

TOWN OF TEMPLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE PLANNING BOARD

May 2, 2007
FINAL MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

Board members present: Bruce Kullgren, Rose Lowry, Randy Martin, Will Wildes, Richard Whitcomb, Allan Pickman, John Kieleley

Call to order by Kullgren at 7:43 p.m.

After brief conversation with the applicant, consideration of Mike Barrett's application for a lot line adjustment was rescheduled to the next PB meeting on May 16th, 2007.

1. Speaker from SWRPC - Kullgren introduced Jo Anne Carr from Southwest Region Planning Commission. Carr briefly related her 20-year background as a land planner, and then gave a presentation on open space residential development (OSRD). Carr told the board and audience to expect the community will grow and change, and to use the Master Plan to guide the town's future. She stated the Master Plan is not regulatory, and that zoning, subdivision, and site plan review ordinances are the tools to implement the goals and objectives of the Master Plan. She said the Master Plan should be updated every 5-10 years, with NH-OEP recommending every 5 years depending on the rate of growth the town is experiencing. Carr also said the town's Capital Improvements Plan should be utilized to plan spending for projects over a period of time.

Carr then addressed the issue of "sprawl" in rural areas, which she said is accelerating and using more land per person. Carr used the term "homogenizing residential density" in relation to single use zoning with a 2-3 acre lot size. Carr stated that zoning standards today would not allow recreation of a village, such as exists in the center of Temple and other small New England towns. She then discussed the differences between conventional subdivision and open space residential development (also known as a planned residential development (PRD) or cluster development.) Illustrations highlighted the differences in housing concentration between conventional subdivisions and OSRD configurations. Carr said a planned unit development could make use of a mixture of types of residential units such as condo, duplex, or entry level home.

Next, Carr offered information about utilizing a conservation design subdivision. She stated the process begins by determining the most important natural, cultural and historic features to protect. She provided Illustrations to show the different steps in creating this type of development, including designation of conservation elements, definition of open space, location of roads and trails, placement of houses, and then drawing of lot lines. Carr said this type of development can create both agriculture and civil culture, and benefits include coinciding with Smart Growth and protection of scenic vistas and farmland. She also said that conservation design does not constitute a land taking in NH, where there are strong property rights, as developers do not experience any loss of density and no land is taken for public use. Carr also talked about use of conservation easements to protect land, and specifics of open space ownership and property rights. She also mentioned design of community waste disposal systems.

A question was asked about steep slope development in the mountain zone, followed by discussion of slope percentages and what is allowed in zoning regulations in nearby towns. Carr told the board a yield plan could offer varying density formula possibilities and also

TOWN OF TEMPLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE PLANNING BOARD

May 2, 2007

FINAL MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

address environmental concerns. She mentioned setting a slope limit of 25% or less, with more restrictions in the 15-25% range. Carr recommended using driveway regulations to further limit building on steep slopes. She suggested a driveway slope norm of 8% or less, with an 8-12% slope allowable at the road agent's discretion, and anything greater than 12% requiring engineering design.

A question was asked about view shed protection. Carr told the board to first create a list of criteria, and then identify specific areas for protection. She said in regard to open space land "the best means of protection is to own it" and mentioned consideration of buying up development rights. She said the first large mountain zone development in town will "raise a ruckus", and suggested keeping in touch with owners of large parcels of land. Lowry commented that a conservation design PRD for the mountain zone might resolve a lot of issues that had created such uproar with the Tamposi PRD and caused voters to toss out the PRD option for the mountain district.

Carr then answered questions from the board and audience members. Whitcomb asked for clarification regarding the PB telling a developer he cannot use a certain portion of land identified as a protected area by the town. Carr discussed compensation and exploration of buying development rights, and mentioned having an agricultural easement on farmland. Bruce Kantner asked if other towns in the region were using the conservation approach rather than cluster PRD designs, and was told they were. Kieley told Carr the driveway regulations being proposed for the town do not define slope percentages. Carr said the PB does have a responsibility to ensure public safety and recommended compromise. Honey Hastings commented on using a "carrot vs. stick" approach regarding public access on open space land and said it made sense to offer the developer more density in return for public access. Carr responded that the town cannot "trade" or require public access, and that a density bonus was usually granted for a public purpose such as elderly housing, etc. Other questions were asked about the responsibility of the homeowner's association with regard to common land, with Carr indicating that certain specifications could be put into the ordinance.

2. Review of minutes: Meeting of April 18, 2007. Move by Wildes to accept as amended, second by Pickman, and voted in the unanimous affirmative.

Move by Kieley to adjourn, second by Pickman, and so voted. Meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Betsy Perry