



Meeting Minutes
Public Hearing & Work Session
North Hampton Planning Board
Tuesday, December 18, 2012 at 6:30 p.m.
Town Hall, 233 Atlantic Avenue

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 **Members present:** Shep Kroner, Chair; Laurel Pohl, Vice Chair, Joseph Arena and Phil Wilson, Select
14 Board Representative.

15

16 **Members absent:** Barbara Kohl, Mike Hornsby, and Tim Harned

17

18 **Alternates present:** None

19

20 **Others present:** Wendy Chase, Recording Secretary and Kevin Kelley, Building Inspector

21

22 The Public Hearing is being held on the following proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments to consider
23 placing them on the March 2013 Town Warrant.

24

25 Mr. Kroner convened the Public Hearing at 6:35 p.m. and noted for the record that there was a quorum.

26

27 **First Public Hearing** on proposed Amendment to Article IV, Section 406.5 - the proposed amendment
28 will close a "loop hole" regarding "residential" and "business" uses utilized on the same lot in the I-B/R
29 Zoning District.

30

31 Mr. Kroner read the existing Section 406.5 into the record that was adopted in 1985. *A lot in the I-B/R*
32 *District that is presently utilized for business purposes shall not be used for residential purposes. Any*
33 *existing undeveloped lot may be used for either a business or residential purpose, but not both.* He
34 explained that there is an inconsistency that was brought to the attention of the Planning and Zoning
35 Administrator in the Section. The proposed change is to add the following at the end of the first
36 sentence: *A lot in the I-B/R District that is presently utilized for residential purposes shall not be used for*
37 *commercial purposes.*

38

39 Mr. Kroner explained that this is the first Public Hearing on this proposed amendment and the Board can
40 either decide to make changes to what is proposed; choose not to take the proposed amendment to
41 Town Meeting, or make no changes to the current section and not take it to Town Meeting.

42

43 Mr. Wilson said that in the years he has been involved in the Planning Board it has consistently treated
44 this provision in the Zoning Ordinance as meaning exactly what it says in the proposed amendment. He
45 the original Ordinance was adopted to encourage business development for various reasons, and one

46 reason was to increase the tax base with commercial properties rather than residential properties. The
47 proposed amendment is to “spell out” what the Board has been consistently doing over the past years.
48

49 Dr. Arena commented that allowing both business and residential on the same lot can prevent “sprawl”,
50 and the Board wants to prevent “sprawl” and maintain more “open space”. He suggested that it be
51 limited to specific localities and allow businesses, other than manufacturing, to have apartments on the
52 second floor.

53
54 Mr. Wilson explained that when the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance was created the concept of “mixed
55 use” in the I-B/R was introduced. Under the Inclusionary Housing, if qualified, an apartment above a
56 retail business is allowed, but the law states that there has to be five (5) units to qualify. He also
57 commented that the Board may consider allowing the I-B/R in other locations in Town, such as between
58 the Stratham town line and the Town Forest on Route 111, to allow the Industrial Park to expand
59 without negatively affecting the abutters because the Town Forest would act as a buffer. There are
60 things the Board can look at to prevent sprawl and provide more tax base that wouldn’t use Town
61 Services.

62
63 Mr. Kroner said that he supports “mixed use” as a concept. He said he believes it was added to promote
64 commercialization of the I-B/R Zone because it would drive higher tax revenue, but also wonder if it was
65 purposely written as it is in acknowledgement of unique properties on the Route 1 corridor, such as
66 Drake Farm, which is both a residence and a business.

67
68 Dr. Arena said that by allowing business and commercial in the same lot is a way of controlling “sprawl”.

69
70 Ms. Pohl said that the proposed amendment is a way to improve the current Ordinance, because right
71 now it clarifies the problem with strict prohibition of the use of combined functions.

72
73 Dr. Arena suggested the Board take some time to work on the Ordinance and figure out the pros and
74 cons of it. He said that great gains are being made on preserving open space, and in order to control
75 open space there has to be control over “sprawl”.

76
77 Ms. Pohl said that “home occupation” would have to be changed to prevent “sprawl”.

78
79 Dr. Arena said a “home occupation” is different. He said there are criteria that has to be satisfied for a
80 “home occupation”, one being that the “home occupation” has to be carried on by a member of the
81 family residing in the dwelling until with not more than two employees who are not part of the family
82 residing in the dwelling.

83
84 Mr. Wilson commented that the Zoning Board just approved a “home occupation” that allows 15
85 employees and is essentially a dispatching area for a landscape business on Post Road.

86
87 Mr. Kroner opened the Public Hearing at 6:52 p.m.

88
89 **Ted Turchan, 125 Lafayette Road** – asked whether or not apartments were included in the “count”
90 regarding the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.

91

92 Mr. Wilson said that any apartment that meets the criteria stated in the Law, counts in the calculation
93 determining the Town's "fair share" of workforce housing. He explained that there is some question in
94 the Rockingham Planning Commission who does the counting if a town is going to build apartments now
95 that would qualify for workforce housing , a minimum of five (5) units have to be built and a percentage
96 of them have to be workforce housing units. The question is; if there are isolated apartments in Town,
97 and the rent qualifies for workforce housing, do they count in the calculation. Mr. Wilson opined that
98 the isolated units will be included in the "count", but any new workforce housing apartments will have
99 to have a minimum of five (5) units to qualify.

100
101 Mr. Wilson explained that the leading advocate for workforce housing said there was a workforce
102 housing crisis in New Hampshire that's why the workforce housing law should be passed. Mr. Wilson
103 met with Martha Fuller Clark and she explained that five focus groups declared there was a crisis, but
104 did not provide any data. He said after the Bill passed an Email was distributed to Planners and Planning
105 Board Chairs requesting data regarding relief for workforce housing.

106
107 Mr. Turchan referred to the proposed amendment to Section 406.5 and said that he understands that
108 the Board is closing up a "loop hole". He suggested add a "special exception" where the Board can
109 come up with specific criteria that would allow "mixed use" on one lot instead of prohibiting it.

110
111 Dr. Arena mentioned the "Tudor apartments" in town that received conditional approval for workforce
112 housing units.

113
114 Mr. Wilson said that he suspected that most apartments in Town would qualify for workforce housing.
115 He said that the Executive Director of the Rockingham Planning Commission said that because the value
116 of housing has declined so dramatically he believes North Hampton is at its "fair share" as well as other
117 area towns.

118
119 Mr. Kroner said that a qualified workforce housing unit rents at approximately \$1,200. Per month and a
120 qualifying home costs around 277,000.

121
122 **Attorney Sharon Somers of Donahue, Tucker and Ciandella**, said that she represents Annette Lee and
123 Nicole Carrier who own Hobbs Farm. She submitted a copy of her comments to each of the Board
124 Members and to the Recording Secretary. She said on behalf of her Client Annette Lee she requests
125 that the Board not move this zoning amendment (406.5) forward in 2013.

126
127 Ms. Somers said referred to Article IV, Section 401 that describes the I-B/R District s being limited to
128 business, light industrial and certain residential uses. The purpose of the Ordinance is to provide
129 compact areas so that the necessary services such as fire and police protection can be provided to
130 business uses and to encourage business growth. She also referred to Article IV, Section 405.1 which
131 describes the permitted uses in the District. The business development and growth the Town
132 encourages must be compatible with the Town's environment and the safety, health and quiet
133 enjoyment of residences in and adjacent to the District. For this reason the ordinance includes
134 performance standards which are to be applied above and beyond the threshold standards for
135 permitted uses which will be applied by the Planning Board and which will confirm that there are no
136 unreasonable adverse impacts which could be caused by the proposed use on the abutting or
137 neighboring residential uses.

138

139 Ms. Somers said that the intent to close the “loop hole “ is to prevent “mixed use” in the I-B/R District,
140 but when she reads the proposed amendment she reads that it is to prevent a residential property
141 owner with an existing residential property from transforming that property into a business, or a “mixed
142 use”.

143
144 Ms. Somers said that if the amendment is adopted it could affect the rights of property owners, because
145 currently an existing residential property in the District wants to sell their property to a buyer with a
146 potential business the owner had the right to do so provided that they meet the performance standards
147 that fall within one of the listed permitted uses; the proposal decreases the options which a residential
148 property owner has to market the property.

149
150 Ms. Somers said that the Master Plan contains no language to support the proposed change.

151
152 Ms. Somers suggested that the Board not to move the proposed amendment forward to the ballot, but
153 if need be, to study the issue for possible future action, such as implementing a “special exception
154 process that deals with “mixed use” in the I-B/R District.

155
156 Mr. Wilson said that it was his belief that the intention for Section 406.5 was to encourage commercial
157 development to diversify the tax base and the purpose of the amendment is to close a “loop hole” that
158 the Board has been practicing all along as if the provision was already included, since its adoption. He
159 said the townspeople have choices, to codify what the practice has been; leave things the way they are,
160 recognizing that the practice has not been consistent with the literal meaning of Section 406.5, or strike
161 it completely. If the Board decided to “strike it” if anyone from the I-B/R District that wanted to use their
162 property for residential purposes they would have to go before the Planning Board for a Site Plan
163 Review.

164
165 **Rick Fucci, 180 Lafayette Road** – said that he is thinking of adding an apartment over the existing office
166 he owns at 180 Lafayette Road giving them the option of hiring a manager of the property that would
167 live “on-site” and run the business.

168
169 Mr. Kroner said that currently if Mr. Fucci wanted to add an apartment on his existing commercial use
170 lot he would be required to request a variance. Mr. Wilson agreed.

171
172 Mr. Kroner explained that it was brought to the Board’s attention because as Section 406.5 is written it
173 only goes one way; prohibiting the commercial business from adding a residential, but doesn’t prohibit
174 the same if it is residential use adding a commercial use; making it inconsistent.

175
176 Ms. Pohl referred to the Town Counsel’s recommendation to add *unless a special exception is obtained*
177 *to allow a home occupation*.

178
179 Mr. Wilson said that the way the Ordinance is written may have been deliberate, and asked Mr. Turchan
180 for his opinion.

181
182 Mr. Turchan said that he thought the Section was created to eliminate all the substandard residences
183 along Route 1 and be replaced with new businesses that would bring a better tax base in rather than a
184 house. He suggested striking the words “home occupation” from Attorney Serge’s suggested and
185 replacing it with “business use”. He referred to Section 601 – Special Exception.

186 Mr. Kroner referred to Section 405.2.1 that states, *In instances where standards for a listed Special*
187 *Exception are defined in the Zoning Ordinance, the ZBA shall apply those standards.*
188

189 **Annette Lee, 2 Elm Road (Hobbs Farm)** – said that her intentions are to bring the property back to a
190 working farm, living in the house and to operate a commercial business all on the same lot. She said that
191 with the proposed amendment she is concerned with how it will affect her ability to move forward with
192 the process she has to go through with the Zoning Board and Planning Board.
193

194 Mr. Kroner said that he is concerned with potential impacts the amendment can have on properties in
195 Town. He said that one part of the tenant of the Master Plan is retaining the Town’s Heritage, and he is
196 concerned that the amendment is contrary to that goal. He referred to the “Drake Farm” and if the
197 Town is going to retain these types of properties that tie the Town back to its heritage certain activities
198 need to be allowed in order to accomplish that. He said residential properties in the I-B/R District are
199 taxed based on the potential of an I-B/R property, paying that premium for that residential use, because
200 it is in the I-B/R District. There needs to be flexibility to do something with the property to generate
201 enough income to pay an above average tax evaluation.
202

203 Dr. Arena commented that Ms. Lee’s intentions on the property may be more of a “home occupation”,
204 because she lives on the property and will be producing the material she will be selling from the home.
205 He said that in the broad sense what she will be proposing is a “home occupation”.
206

207 Mr. Kroner closed the Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m.
208

209 Mr. Wilson said that as a result the Hobbs Farm is an extraordinary test case because it ties in the
210 Heritage, with agricultural use that the Town wants to promote, and eventually move Throwback
211 Brewery there and live on the site. He said that he doesn’t want to prevent that. He said that one
212 interpretation of Section 406.5 is to prevent “mixed use”. Mr. Wilson said that the Board should
213 consider some of the issues the Attorney rose, such as, what kind of characteristics they want in “mixed
214 use” properties in the I-B/R and protection of existing property owners and for abutters. He suggested
215 the Board not move this forward and not to strike it, and work on it over the next year. He said it would
216 prudent to devote time over the next year about what should be done.
217

218 Mr. Kroner agreed, going toward “mixed use” is a good idea, but also developing a set of criteria that
219 will spell out how it will look and feel and how it will prevent that conflict between public safety and
220 consumers coming and going each day.
221

222 **Dr. Arena moved and Mr. Wilson seconded the motion that proposed amendments to Article IV,**
223 **Section 406.5 be tabled for further discussion, and not moved forward onto the 2013 Town Warrant.**
224 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).**
225

226 Mr. Kroner said that it would be a good idea to get input from the Town’s Circuit Rider regarding Section
227 406.5.
228

229 Dr. Arena commented that he would like to see more townspeople get involved with the discussions
230 over the next year.
231

232 **Second Public Hearing** on proposed Amendments to the Sign Ordinance Article V, Section 506:

233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278

- a. Article V, Section 506.2 – Add to the Definitions, G. Feather Flag/Banner.
- b. Article V, Section 506.4.K replace “Flags” with “Flags and Banners”.
- c. Article V, Section 506.4.K.2 – Change “Open Flags” to “Open Flags and Banners”.
- d. Article V, Section 506.5 – Prohibited Signs, add “Feather Flag/Banner”.

Mr. Kroner explained that the Board held a Public Hearing on the proposed amendments to the Sign Ordinance and wanted to ask the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer, Kevin Kelley, questions on the amendments regarding “banners”. He said that there are some conflicting things in allowing “banners” in the current Ordinance and the Board wanted a better understanding of why “banners” became relevant to the Code Enforcement Officer. Mr. Kroner explained that under Section 506.4. I. “banners” are a permitted use without a permit.

Mr. Kelley said that a “flag” is on a pole and a “banner” could be on a pole.

Mr. Wilson said that when the Board was referring to “banners” they were trying to avoid the situation where someone would argue that a “feather flag” was a “banner”. He suggested changing it to describe it as “feather style banner” to separate it from “banners” which are allowed.

Mr. Kelley said that the ordinance needs to be clarified for the business owners because it is ambiguous in some aspects.

Mr. Wilson suggested changing it to “feather flag” or “feather flag style banner”. Mr. Kelley said that Mr. Wilson’s suggestion would resolve of the issue.

The Board discussed the proposed amendments to Article V, Section 506.4.K and Article V, Section 506.4.K.2.

It was a consensus of the Board that Sections 506.4.K and 506.4.K.2 did not need to be amended.

Mr. Kroner opened the Public Hearing on proposed amendment 506.2 at 8:04pm, and explained that it is to primarily add a definition to feather style banner or flag and to prohibit them.

Mr. Kroner closed the Public Hearing at 8:05pm without public comment.

Mr. Wilson moved and Dr. Arena seconded the motion to hold a third Public Hearing on January 15, 2013 on proposed amendments to Article V, Section 506 to add to Section 506.2 – Definition: G, Feather Flag or Feather-flag style Banner: A lightweight portable advertising medium, mounted on a pole, that resembles a sail and to strike the proposed amendments to Section 506.4.K and 506.4.K.2, and to add to Section 506.5 – Prohibited signs: Section H, Feather Flag or Feather-flag style Banner. A lightweight portable advertising medium, mounted on a pole, that resembles a sail. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Second Public Hearing on proposed Amendments to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Article IV, Section 418 to implement a “trigger” that the ordinance would only come into effect if it is demonstrated that the Town is below its “fair share” and a proposed process that calculates the

279 percentage of a development that must be affordable so that the Town will eventually meet its required
280 "fair share" of affordable housing.

281

282 Shep read the proposed amendments to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance into the record:

283

284

285 **PREFACE:**

286 *This Inclusionary Housing Ordinance shall be in force and effect if and only if the Planning Board has*
287 *found that the percentage of housing units in the Town of North Hampton's housing stock that meet*
288 *legal and regulatory standards for classification as workforce housing does not equal or exceed the*
289 *Town's "Fair Share" of workforce housing.*

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

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

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

302 **Add to definitions:**

303 **A. *Development Fair Share:*** The percentage of workforce housing units in a proposed subdivision
304 that shall be equaled or exceeded for the application to qualify for review under this
305 Inclusionary Housing Ordinance when the Planning Board has determined that this Ordinance is
306 in force and effect (cf. Preface above). The Planning Board shall determine this percentage at
307 least annually, as stated in the Preface above. It shall be calculated as the sum of Town's Fair
308 Share percentage plus the product of 1.5 times the difference of the Town's Fair Share
309 percentage of workforce housing units and the Town's actual percentage of workforce housing
310 units (owner occupied plus renter occupied). (*Development Fair Share = Town's Fair Share*
311 *Percentage + 1.5 x [Town's Fair Share Percentage – Town's actual percentage of workforce*
312 *housing units]). *By definition this* percentage is a positive number when the Planning Board has
313 determined that the Town is not providing its Fair Share of workforce housing units. The
314 purpose of establishing this Development Fair Share standard is to ensure that, as site plans and
315 subdivision plans are approved under this Ordinance, they tend to diminish -- rather than to
316 perpetuate or increase -- any deficiency in the Town's Fair Share of workforce housing units.*

317 **VII. Density**

- 318 A. A site plan or subdivision plan that proposes to guarantee a percentage of workforce housing
319 units that is equal to or greater than the Town's "*Development Fair Share*" of workforce housing
320 may be granted relief from the minimum lot size, frontage, front-yard, side-yard and rear-yard
321 setback requirements in the underlying district.
- 322 B. When applying the Town's "*Development Fair Share*" percentage to the total number of units
323 proposed in an application under this Article results in a number that is not a whole number, the
324 required number of workforce housing units shall be rounded up to the next whole number.

325
326 Mr. Kroner explained that there are two primary changes; the first is the Board felt that if the Town was
327 delivering its "fair share" of Inclusionary Housing it didn't make sense to keep the Inclusionary Housing
328 Ordinance on the books and further develop the Town with Inclusionary Housing developments,
329 because it would have a long term impact on the Town. The second thing is that every development
330 that came into Town perpetuated the gap that the Town had in the number of workforce housing units
331 available and would never meet the Town's "fair share".

332
333 Mr. Wilson said that the Town doesn't need the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance if it is meeting its "fair
334 share" of workforce housing. There is a provision in the RSA that states that if the Town can
335 demonstrate that it is providing its "fair share" then it is satisfying the requirement of the law. He
336 explained that the "trigger" was added because if the Town were falling short it will make up the gap,
337 and if the Town is not falling short, the Town can maintain its dimensional and setback requirements.

338
339 Mr. Kroner opened the Public Hearing at 8:28pm.

340
341 **Ted Turchan, 125 Lafayette Road** - suggested that the Board come up with a date specific when
342 determining the Town's "fair share" percentage, so that everyone knows when the new number comes
343 out.

344 Dr. Arena agreed and suggested it be when the Town's fiscal year begins.

345
346 Ms. Pohl suggested that it be done when a new development is being proposed.

347
348 Mr. Kroner said that if we added the provision that the percentage would be determined on a date
349 certain it were preclude the Board from addressing the "trigger" issue. If the Board had an approved
350 application and felt that it may be at its "fair share" it would be precluded from doing so if there were a
351 date certain.

352
353 Mr. Wilson said that the way it's written it provides flexibility.

354
355 Mr. Kroner said that something could be added to the Rules of Procedures that it would be the Chairs
356 responsibility

357
358 **Glenn Martin, 11 Evergreen Drive** – referred to Section IX.A. Affordability Monitoring Agent, sections iv.
359 and v., where the Monitoring Agent reports to the Planning Board annually..... Mr. Wilson explained that

360 the Monitoring Agent refers a person or organization that is paid by the developer to monitor what goes
361 on with the development.

362
363 Mr. Martin suggested using the same date as the tax year, April 1st. He asked whether or not building
364 permits were included in the calculation.

365
366 Mr. Kroner said the building would have to be built to be included in the calculation.

367
368 The proposed amendment to the second paragraph of the Preface on the proposed amendment to
369 Article IV, Section 418 will read: At least once per year, **and no later than April 15 of each year**,
370 therefore....

371
372 **Ms. Pohl moved and Dr. Arena seconded the motion to accept the proposed amendment Article IV,**
373 **Section 418 and to take it to a third Public Hearing on January 15, 2013.**
374 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).**

375
376 It was noted that the Town's Attorney had no comment or recommendations on the proposed
377 amendment to Article IV, Section 418.

378
379 **The Planning Board will hold a Public Hearing to consider an Amendment to the Site Plan Review**
380 **Regulation V, Section B.1.c. – Use Change Review Required - by eliminating it in its entirety, “Any**
381 **change of use which results in the need for a new occupancy permit.”**

382
383 Mr. Kroner explained that the Building Inspector suggested this section be eliminated because he issues
384 Certificate of Occupancy permits to any change of tenant which does not require Planning Board
385 Review. A change of tenant is a change from one “use” to a similar “use” i.e. “retail” to “retail”.

386
387 Mr. Kroner opened the Public Hearing at 8:45pm.

388
389 **Rick Fucci, 180 Lafayette Road** – said that he agrees that if a change is of the same use there shouldn't
390 be a need for Planning Board review.

391
392 Mr. Kroner closed the Public Hearing at 8:48pm.

393
394 It was a general consensus of the Board that Section V, B.1.c. was redundant and should be eliminated.
395 It was noted that changes to the Site, Subdivision and Excavation Regulations do not require a Town
396 Vote.

397
398 **Mr. Wilson moved and Ms. Pohl seconded the motion to amend Regulation V, Section B.1.c. by**
399 **eliminating in its entirety - *Any change of use which results in the need for a new occupancy permit.***
400 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).**

401
402 **The Public Hearing was adjourned at 8:50pm without objection.**

403
404 **The North Hampton Work Session immediately followed the Public Hearing.**

405
406 **Ms. Pohl assumed the Chair.**

407
408 The Board discovered a typographical error in Article V, Section 506.4. A. Small Sign, and discussed
409 whether or not it was a substantive change that would require a Town vote.
410
411 The Article currently reads: *Small sign. One sign per parcel, not illuminated, constructed of weather*
412 *resistant materials, and not exceeding three square feet in area is allowed without permit, subject to the*
413 *following conditions:* There no following conditions.
414
415 The Board decided to put a period after permit and eliminate “subject to the following conditions”.
416 The Board declared that it was not a substantive change.
417
418 **Dr. Arena moved and Ms. Pohl seconded the motion that the amendment to Article V, Section 506.4.A**
419 **does not require a Public Hearing because it is a minor immaterial grammatical revision.**
420 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).**
421
422 **Old Business**
423
424 There was no “Old Business” before the Board.
425
426 **New Business**
427
428 **Committee Updates –**
429
430 **1. Long Range Planning/Master Plan update** - Mr. Kroner reported that he attended a Heritage
431 Commission meeting last month and they have drafted a Chapter to be added to the Master Plan. He
432 commented on the Preamble the Commission is working on that gives a history of the Town. He said
433 that the Chapter sets out a set of goals and recommendations, and the Master Plan Chapters is used to
434 prompt the Planning Board into considering the recommendations. They want to make historic
435 preservation part of the planning process; they have a goal to propose amendments to the Zoning
436 Ordinance to preserve the rural New England character and Heritage of North Hampton. Mr. Kroner
437 said that the intent is not to prevent people from doing what they want on their properties; the idea is
438 to have time, before any kind of demolition, to come in and obtain documentation and photograph so
439 the history doesn’t get lost forever.
440
441 Dr. Arena commented that fifty (50) years is too young to be considered a historic building. The Board
442 agreed and thought seventy-five (75) years.
443
444 Mr. Kroner said that he would contact Donna Etela, Chair of the Heritage Commission, and the Board
445 can decide at the January Work Session whether or not to hold a public hearing on adopting the
446 Heritage Chapter.
447
448 Mr. Kroner said that the Board should be receiving a copy of an updated Chapter from the Agriculture
449 Committee.
450

451 Ms. Chase said that she spoke to Brian Groth from RPC and he said that the new Circuit Rider that is
452 appointed to work in North Hampton will be finalizing the Town's Master Plan as their first order of
453 business.

454
455 **CIP** – Mr. Wilson reported that the CIP Committee has finished its routine role and has reviewed all the
456 requests for Capital Expenditures and Warrant Articles from all the Departments and the School. They
457 have prepared the standard spreadsheet that goes out to the year 2019, and shows, by year, what each
458 Department has requested, and prioritized them; that will be discussed at their next meeting on January
459 14, 2013. He said they have been deliberating about what should be done with the Municipal Complex,
460 and at the January 14th meeting the Committee is going to consider and act on finalizing a
461 recommendation to the Select Board and then to the Budget Committee about what kind of process
462 should be followed in order to bring the "open" issue of the Municipal Complex to closure.

463 Mr. Wilson reported on the Library's current plan. The will be requesting, from the voters, for a bond
464 for 1.5 Million Dollars in 2014 with a plan to have raised 1.5 Million Dollars, which they have already
465 raised approximately \$500,000., to fund a new Library for a total cost of 3 Million Dollars. The
466 presented an analysis to the CIP Committee that determined North Hampton would need the size of the
467 Library to be between 9,000 square-feet to 14,000 square-feet. He said the CIP Committee strongly
468 advised them not to go above 10,000 square-feet. He said the Library has an option of receiving the
469 "homestead" property for one-year. The rest of the complex is waiting for their process, and the Town
470 Complex cannot wait indefinitely. They have discussed moving the Town Administrative Offices in
471 temporary quarters, there are several possibilities, but in essence it comes down to is "what is the cost"
472 and "what is the benefit".

473
474 Dr. Victor Azzi went through all the buildings and reviewed all of the prior studies and gave
475 recommendations, which are available at the Town Office. Dr. Azzi came to various conclusions that the
476 CIP Committee has found very useful. He said the Library was built in 1973, and built to last 20 years,
477 and now it is approaching 40 years and recommends that it would cost more money to renovate it than
478 to build a new building. He made interesting observations such as combining the Town Administrative
479 Offices with the Library in a two story building, but may make it impossible for the Library to raise
480 private funds. The CIP Committee is ready to wrap up the analysis of the Municipal Complex situation;
481 they are not advocating one way or the other, it's because something needs to be decided. The
482 Police/Fire/Administrative building is deteriorating, and if it goes on longer with nothing being done; it
483 will become too late to have an option of renovation rather than tearing down and rebuilding.

484
485 Mr. Wilson said that the Town and School are beginning to establish regular routine maintenance funds.
486 There is more management for maintaining the facilities in Town.

487
488 The Board was in receipt of a monthly report of the Building Inspector and was asked to review it.

489
490 There was no report of the ARC and Rules of Regulations/Procedures Committees.

491
492 **1. ¹ Items laid on the table**

493
494 **Junk Yard update** – Mr. Wilson said that he will ask for an update from the Town Administrator on the
495 status of the "junk yards".

496

497 **2. Minutes**

498 a. November 27, 2012 Work Session

499 b. December 4, 2012

500

501 There wasn't a quorum to vote on accepting the minutes. Acceptance of the Minutes was tabled to the
502 January 15, 2013 Work Session.

503

504 Ms. Chase passed out copies of the applications on the January 8, 2013 Planning Board Agenda to
505 review whether or not an engineering review would be required or an ARC meeting would need to be
506 scheduled.

507

508 Mr. Wilson suggested that the application for the 2-lot subdivision be forwarded to the Town's Engineer
509 for a minor review. The Board agreed.

510

511 Mr. Falzone has submitted a new application for a Design Review on a proposed 49 lot workforce
512 housing development. Mr. Wilson said that he is working with the Conservation Commission o

513

514 The Meeting Adjourned at 9:40 p.m. without objection.

515

516 Respectfully submitted,

517

518 Wendy V. Chase

519 Recording Secretary

520

521 **Approve January 15, 2013**