to do it. Mr.  
128 Wilson proposed the following: The requirement of "fair share" is 46%; the Town is at 42%, which  
129 makes the Town 4% below the requirement, so in order to meet the "fair share" requirement the  
130 workforce housing development coming in would have to be two times, (or whatever number the Board  
131 agrees with) the percentage the Town is under, which would be 8%, so the development would have to  
132 come in with 54% of the development as qualified workforce housing units.

133

134 Mr. Harned said that fundamentally the “fair share” percentage could change annually or with every  
135 development. He said that he is concerned that if the percentage requirement for the Developer is too  
136 high; they could take the Town to Court and try and prove that the percentage is too high and makes it  
137 so it is not economically viable to build.

138  
139 Dr. Arena said that the Board must consider the effect these developments will have on the Town. He  
140 said that Workforce Housing is aimed at a certain age group and with increase in population it affects  
141 the financial impact on the people as a whole and that has never been factored in.

142  
143 Mr. Wilson said that the Select Board is reviewing the proposals from the Appraisers to do the statistical  
144 update on property values next year, and the Board could ask them if they could produce data based on  
145 their statistical update about the extent of which North Hampton is providing its “fair share”.

146  
147 It was a consensus of the Board to change paragraph A under Section 418.7 – Density to provide a  
148 “target” percentage of Workforce housing units in any development that qualifies under the  
149 Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. Mr. Harned and Mr. Wilson will work on it and come up with a name  
150 for what that is and will draft a definition of whatever term they decide they want to use and that term  
151 is going to be something that is the difference between the actual housing units that qualify and the  
152 “fair share” number of housing units times a factor they will come up that the Board will agree to.

153  
154 **Dr. Arena moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion to authorize Mr. Wilson and Mr. Harned to**  
155 **work on the additional proposed amendments to Section 418 – Inclusionary Housing.**  
156 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

157  
158 There was discussion on having the information available for the December 4, 2012 Public Hearing. It  
159 was determined that the Board will review the proposed changes at the December 4, 2012 meeting, and  
160 take the amendments to another Public Hearing.

161  
162 **Master Plan Update**

163  
164 Mr. Kroner reported that he met with the Heritage Commission. They would like to add a Chapter to the  
165 Master Plan. Mr. Kroner explained that they are trying to lay some groundwork for how a Board might  
166 adopt simple provisions to the regulations, such as, if someone were to apply for a demolition permit to  
167 demolish a historic building, the Board may establish a requirement that would allow the Heritage  
168 Commission to have a few days to view the property and document it before the actual demolition, so  
169 they preserve some history of the property.

170  
171 Mr. Kroner said he will ask the Planning Administrator to provide copies of the proposed Heritage  
172 Chapter to the Board Members for their review at the December 18, 2012 Work Session.

173  
174 Mr. Kroner said that he doesn’t think the Vision Chapter is going to change very much from the current  
175 Chapter. He would like to add all the statistical data from the Visioning Sessions to it. He would like the  
176 RPC to finalize the project.

177  
178 **CIP Update –**

179

180 Mr. Wilson reported that the CIP Committee has completed the prioritization of all Capital requests for  
181 the period 2014 – 2019, with the exception of the Library, and they did not include anything to do with  
182 the Municipal Complex. The CIP Committee has taken the task itself to come up with a  
183 recommendation to the Select Board on how to deal with Municipal Complex question. The Library is  
184 planning to present their Library plan at the next CIP Committee Meeting on Friday, November 30<sup>th</sup>.

185

186 Mr. Wilson said that this is the second year the CIP Committee has engaged with the School. He  
187 reported that the School would like to renovate rather than build a new building. They will be proposing  
188 (1) to renovate three classrooms into a new Science Lab, (2) replace all the windows because they are  
189 not energy sufficient and for security reasons, and (3) to renovate the bathrooms for ADA compliancy.

190

191 **Minutes**

192

193 October 16, 2012 and November 5, 2012 – **Dr. Arena moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion**  
194 **to approve the meeting minutes of October 16, 2012 and November 5, 2012 as written.**

195 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

196

197 There was no report from the Building Inspector. Mr. Wilson suggested that Ms. Chase request a copy  
198 of the report the Building Inspector submits to the Select Board and make copies for the Planning Board.

199

200 Mr. Hornsby asked if the Building Inspector was working on the LED and neon “open” signs around  
201 Town.

202

203 Mr. Wilson said that the Board should consult with Mr. Kelley on the “open” signs. He said that Mr.  
204 Kelley is doing a good job on enforcement issues and with keeping records.

205

206 The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m. without objection.

207

208 Respectfully submitted,

209

210 Wendy V. Chase

211 Recording Secretary

212

213 **Approved January 15, 2013**

214