

Town of Farmington
Planning Board Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, November 1, 2023
356 Main Street-Farmington, NH 03835

Board Members Present:

Rick Pelkey, Chairman
Bill Fisher, Vice Chairman
Charlie King, Selectmen's Rep
Mike Day
Rebecca Patton-Sanderson
Board Members Absent:
Stephen Henry, Secretary
Jeremy Squires

Others Present:

Kyle Pimental, Planning Director
Tom Quarles, Att., Devine, Millimet & Branch
Steve Whitman, Resilience Planning & Design
Angela Cleveland, SRPC Planner
Norman Russell
Kevin Grondin, owner Peaceful Pines Mobile
Home Park

1). Call to Order:

Chairman Pelkey called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

2). Pledge of Allegiance:

All present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

3). Review of Minutes:

October 18, 2023- Not received

4).Public Comment:

Norman Russell came forward and said he discovered that the Zoning Board contradicts itself in that when you look up the Table of Permitted Uses you find that duplex homes are allowed in every district that allows residential development. He said then one day it was raining and he was bored so he thought he would look through the Zoning Ordinance and noted that the standards for rear lot subdivisions changed from when they were initially done and now they don't allow duplex homes on rear lots-single family residential homes only on rear lots. He said he wondered why and when you go to the Table of Permitted Uses that's supposed to tell you whether or not what you were contemplating is permitted and it seemly was and now he doesn't know why and he was trying to rationalize why rear lots aren't the same as all the frontage lots and every other lot. He said he would like to see the zoning changed to allow duplex homes and his plan was to develop a duplex home that is handicapped accessible and he is only a couple 100 ft. off the road on a nice level, flat lot with the prescribed 30 ft. access, it's got plenty of sight distance. He said he covered in his notations that the character of the neighborhood isn't going to change if all the other lots have duplexes and asked why the rear lot can't have duplexes.

Mr. Pelkey said rear lot subdivisions were disallowed for awhile and we just passed zoning to bring them back 2 years ago. He said in the discussion he didn't think they ever considered that and how the language got into it to disallow that he was not sure.

Mr. King asked when he did the rear lot subdivision off of Chestnut Hill Rd. if a duplex was permitted at that time with that version of a rear lot subdivision.

Mr. Russell said he believes that it was but he just didn't feel as though it was necessary to go right out and do it. I can't tell you that I'm absolutely sure but my belief was that it was he said.

Mr. Pelkey asked if that is in the standards for rear lot subdivisions.

Mr. Russell said it's in Section 3.04 and that he met all the requirements because he was able to subdivide. He said they were discontinued for a while and then when they started to allow them...

Mr. Pelkey said the lot meets all of the same characteristics as the front lot does so he gets it.

Mr. Russell said that's correct and it has the same acreage and that's his point. He said affordable housing, with housing being what it costs today his would be detrimental to that purpose of housing and this is an appropriate land use for those rear lots and he didn't see any reason why so that's what he'd like to see changed.

Mr. Pelkey thanked Mr. Russell and said that when they talked about it he doesn't remember that they ever brought up the possibility of duplexes on it. He said he was not sure how it was not written that it would be under the same standards as the zone and he was not sure why. I think it might be that we just didn't include the language quite right. I don't have an issue with it but we have to look through it he said.

Mr. Pelkey then asked if the driveway standards would be different if you had a duplex.

Mr. King said the access requirement is 30 ft.

Mr. Russell said they do allow accessory apartments and that's essentially 2 units and they can be in the same building like a duplex would be or in a separate outbuilding. He said the driveway subject is something he has given some thought to but as he looked through it he recalled when his lot was subdivided that the road person that was supposed to look at it and say okay wasn't consulted and he saw that in order to bring in a driveway according to this they're supposed to be consulted but the Planning Board considered it when they looked at it and there is enough sight distance and there is no reason why his wouldn't be suitable but he could think of locations where it might not be suitable.

Mr. Pelkey said he wasn't thinking in terms of access he was thinking of the build for the driveway and if it would be different if it was a duplex.

Mr. King said in the driveway standards they denote a requirement for two.

Mr. Pimental said you can have up to 2 for a regular driveway.

Mr. Pelkey said that's a wash then and his question was if you make it a duplex if it triggers a different driveway standard.

Mr. King said he thinks it triggers at 3 homes to a higher level requirement.

Mr. Russell said an accessory apartment can contain multiple bedrooms that would probably generate the same traffic as a couple of 2 bedroom duplexes.

Mr. Pelkey said he tends to agree with what he is saying it wasn't something he considered when they put the language in to reinstate the rear lot subdivision. He said they should put this on the agenda for discussion concerning the zoning amendments so they can have it all printed up and go through it.

Mr. Pimental said he didn't remember why that was specifically called out but he does remember that there was some literature about the pros and cons of rear lots and some of the issues that can arise from them. He said typically you'd want to allow that with a long skinny lot that's got 40 acres of back land but only has 175 ft. of frontage. He said you don't want to see these everywhere but there are places that are appropriate for them.

He said he remembers reviewing some pros and cons and they probably looked at several other communities that have rear lot subdivisions in their zoning and perhaps that was one of the things that was in there that the board decided to ultimately keep but Norm raises a good point that so long as that subdivision can still meet all of the other requirements then why not allow duplexes. It's an interesting thing to look at and we'll put it on the agenda for the next zoning discussion he said.

Chairman Pelkey said he was going to take things out of order (as shown on the agenda) and open up New Business because the work on the Rt. 11 Corridor Study is going to take a little bit of time as there's quite a bit to it and it's a pretty good sized presentation.

5). New Business:

Proposed Zoning Amendment to Allow Manufactured Housing Parks to Expand- Attorney Tom Devine, Millimet & Branch Attorney Tom Quarles introduced himself and Peaceful Pines Mobile Home Park owner Kevin Grondin and said the board may remember that over the summer they were here twice for a design review issue where they were preliminarily proposing to expand the park and they felt they were entitled to do that under the terms of the Zoning Ordinance and their legal advice was to the contrary and that they needed 2 variances. He said they agreed to disagree but they think they have a much better solution that was motivated by their comments especially at the second meeting.

Att. Quarles said the board seemed receptive to the idea in concept and that they had heard that Peaceful Pines was a good citizen of Farmington. He said there were a couple of Peaceful Pines residents at both sessions who said they did not oppose the proposal and they are here because they think it would be a very simple matter to fine tune the ordinance by changing the Table of Permitted Uses to allow just the existing 2 mobile home parks in town to expand but not to expand their existing-not footprint because that applies to buildings, but you can't buy an adjacent lot and expand the size of the park in that fashion. My client is perfectly happy to keep within the boundaries of the existing park but should be allowed to increase and we believe we should be because we are only asking for an additional 20 units. We have 120 now

and we'd like an additional 20 and we would not be expanding the boundaries of the park he said.

Att. Quarles said a lot of research was aided by their engineer and he found the 1986 and the amended 1988 Manufactured Housing Park Regulations that they submitted and they are at the back end of their packets. He said he did a 3 page memo explaining the background, how they would envision accomplishing this small zoning ordinance amendment and behind those pages is the 11 page current Manufactured Housing Park Regulations. He said they are still in effect and his client still has to pay the annual license fee at the end of the document.

He said the scope of the document clearly talks about not just building a mobile home park which is now prohibited under the ordinance since the zoning changes in the early 2000's but also the on-going operations of the mobile home park. So they still have life and are still viable to the extent that they're inconsistent or there is conflict in there between them and the ordinance then the ordinance controls he said.

He said basically why they're here is because if we can change the Table of Permitted Uses in the Zoning Ordinance which currently says "Expansion of existing Manufactured Housing Parks" and you look across the various zones in town and the hyphen means it's not permitted so they would propose that they change it from not permitted to having a P under the RR (Rural Residential) which is where Peaceful Pines is located and they proposed putting a P in the UR for the other mobile home park in town, Farmington Ridge but that they got their zone wrong and they are in the SR (Suburban Residential). He said their thought process was this isn't just an opportunity for them to get what they want and they should be even handed and that it's fair that they be given the same expansion opportunities as they are and if the board doesn't feel that way then they are okay with just having it permitted in the RR.

Att. Quarles said with that change and the 3A footnote that would be part of the verbiage below the Table of Permitted Uses they would have the ability to plan to do this 20 unit expansion because of the balance of the 1988 Mobile Home Park Regulations in terms of density, setbacks, etc. He said when (Norway Plains Surveyor) Randy Tetreault was here and he gave the presentation initially the 20 units that they proposed fall well within the requirements of the 1988 set of regulations.

He said there are 2 ways to propose a zoning amendment-having an amendment proposed by the Planning Board itself or doing it by citizen petition. He said they are not asking the second because those do not have a great success rate especially if the Planning Board does not support the citizen proposed amendment. He said they are asking that the board and they would work with them on the language until they get to an amendment language that they are all happy with and then this becomes a proposed amendment by the Planning Board that they obviously support and then with that methodology they think it's very likely it would be approved at Town Meeting.

He said there's a crying need for affordable housing in NH and every town is supposed to have

an affordable housing plan and provisions that Farmington doesn't seem to have. He said no one could argue that mobile home parks are not affordable housing it's sort of the original type of affordable housing and you have 2 parks and you decided in the early 2000's no more parks. He said it's a very simple thing to say we're not going to change the outline of the parks, the boundaries or the limits of the parks but we are going to allow the density to increase controlled by this 1988 regulation and they would have to go through site plan review. He said he would be happy to answer any questions and to come back again if they need to work on language and have Kevin answer any questions they might have for him.

Mr. King said this could unfold into 3 scenarios-one the board doesn't put it forth, two the board does put it forth and if it doesn't pass and they apply for a variance if that would improve or make their chances of getting that variance worse. He said if the voters were to vote it down and then they apply for a variance after that based upon the evidence submitted by the community they may have less of a chance for that variance if it were to fail than if they were to try that now.

Kevin Grondin came forward and thanked the board for listening to them and it's been a long road and it's not easy. He said they are the ones that ran the water up the road and at the time that they did that it was kind of a game changer.

Mr. King asked what year that was and if it was before the zoning prohibition came in place.

Mr. Grondin said it was way back and he believed it was before the prohibition. He said they inadvertently thought they were at 1.25 per acre and the zoning has changed since. He said they are in a pickle because the lawyers are costing him an arm and a leg and it's been made very clear to them that going for a ZBA hearing and being turned down on that no matter how that happens then that's the only thing he can litigate.

He said he believes from the knowledge of the 2 or 3 state laws that in his opinion overrides all of these issues because the state does want affordable housing and workforce housing and he thinks they would have a very good chance in a superior court situation which he doesn't want to do because it would be the last straw because he didn't want to get turned down by the ZBA and have no other options because you can only appeal the ZBA decision itself.

Mr. Grondin said he would have the option of going to the "big court" or to the Housing Appeals Board and knowing the situation in town with the fact that we have just the proper 2 mobile home parks which covers them perfectly here in Farmington. He said the fact that one can have 2 per acre and the other one can only have 1 per acre he didn't care what the densities are in the specific areas his lots are bigger and more spread out and more of a neighborhood type than a mobile home park and they want to continue that only and he doesn't want to go for the large number that a .25 would give them it's too much work and the turf doesn't adhere to that at all. He said none of these additions that we're talking about have any effect on the neighborhood, none of them are near any neighbors and his neighbors are the Farmington landfill, Pike out back and Dick LaPierre is about the only one that's affected but he

has a buffer on this side and the rest are within the mobile home park that aren't even able to be done until 2028 which was the easement they gave to Textron for their pollution situation. Mr. Grondin said he was hoping they could do something simpler like this than go play litigation and he would rather try to just do a proper right addition and stick with that and whether that's in the arrangement or not or it could be in the actual site review stuff.

Att. Quarles said that would be at the site plan review stage.

Mr. Pelkey said Farmington is looking at ways to increase affordable housing and it's the next thing on the agenda. He said Farmington isn't doing nothing to find affordable housing and this board isn't doing nothing to find affordable housing.

He said whether you have Planning Board support or no Planning Board support for a zoning amendment that goes before the public they've had them fail so it's not a guarantee that it's going to pass.

He said as for the 1986 regulations he didn't know the last time they were looked at but if they were to consider the Planning Board supporting a change to the zoning for this they would have to go back and look at those '86 regulations from start to finish because he has never studied them and he didn't know how they are invoked right now and he would have to figure that out. You tell me they're in effect but I'd have to ask my lawyer because I don't know how they're invoked right now. You will tell me that they're grandfathered and I understand that he said.

Att. Quarles said there's no evidence that they've been withdrawn and the Town has affirmed their viability every year by charging Mr. Grondin and he's been paying a license fee every year since the regulations have been imposed. He said the regulations were amended in '88 so he gave them the '88 version. He said the first version was in '86 and they were amended in '88 and as far as they know there have been no changes since.

Mr. Pelkey said he has only been on the board for 8 or 10 years and he has read the zoning regulations a couple of times and he doesn't recall seeing it and being a technical kind of guy he is looking for the trace that gets him from here to there. He said he asked the staff if they're paying this how they are doing this.

Mr. Grondin said they pretty much work with the Building Inspector and whatever he wants that's what he gets. He said he is a tough character and he keeps it in line and they try to do the best they can. We helped bring a lot of those ordinances in from our former business in Rochester to try to keep the town safe he said.

Mr. Pelkey said on the face of it he was amenable to what he wanted to do but he worries that he wants to them to put a zoning amendment out there and have the entire town vote on it when he could go before the ZBA and just have the folks on the ZBA who are probably more dialed up on what's going on in planning and zoning than the entire town. Just because the Planning Board says it's a good idea doesn't mean it's going to pass. This will get attention any expansion of mobile homes gets attention whether it should or not he said.

Mr. Grondin asked if less attention would be made to just allowing for anywhere that- and they

didn't do the research on how many land parcels would be affected but by just creating the 1.25 zoning density in areas that have water because in an odd way that's kind of fair and you guys get to make people pay for the water.

Mr. King said they could do that without revising the ordinance to allow the expansion in his case but there would still be a conflict. He said the other thing the board would have to do in consideration of both parks is look at the potential scenarios of changing it and not knowing the situation as far as the land area up there that is owned by the park.

He said they would have to look at that to see if they were to make this change they're recommending or consider it what the build out is in that area also vs. the build out here and they would have consider that. Just to consider this one would not be fair and would be looked at in some ways as favoritism he said.

Att. Quarles asked to go into the history of it and why everybody including them didn't know about these regulations until they were deep into this process. He said the reason they know is that Mr. Grondin and Mr. Tetreault built the park in 1986 so Mr. Tetreault has been working on this issue all spring and summer with them and when looked at all the files from the start of this park that's where he found the regulations. He repeated that independently of that Mr. Grondin has been paying his annual license fee. He said since Mr. Tetreault's company does so much work in the town of Farmington and he told him that he was involved at one point in some actual studies to change the zoning ordinance he's looked through all his files so on the point of is the 1988 version of the Mobile Home Parks Regulations the most recent and existing one according to his files and the Town's files they are.

Mr. Pimental asked for clarification on that the request would be for 2 amendments-the one amendment they talked about in terms of the expansion of the existing mobile home parks in both the RR and SR zones with the 3A note that he put in his memo but also that the board would put forth an amendment that in the RR zone to apply a density bonus for water and/or sewer. He said the reason he asked that was the other challenge with this was the way this is written in his amendment he would not be able to expand the lot size to get to that density because he is already maxed out at 118 so they would have to apply a water bonus that doesn't currently exist.

Mr. King said the argument falls back to the Manufactured Housing Ordinance that was adopted in 1986 and 1988 and they could get into all that legal interpretation but he didn't feel that needs to here but the board needs to address that.

Att. Quarles said they are telling him that's how they read this.

Mr. Grondin said it would make it clearer.

Mr. Pimental recommended that if they are going to go with the proposed Table of Permitted Uses change that he would also request that the board consider applying a density for water in the RR zone.

Mr. King said because in subsequent discussions they're having tonight when they talk about

densities and when they do a density bonus for water or sewer right now that is limited to certain zones not the access to those utilities so it's very likely the discussion will be for them to extend that into other zones that have that but they may be in another zone. To prevent us from having to come back and ask what do we do about these 10 lots that have water and sewer running by them we may address that now in that change so anything that has accesses to those utilities would get that no matter what zone they're in he said.

Mr. Pimental said the Planning staff is going to be recommending changes to the density bonuses in both the UR and the SR and they weren't looking at the RR as part of that because they were looking at more of the downtown area and the surrounding urban core. He said that is something they have been looking at and if they are going to be doing that for those 2 zones and the board is open to it he would recommend that they throw in the RR.

Mr. Pelkey said the next step on this for the board would be for them to put a proposal before the board that they could discuss with the required information concerning the other park and how their build out is and all that.

Mr. King said it would go on that list of the things they are considering for changes and when the board narrows that list does this make that list.

Mr. Pelkey said they have a line of zoning amendments that they need to knock down and be prepared to send to the voters and they have to get thru it by the end of Dec.-middle of Jan.

Mr. Pimental said they usually try to hold the public hearings in Dec. just in case they need 2 so they don't butt up against the deadline in Jan.

Mr. Pelkey said so they are already in the process of trying to get thru some of these now and they're going to be talking about some of them tonight. He said he was amenable to having Mr. Pimental put together the information and bring it in front of the board so they can talk about it unless there's any objection from the board.

Mr. King said they need to talk about it and they have enough information on this one to analyze what the build out will be.

Mr. Pelkey said he can't commit himself ahead of that but the proposal they have before them is very reasonable.

Att. Quarles said it sounds like he should be dealing with Mr. Pimental especially after tonight.

Mr. Pelkey said what they were asking for is not really complicated and the biggest complication is to go back and look at the manufactured housing regulations because they're so old he really didn't know so he has to go back and see how they apply to this particular point in time and what's out dated or what might need to be changed in those too.

He said that isn't a zoning change and that he would like an opinion from our people and he didn't think it was part of the opinion they got before concerning how those are involved.

Mr. Grondin said as they started expanding the park they were at first thinking it would be single wide and it didn't go 3 or 4 homes deep in that new section before he realized "whoa" and he redesigned it 3 times and it's extremely far over what the requirements are in that

mainly because people want more side yards. He said for a while the trend was larger houses and now they're back to reasonable.

Mr. King asked for the typical size of a double wide mobile home.

Mr. Grondin said generally speaking 44 to 52 ft.

Mr. Pimental said it's pretty clear in terms of what they're requesting but asked if the information the board is looking for is the impact to the other park.

Mr. King said he and Mr. Pimental could have a discussion and he could give him the history that he knows and what to look at from the proposed change which was a proposal to put an expansion on that and the land area that may be involved that may be under the ownership and depending on how its worded may or may not qualify under this revision. He said for him it would be look at the land owned by the park and how that would qualify into the proposed amendment and what the build out could be up there.

Mr. Pelkey said its 2 different zones so it's not like you're apples and apples. He said you could say it fits in 1 zone but doesn't fit in the other that's all about study and you have to look at it.

Mr. Grondin thanked the board for listening to them again and then left the meeting.

Att. Quarles said hopefully they will come back with a concrete proposal at a public hearing.

6). Old Business:

Presentation and Discussion Route 11 Corridor Study- Stafford Regional Planning Commission Planner Angela Cleveland said the quarterly update would be on the regulatory audit that the consultants are working on so Steve is here to talk through that and they have seen both the 2 page summary and the other one is a very well formatted, much longer, very well organized report. She said she also just passed out the draft agenda which are the talking points for tonight and they hoped to cover both of those things with the board tonight.

Resilience Planning & Design Planner Steve Whitman said they wanted to update the board on the work that has been completed since they saw them last time and the additional topics that have been explored which are broken out on the double-sided one page handout. He said he would touch on some of the key findings but this was intended initially for them to distill what they saw and to give them a chance if they haven't had time to look at that to see if things came up that either surprised them or they questioned and that they want them to take a deeper look at and that Mr. Pimental may have reviewed this once.

Mr. Whitman said from there they will take any initial comments the board has and they're seeing this as more of a resource document it's just a draft of the initial findings but this is what they're going to mine for information to use at the Nov. event and to use to inform the process going forward. He said it doesn't mean that they can't go back and pull different numbers to fill in something they think is a gap or something that is missing. We are still in the first phase of the project he said.

He said when they were here last time they looked at the spacial analysis map they had with them and since then they looked at population trends, economic trends, housing supply,

housing affordability all with RKG Associates who did a lot of that investigation. He said they also looked at real estate both in Farmington and regionally.

He said for some of this there is a lack of data at the Farmington scale and they tried to get the Farmington scale as much as possible but they considered how they fit within the larger region where they couldn't. He said the audit and review of the Master Plan and the existing Land Use Regulations follows that and he will touch on that.

Mr. Whitman said a lot of this probably won't come as a surprise and if there is something that is a surprise or they think is false to feel free to stop him in mid-sentence. He said Farmington's population has increased with some dips along the way including recently but overall like most NH communities you are continuing to grow in population.

He said you've seen an increase in family households and a decline in household size especially among renters. He said rental households are smaller and you can read a lot of things into that.

Mr. Pelkey asked if that is because single family homes are converting to rentals.

Mr. Whitman said that the households are becoming smaller he did not know.

Mr. King asked if we are decreasing in household size more than in surrounding communities.

Mr. Whitman said he could look at the study report and see if Eric pulled that information.

Mr. King asked if that is just the trend here or a trend in this area.

Mr. Whitman said household size across the board regardless of household type is decreasing everywhere, people are living longer, are off in their own households younger so there's a trend. He said there must have been something significant working on a couple of these with Eric that he called out that it's the renter population that had a smaller household size than the single family home. He said they will look at that and see if they can answer that question.

He said as far as the local economy they noted that it's a tight labor market not just in Farmington but in a lot of places. He said having a tight labor market and having housing be one of the constrictions to finding people to work will eventually have an impact on certain industries and the ability to find jobs close to where you live. He said the further you have to drive they're seeing you start to look for a job closer to home so they see some shifting in that. He said it's interesting to see that there are about 2,000 more people that leave here every day than come here to go to work.

Mr. Pelkey said that is brought up in a couple of different statistics.

Mr. Whitman said what he highlighted it for is that decrease of daytime population impacts businesses and who is here to buy things during the day especially to make use of service and retail businesses.

Mr. Pelkey asked if that means that more of the people are flowing by these businesses along the Rt. 11 corridor as they go back and forth rather than staying home all they're actually out mobile and going by these places.

Mr. Whitman said he made a good point because this doesn't consider how that data intersects with we know people are leaving the Lakes Region to go to the seacoast and vice versa.

Mr. Pelkey said that anybody that has ever driven down Rt. 11 at 5 p.m. knows what's going on. Mr. Whitman said to the point of their earlier conversations tonight they're seeing that a lot of folks in town are making somewhere between \$20,000 and \$60,000 a year and they're looking at a rent that's probably lower than what you're seeing as available for rentals and that's a trend that's already problematic here and in other communities. He said and as people decide that the rents to the south are too high and decide to come up here and compete it's going to make that even more dire.

Mr. Pelkey said we build out all this affordable housing in NH and we get an influx of people from the south and still the people that live here can't to rent houses.

Mr. Whitman said MA is doing a lot more than we are but if you look at people in the Portsmouth-Hampton area this doesn't seem that far that might create that dynamic.

Mr. King said we've had that dynamic for as long as he has lived here and you'll find people that work at the shipyard and they have to find a place to live that's where they want to live in close proximity to get there and then if you look at the types of jobs and industries and you look at the report he was surprised by the percentage that have government jobs which is the highest percentage field and then next 2 are construction and manufacturing/industry. He said those are also the 3 highest paying and he thinks that is when you see that trend of 2,000 people leaving to go to work those are all pretty much in those buckets.

Mr. Pelkey said the shipyard is the economic pump for this area and they have 11,000 people going to be working there and those are high paying jobs.

Mr. King said but also in industry you have Pratt, Sig and Turbo Cam and Sig claims they're going to hire 1,200 people in Rochester next year.

Mr. Whitman said the stories they're telling and the things they're thinking about add context to the numbers. He said talking with all of them and then talking with the public later in the month it starts to weave in what's the most important thing to hang our hats on as we talk about changes and why are some of these things happening.

Mr. King said that number also unfolds to when there are some statistics regarding the income for house owners vs. renters and it seemed like it's really disproportionate but it's also driven by the people that are living here because they can afford to live here and they're working in another town where they can make a higher income than they can find here. They need to have a place where they're happy to live somewhere but have a reasonable commute to a higher paying job he said.

Mr. Pelkey said then all the service that are trying to work in the community but can't afford the housing they need to live in in order to work here. He said they can't afford to drive a long distance because they're not getting paid a lot for working in the community.

Mr. Whitman said if they get pushed further west or north they're going to need to look for employment there. He said some things about the housing supply are rising expenses and neighboring employment centers that they talked about that forces some of that movement

and migration of folks that can compete. He said rental housing in Farmington and in other parts of the region is being challenged because it's limited in quality and the inventory is aging so there are a lot of older rentals. That's a NH thing not necessarily a Farmington thing he said. He said they are seeing vacancy rates so low that you may not be able to have a choice of where you go. He said typically they talk about 5%-7% and that means there are choices and if you're looking for an apartment you have some options but we're seeing 1% and under.

Mr. King asked if it was 1% or 2.4%.

Mr. Whitman said he couldn't cite it right here but if it's under 5% it has already constricted the ability to have availability.

Mr. Pelkey said between the availability and the cost kids in their 20's are having trouble finding places to live.

Mr. Whitman said for renter households one of the things they found here was 62% spend more than 30% of their monthly income on housing so that translates to 290 households in Farmington are beyond the affordability cap. He said the goal is to spend about 30% of our income on housing and that could include utilities, taxes, etc. but they're seeing that number in a lot of communities grow and it's not just the young folks it's also seniors.

Mr. King said it's also based on the current availability of housing stock to buy which has driven the prices up substantially faster than they would be because there's no inventory so when somebody wants to buy there's no inventory so it's like a feeding frenzy and its driving the costs up which drives mortgages up and drives people into a higher percentage than 30%. He said the value they had for the median household in Farmington on that chart which was not even 10 years showed the value of the housing stock doubled from 2016 to 2023.

Mr. Pelkey said that all comes out of the statistics they gave them the last time they were here that talks about how we haven't built houses since before WW II.

Mr. Whitman said not in any significant number and he lives in Plymouth and they haven't either so it's not like they're alone in the struggle to figure it out. He said the regional housing needs assessment also identified that they could need as many as 264 new housing units by 2030. He said that's a lot compared to historically what they've generated and it doesn't mean they would see all those created even if they change the zoning to make it a perfect situation that they would be created but its potentially the need because we're looking at over 6,000 units needed in the region.

Mr. Pelkey said that's 2 parts it's not just giving the developers the ability to do it but to find developers that want to do it.

Mr. Whitman said the approx. split of those would be about 175 units that would be owner occupied and about 88 units that would be renter so they don't all have to be single family and they all don't have to be renters. He said they are seeing preferences for where people live based on how old they are and what type of unit they want is changing as well.

He said there is little demand for office space.

Mr. Pelkey said and there is small growth potential.

Mr. Whitman said that could shift if all of a sudden you had some multi-family units and some other activity that did develop on Rt. 11 that may generate some new but as far as looking up that data RKG couldn't say there was any demand.

Mr. Pelkey said it was 200 sq. ft. a year or something like that.

Mr. Whitman said the industrial sector is growing across the region and they have some opportunities. He said that although they're charged with looking just at housing they had them look at where people would be working and what is going to support that housing. He said there is some viability there so they don't want to pretend that there's not and Mr. King is invested in the corridor as well and it does seem like that is a niche for Farmington that could continue to be as well as other mixed use development.

Mr. King said when you talk about that there's one statistic they are missing in the industrial and it talked about cost per sq. footage but it's not done for the industrial.

Mr. Whitman said it was not available.

Mr. King said he was going to ask if that was because there's not enough data or not enough renters/leasers of industrial space and he was curious as to what that was.

Mr. Whitman said some of these questions they could give them a heads up and then Eric is going to be with them at the end of the month.

Ms. Cleveland said she was wondering if they could compare it to the sq. footage based on what he purchased it for.

Mr. King said the value is the least value in one of the other charts. He said one was for commercial (\$13.50) and the other one was office space (\$12.50) that was a least amount and there wasn't one for the industrial.

Mr. Whitman said he would see if they could come up with something they could use even as a proxy.

Mr. Fisher said the only place he could think of that would be under a lease is the old Aiken building that used to have the scrap metal farm there and that closed up and he didn't know what they are doing with the building now.

Mr. King said a moving company bought it so it's a different owner and they are occupying it.

Mr. Whitman said some of the highlights from the regulatory audit were simply looking at the Master Plan and the existing regulations and the 6 things they included in the short version handout and a lot of the things are much more detailed and they want to hold on to them and come back to them and see if there are things they would like to address later on.

He said one of the big things was they were checking off a lot of actions from the Master Plan and this is one project that is helping them do that and there are other things they've been accomplishing. He said related to housing as they pointed out to an earlier guest they are working on it, they've identified it as a need and they are trying to figure it out and they don't know yet how they're going to proceed.

Mr. King said they made some density changes 2 years ago and the density has increased substantially in the downtown and they've seen a couple of transitions and applicants apply those.

Mr. Pelkey said they allowed multi-use in the Industrial and Commercial zones too.

Mr. King said for the parcel that he bought he had to get a variance and then the zoning changed to allow the use he has in the zone that he is in. He said one of the things that they point out is talking about why they have the overlay. He said they wanted to accomplish in some ways a re-zoning but if we put in an overlay that is more permissive we can get to that point instead of doing a full re-write of analyzing these zones so instead of opening up that whole can we said there's just going to be more mixed use in the zones and let the businesses and the applications sort it out and the market would take care of that. If we had to re-write all the zones it wouldn't have gotten done so we put a permissive overlay in to accomplish that until we can re-write it he said.

Mr. Pelkey said they took commercial and industrial and made them the same so you were getting the same opportunities.

Mr. Whitman asked if they would be open through their help with this project to re-write it.

Mr. Pelkey said that was their long term goal and they knew they were going to be talking about this 2 years ago. He said they said they would move in this direction but they're not going to get ahead of themselves and they would wait until they got some information back from them before they jump right into it.

Mr. King said when the board did that they didn't make anything more restrictive it was more permissive without changing the meets and bounds which is a big undertaking.

Mr. Whitman said they set it up so now they go through this process to figure out what would be most appropriate for Farmington and clarify it so when the developers come here it's crystal clear what you want and where you want it and it's leaving these other options open for other kinds of development you also want. He said it could be clearer on where they want housing on the Rt. 11 corridor and where they want mixed-use development.

Mr. Pimental said that in terms of the overlay district there are 2 different things they are talking about-one is what Charlie and Rick were talking about we got rid of the commercial/industrial/business overlay district that they were referring to that we essentially wiped out. He said in reviewing this again based off of their comments there are a couple of places that they missed they don't line up perfectly.

He said the other overlay district that is still in place is the business node overlay district which is the Tax Increment Financing District. He said it is not treated any differently in terms of the underlying zoning but it does have a whole bunch of architectural design standards that are in the site plan regulations that we have never used. He said we have had a couple of different developments in there but they just haven't lent themselves to the standards in how they're written so if there is a way to refocus the TIF District whether it's a mixed use district or what

that would help meet the town's goals of raising the additional funding to extend the sewer out to Rt. 11 which is a long term goal. He said the way in which it is currently designed is not getting the town where it wants to be.

Mr. King said we say that then when we start talking about increasing the density in our areas that have water and sewer and extend it to Rt. 11 you're already at capacity. He said we need to consider when we change this density what is going to be the build out that's going to keep us at a higher level but not put us over capacity. That first gallon of sewer that goes over is going to cost you millions of dollars so we need to stay in an area that has a reasonable amount of capacity but when we do this we want to say what's the build out and is that going to put us at capacity. He then explained the ground infiltration system but that he didn't know what the ability is to add some capacity there say in 2030 to continue with this in fill.

He said when we have to redo that plant when it gets to the end of its life maybe in another 20 years and the cost of things and the regulatory costs continue to go up which is the reason we got out of the river. He said the town wasn't forced out of the river and our permit allows us to discharge treated water into the river if we need to but if we were going to discharge on a regular basis we would have to change our permit and that may not be permitted so we have to at least keep that in mind when we look at this build out.

He said they just went to the town with \$2 million grant funding for adding a well and improving our water infrastructure which needs to be improved from the golf course back because all the old infrastructure is here and we have a well that is kind of on its last life. He said that's going to be good and he thinks our water capacity is good but our sewerage is going to be where we need to consider.

Mr. Whitman said these are the types of conversations they're going to start to be able to have and there is no assumption on their behalf that all of the new units are going to have to be on water and sewer so when they talk about more mixed use development to what degree as you get away from that main intersection could they be on water but not on sewer.

He said looking at some of the options and thinking about how to mix the zoning, the TIF and a realistic understanding of the infrastructure all that is in the works so as we look at the TIF in early 2024 a lot of those are questions Eric is going to want to talk to them about because he'll have enough information and they have perspective that they could start to talk about this stuff. He said it might be a phased approach like there may be things they can do over the next decade so maybe you focus your zoning in that area to try to drive some of that activity that's going to be more water and sewer focused and then other things are allowed to be elsewhere in the corridor.

Mr. King said he has been around this table for a while and this is the best product that he has seen come to this board and it's very well done and has a lot of information in it. He said as far as the amount of people that are leaving out of town and coming in and there was an interesting statistic about how many vehicles a day come across Rt. 11 at the Farmington Town

line on the Rochester side and how many on the New Durham side and the difference and this data supports that because he thinks it was 11,000 vehicles a day on the southerly border and 6,000 on the northern border so there are 5,000 people coming through Rochester on to Rt. 11 and are disbursing before they hit the New Durham line.

Mr. Whitman said some of them may be cutting through Farmington to go east.

Mr. King said that's 5,000 vehicles a day and 2,000 of them live here so 3,000 are passing through.

Mr. Whitman said he was glad they were happy to receive this information it was really intended to be resource information and some of the holes they have identified with the questions they have. He said they will try to get ahead of those and get the information through Mr. Pimental to them on those questions. He said the meeting on Nov. 29 will also be an opportunity for the board to talk to team members that don't get to come to these periodic updates and sometimes they can think of other ways to try to get an answer.

Mr. Pimental said to close the loop on the traffic data, at the Farmington/Rochester Town line it's 18,593 and the number on Rt. 11 from Farmington to New Durham is 11,634. He said these are numbers from the DOT's transportation data management system and the numbers are from 2022.

Ms. Cleveland said they like to have annotated agenda to start weeding out how they can make the most of the data they collect, the information they're assessing and analyzing and what they heard from the public. She said they got about 160 responses from the survey and they saw spikes from putting it on both of the Face book pages, the Economic Development Committee was really key in sending out information and then they sent it directly to the businesses and saw a spike so they had a really good mix.

She said they decided not to do a demographic survey because they wanted to make it simple, short and sweet so they don't know who they might have missed but they got a lot of good feedback especially on the types of housing that people would like to see on Rt. 11 because people do believe housing should go on Rt. 11 just not single family homes but there should be mixed use and multi-family. She said some people thought that's going to be a hot mess, others thought it should be typical New England style it was a really big mix but overall they wanted to get into the nitty-gritty of what that could look like through a couple of these exercises.

She said the Nov. 29 meeting would run from 5 to 8 p.m. and it would be open house style with a little bit of presentation. She said the presentation would be to get to what they can tell people about the current analysis that they're doing around the market and their audit findings from the consultants (from Fougere Planning & Development, Resilience Planning & Design and RKG Assocs.) that developed the packet in front of the board.

Ms. Cleveland said Mr. Pimental came up with the idea to talk about the transportation improvements projects they're proposing because all these go hand-in-hand and having a booth to get feedback on that would be key to start engaging the community in those ideas.

She said those are due in early 2024 so test driving those ideas at this would be really powerful and people could interact with Senior Transportation Planner Colin Lentz as well as in a presentation because people learn differently so having both opportunities at the workshop would be good as well.

Ms. Cleveland said a visual preference survey is a style of engagement where you show folks photos of whatever you're trying to get feedback on and in this case in the survey we heard that people thought mixed use and multi-family would be good uses if they were to focus on housing along Rt. 11. She said they would ask what the preference is around that because that could help them with the design standards next year when they do some zoning changes. She asked the board to imagine a big board with a whole bunch of photos of different types of housing and mixed uses with commercial/retail on the bottom with housing on the top and from that folks could tell you what they think is visually appealing and fits within the context of Farmington especially all around Rt. 11. She said that would help them to create design standards to help them to achieve that and people would say "Yes, you listened to me!" which is what you want them to get out of this workshop.

She said there is a lot of feedback on having a booth that would allow folks to give the board feedback on what is in this analysis. She suggested putting the summary overview of the key findings from the analysis on a board with some highlights so people can read it and give us feedback on how they feel about the market analysis, what is shocking to them, what is realistic and how we address some of the issues on this.

She said the workshop would take place at the Town Hall from 5-8 p.m. open house style with some chairs in the middle and the booths around the edges. She said the presentation would be limited to 45 minutes so people would have more of an opportunity to engage with the planners and the people who assessing and analyzing the data and with the Planning Board members so they can hear from them as well. She said they want to set this up successfully for them to be able to propose zoning changes next year. If you start having this campaign now where you start proposing ideas and assessing what will "whet their appetite" then this will mean more when you actually propose those changes next year because they can relate it back to what they heard from the workshop she said.

Mr. Pimental then corrected the proposed zoning changes would be in 2025.

Mr. Pelkey said one of their biggest challenges is getting people to understand what they're proposing and why.

Ms. Cleveland said people respond to visuals and some of the most successful campaigns she has seen at Town Meeting used visuals so it's tangible it's not just a bunch of words on a document and it shows what the scenario would actually look like if it was in their town.

Mr. Whitman said a visual preference survey is super helpful at this point so people can say what they like or don't like and what issues they have and later on when they've decided on some of the regulatory tools they may want to implement they can pull from the consulting

team some examples of case studies so tangible places like a multi-family development that's mixed income because they also found the town is also lacking more expensive units and there may be people that want to be in a multi-family setting with a nicer unit. He said there are places with mixed income with an incentive for some work force housing mixed in with other income levels and there are places people can visit and check it out.

Ms. Cleveland said they're seeing this mixed use new community in Dover (Point Place behind Patty B's restaurant on Dover Point Rd.) and thinking why can't we do that in Farmington. She said case in point it's something that is already in the region and something accessible and it's a newer development- not that they wouldn't want to encourage New England style development too, and even new developments can still have a great character.

She asked for any feedback or thoughts and said that they are trying to make this not too overwhelming for folks but at the same time trying to give them additional feedback and for them to work with on the rest of this project which is through June. She said they've started to promote this on Face book and they extended an invitation to the businesses and the EDC is promoting this so if there are ways to get this out through the Planning Board if they know folks and other board members and asked Mr. King to get it to the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. King said if they can do a large flyer he could probably get them some nice window space downtown.

Ms. Cleveland said they could do that and she would send it to him.

Mr. Fisher suggested they leave some copies here and he will drop them off at the Goodwin Library and distribute them at the ZBA and Con Com meetings. He asked if it could be posted on the local cable TV channel.

Mr. Pimental said he would send it to the Cable TV Coordinator.

Mr. King said the flyer needs something visual to catch people's eye in the space downtown.

Mr. Fisher said the library staff is real good at getting these things passed out to people.

Mr. Pimental said Ms. Cleveland mentioned what is realistic and managing people's expectations and that is going to be important because what they heard with the survey from what people said that they wanted doesn't necessarily line up with what the market analysis came back as. He said they want to be able to manage people's expectations and to be honest with them and to expect that there's going to be some "Hey I really want this" but also say this is not necessarily realistic for this.

Mr. Pelkey asked if he was here when they had the public tell them what they wanted to do with the old Fire Dept. lot there were lots of different ideas and some of them were completely unrealistic.

Mr. Pimental said the other thing they heard with the survey that isn't in here yet but may be useful is that there was an overwhelming positive response to the Town making a concerted effort on the rail trail. He said people said they would like that to be used in the long term as a pedestrian connection between downtown Farmington and downtown Rochester. He said it's a

long way away to get there and there would be a lot of work that needs to be done but it's something that people said that they think is an underutilized resource in town.

Mr. King said they could say that but there are people on it every day. He said he has seen people parked at Meetinghouse Hill Rd. walking their dogs, going for walks, mountain bikes from here to there to come into town down the rail trail and he has been all the way on that into Rochester and there are more hurdles on that side to making it a good connector through Rochester than on our side. Ours is pretty undeveloped it's a good travel way and it's accessible he said.

Mr. Pelkey said it would be nice if we could open it all the way to New Durham.

Mr. Whitman asked if the DOT has retained control of that corridor.

Mr. King said not 100% so they have over the years given back sections and those are where Cameron's is and depending on the parcel of land and the position there are 3 scenarios-they either have an easement or r-o-w over it, they own it or they gave it back. He said that gets broken on the north side of town because they utilize the snow mobile trail and where the breaks are they have to go around and come back to it. It's broken there right by Cameron's because of the old bridge and back when they first disbanded it some of the businesses or residents may have petitioned the state they didn't have any purpose with it so before the idea of trail system was even hatched the goal of the state was to relinquish it. He said the best person to ask would be Randy Orvis as he is probably the most experienced person as far as where the breaks are. He is a local land surveyor who has retired and he has always lived up off of Hornetown Rd. so he has done a lot of work in the area, has lived in the area, he's an ATV enthusiast and he pretty knowledgeable about where the breaks are and the types of ownerships there are. It's on my property on Rt. 11 that is an easement not ownership he said.

Mr. Pimental said what they were talking about was from Meetinghouse Hill Rd. towards Rochester not going north. He said the biggest challenge is at Places Crossing that's where you cross Rt. 11 that's a pedestrian nightmare.

Mr. King said there is a parcel on Places Crossing, he owns the parcel to the left side also and that's where it breaks off of Rt. 11 and crosses and there it runs along pretty much parallel all the way down to behind the gas station and it continues down to the access road the Town uses where they put the new wells and it goes over that.

Mr. Whitman said it's going to need a long range plan but it does seem like a treasure.

Mr. Pimental said it seemed from the responses from the public that it's underutilized but it could be something that is really special for the Town of Farmington if there's some investment in it and they can work with the DOT to come up with a safe crossing which he guessed would probably be a tunnel that would satisfy that.

Mr. King said the Rochester/Farmington town line is a hot mess. He said the DOT stopped the center turn lane ¼ mile from the town line and since then we've had 2 employees get in major car accidents there, there have been at least 2 fatalities between Places Crossing Rd. and the

town line and a fistful of accidents. He said if the DOT had done a little more research and looked at their own traffic counts they would have extended that further to get past the 7 or 8 businesses until you get past Energy Resources and there's a lot of truck access in and out of there.

Mr. Pelkey said if it ends up developing in the way they conceive it going over the next 20 years it's going to continue to be that all the way down through. He said he didn't know how you improve Rt. 11 to make it safe and still do the things we want to do along Rt. 11.

Mr. King said sooner or later the center turn lane is going to have to go the whole way whether they decide to do it all at once or do it piecemeal like they've done it to control the access and sooner or later they be knocking the speed down.

Mr. Whitman said Mr. Pimental said managing expectations having the survey results some of the key things shared at the beginning and then having them work their way down to the realities of the market and let Eric give the bad news and focus the attention on one thing. He said of all the things they want, all of the changes that would need to be made that the town would have to support these are the ones the market says you could have. He said it will change and they could be having similar conversations 20 years from now saying they accomplished this but now things are different.

Mr. Pelkey said they have been talking about what they could do to try to develop that area and that area has the most potential to do things for the town.

Mr. King said there are a lot of challenges out there the rail trail creates a lot challenges for development and people don't understand the characteristics of the land there. He said as you drive Rt. 11 you have all the gravel deposits on the right, almost none on the left because the rail system was put at the bottom of a slope that goes 250 ft. up and then you get over to Ten Rod Rd. so the frontage on that side is sometimes limited by slope in the back, rock, ledge and wetlands. He said you get further north and on the right hand side we have streams that adjacent so when you survey it as far as what is easily buildable they'd have some challenges because of the topography and the land type.

Mr. Whitman said some of those constraints actually help direct what the zoning and future development can do and it makes sure you're not going to have the same number of cars entering from both sides in the future. He said there's going to be pockets of development that are going to be hit with more density and some that will be somewhat constrained and challenging because of rail trail or because of the ledge and the hill.

Mr. King said on the right hand side we have some mined gravel pits that were significantly dug out and that has development challenges.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson suggested they put in what the constraints are at the open house so people are aware of them.

Mr. Whitman said that is a good idea and having the big maps there to allow people to see it and talk about it would be a good idea.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said that way they could manage their expectations along those lines. Mr. Fisher said Colin is working on getting sidewalks from here out to Rt. 11. He said the state got some more money in and he is trying to get a chunk of that for us.

He said maybe in a couple of months at the other end of town we're close to getting 370 acres to make a park, trails and stuff and maybe we can bring people from Rt. 11 this way.

Mr. Pimental said the one thing that he didn't see in the report and maybe it belongs as part of the mapping was that some of those gravel pits as they come to the end of their useful life they have seen Pike sell off their building which is now NAPA that's sort of a redevelopment project that has happened and the end of the useful life of that property is going to happen relatively soon. He said there are several other pits and the Town just acquired 94 acres where the well is and there are a couple of pockets that he didn't see and he was wondering if that is something that in terms of development potential those areas should specifically be called out.

Mr. King said in their discussions they delineated 1,000 ft. back on either side so where they have a large area using Pike as an example it may be ripe for redevelopment if the zoning is changed and that's in a reasonable spot as long as we have good water protection as part of that development plan for some of this mixed use, residential and business in there where it's really not zoned that way right now. He said we know we need to put a concerted effort and a lot of time into it to see what makes sense so we can consider the zoning change so that when it happens it won't be a mess. He said what's around it is already there so it already has some residential and this would allow those areas to be potential for redevelopment that are not really considered in these residential development zones.

Mr. Whitman said if Mr. Pimental is comfortable marking up a map and with the landowners knowing they're saying this is a potential future development area they can add it to the map. He said towards the end of the document in the audit findings they reviewed and analyzed the cluster provision and talked about a plan for a development provision and having something that a developer could use as a tool to be creative in how he lays out his buildings even if it's a mix of uses and he can phase it over time so he can a longer term thought about access management and how he is going to move people and he can build things out as the market supports it. So they can be sensitive to natural resources, think about the aesthetics from Rt. 11, think about not having a bunch of driveways and have a longer term plan. You have a unique opportunity for a large development to happen in that area unlike a lot of places he said.

Mr. King asked if it makes sense to incorporate some of the DOT statistics in the Rt. 11 study and put it into perspective because if they are going to refer to this in the future they could put what is currently there and this is what we're seeing for influx, this is what is leaving and that ties into that 2,000 people a day and categorize what is the balance and where are they going.

Mr. Whitman said they can do that they have ridership numbers from those that are using public transit so they can pull each of those things in so they're all in one place.

Mr. Pelkey said a lot of folks drive past the successful development of Rt. 11 next door to us and wonder when that will be coming to Farmington and we're trying to help make that happen. Mr. Whitman said and in a way that will reflect your community and what you want to see.

Potential Zoning Amendments in the Urban and Suburban Residential Zoning Districts- Mr.

Pimental said at the last discussion they had he shared some of the statistics the Housing Navigator pulled together. He said they added in their packets some stats about Milton as requested by Mr. King and they looked at all of that information and he made a starting conversation of what some recommendations might be for the suburban and urban districts.

Mr. King asked him to explain why some are crossed out, some are in gray and some are in solid and which ones are proposed and which ones are current.

Mr. Pimental began with Table 2.02 (B) Space and Bulk Standards-Suburban Residential District and said right now the max residential is one dwelling unit per acre and one accessory dwelling unit. He said their recommendation is breaking that out from single family and then duplex and multi-family and changing the minimum lot size from 1 acre to 20,000 sq. ft. So for single families we would stay with that larger amount so one single family per 20,000 sq. ft. but the units for duplex and multi-family would come down all the way to 4,000 sq. ft. he said.

Mr. King said 20,000 ft. is $\frac{1}{2}$ an acre and if the lot doesn't have water and sewer available it falls to the state standard and it's going to be more than 30,000 ft. as noted in (C). He said the problem is when you do that you would say you can do one every 20,000 ft. but you really can't you can't even get close. He asked how they would deal with that because somebody is going to say that's a $\frac{1}{2}$ acre and then you get into the soil types and it's a sliding scale based upon your soil type.

He said it's different if it has water and sewer and he didn't have an issue in the SR area with going to 20,000 but if the soil types don't support it we're putting stuff in there you can't do. Mr. Pimental agreed that if the soils don't support it then they wouldn't be able to do it they would have to defer to at least 30,000 ft. if it has type 1 soils. It could be 39,000 ft., 48,000 ft. or 90,000 ft. if you're in poorly drained soils which you wouldn't use anyway but that's how they break this out he said.

Mr. King asked if they should state that the lot size is based upon the soil types.

Mr. Pimental said he asked about that and he went to a couple of different communities and they said to not do that because it would have to be administrated by staff instead of the applicant. He said if we say it's 20,000 sq. ft. however they have to follow the state subdivision rules then that's for them to figure out. They're going to have to figure out the soils and if it meets the state subdivision rules or not and if they can and the soils account for it then we can allow them to come down to 20,000 sq. ft.

He said he asked a surveyor what the lowest amount is they could get to with a connection and they said you can't go below 13,000 sq. ft. without being connected to water and sewer. He said they kept it at 20,000 sq. ft. for suburban and 15,000 sq. ft. for the urban area.

Mr. King asked why they wouldn't put it at the lowest possible number which would be $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre. He asked if the lowest possible one based on soil type was 30,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Pimental said the lowest is 30,000 sq. ft. and the highest is 90,000 sq. ft.

Mr. King said right now 30,000 sq. ft. is the lowest you're going to be in the state of NH based on good soils. He said the state could change the requirements based on septic design and then later change it so that would be another reason not to have it based upon the state standard but if they reduce it to 20,000 sq. ft. based on soil types and new technology we could look at changing it then. If they dropped it to 15,000 then we would be lower than what we wanted to if we wanted a $\frac{1}{2}$ acre to start with.

Mr. Pimental said they would not be opening the door to any confusion with the state if they went 30,000 sq. ft. as that's the lowest number under the state subdivision rules. He said if they want to change the minimum lot size to 30,000 sq. ft. that's fine and they would change the single family to 30,000 sq. ft. and the number that they saw in other communities was between 3 and 5 per unit. That's your density that has nothing to do with the lot size he said.

He said what they are trying to avoid is right now in this zone with 1 acre zoning or 1 acre minimum lot size and 1 acre density you need 3 acres for a 3 unit apartment and under this zoning you would need 12,000 sq. ft. for a 3 unit apartment on a 30,000 sq. ft. lot (if we change it).

Mr. King said if they reduce it to 30,000 sq. ft. with a density of 4 we would allow up to 7 units on $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre.

Mr. Pimental said they would still have to meet our site plan regulations so if they can't have parking on site then it doesn't work. He said as soon as they go over 3 units that falls under the jurisdiction of this board for site plan. The site plan regulations should determine maybe by the zoning they can have a max of 7 but they can't fit so they have to come down to 5 units he said.

Mr. King said the other hurdle they have is to meet the state requirements for septage disposal because if they only have 30,000 sq. ft. and they're the best soils but say they are going to put in 5 units and asked what is the requirement from the state and does that area increase.

Mr. Pimental said it does change with more units.

Mr. King said right now it's one unit per acre and they're talking 7 times denser and that's a huge swing.

Mr. Pimental said this is something that any surveyor is going to know the lot size calculation is the estimated daily flow of sewage in gallons per day divided by 2,000 and then you get the loading factor and that gives you what your lot size would be based on that loading analysis.

Mr. Pelkey asked if that includes the footprint of the building.

Mr. Pimental said no that's just the lot size. He said this is where it comes into figuring out you're septic design load. He said he wouldn't worry too much about that because the state regulations are going to determine that but if the 4,000 is too much of a swing to go from 1 acre to that we can certainly change that. This is a big difference than what you have now and

you're allowing duplexes by right but all these properties don't have 2 acres so you're essentially zoning out duplexes he said.

Mr. King asked if they should look at the center of town and this is the density here and if we progressively reduce the density as we move out where this zone falls in relationship to the density in the Village Center. He said this is the SR and the other one that is denser is the UR.

Mr. Pimental said the UR they are saying 15,000 sq. ft. and 1 unit per 4,000 SF. He said most of the lots in the UR are connected to water and sewer or can be connected.

Mr. King said when they looked at the density they asked what is a reasonable progression of that density. He said they could also look at what is there in the SR and what that has for density now and asked if they want to limit their increase in density to double or triple it because right now it's 1 unit per acre and we're going to go 7 times as dense and that may be too extreme. He said we have pockets of existing density which is higher than that because it's pre-existing and we've got some stuff out there now like the subdivision we just approved on Chestnut Hill Rd.

Mr. Fisher said case in point coming before the Zoning Board tomorrow night and it's already out on public record a person wants to have 2 family units down the road on one piece of property which would be less than an acre and the neighbors are against it from what they have received so they submitted a variance request because it would be outside the one family unit per acre by putting in the second unit by converting an existing property into residential. Mr. King said he was open to considering reducing the density requirement or the space to get higher density but he didn't want to do something where all of a sudden it's a big change to the people that live there. He asked what's reasonable 4 times more dense, 3 times more dense, twice or this number 7.

Mr. Pelkey said and comparing it to neighboring communities.

Mr. King said they could compare it to the actual density on the ground and use that as a number to consider as the factor.

Mr. Pimental said the minimum lot size in the Village Center District which they changed was 8,000 sq. ft. and they wanted to apply some form of a multiplier to that to get to the UR and right now it's a little less than doubling that size going from 8,000 SF to 15,000 SF. He said what is there now is that they allow 10,000 SF but it has to be connected to both water and sewer. He said if it's not connected to water and sewer then it's 1 acre and there are properties that are not connected to both and the way that it's written they don't get any density bonus.

Mr. King said they need to look at the densities as far as the increases for utilities and not restrict that to a zone.

Mr. Pimental said the other thing they want to accomplish is the way it's written now is that the density bonus is being applied to the lot in terms of lot size where it should be tied to the number of units. He said the density bonus shouldn't reduce the need for a minimum lot size it should reduce whatever the standards are per unit. He said he didn't disagree that going from 1

acre to 20,000 SF is a big jump but it's not that big of a jump in the UR because if you're connected to water and sewer you're already allowing for 10,000 SF and we're increasing that to 15,000 SF across the board that means you don't need to be connected to water and sewer for 15,000 SF. He said if they wanted to make these both 30,000 SF so they don't run into the state subdivision issue they could but they may want to reduce the density piece.

Mr. King asked if he meant to make it more dense in the UR.

Mr. Pimental said yes.

Mr. King said in the UR the 4,000 SF may work and may closer fit what is already there. He said it may be a little denser or twice as dense but not 6 times as dense.

Mr. Pelkey asked what the compromise would be to make the change in the SR.

Mr. King said he didn't know and he didn't think they were going to hash all this out tonight.

Mr. Pimental said he was looking for some general direction and if they want to come back and look at the minimum lot size as if they want to go to the lowest threshold of the state subdivision regulations which would be 30,000 SF in the UR regardless of their connection to water and sewer and that's an improvement because it's down from 1 acre and then apply a density change of maybe 4,000 SF in the UR and maybe it's 7,000 SF per unit in the SR so it's not quite as much of a jump as it is now.

Mr. King said if somebody had 40,000 SF in an existing acre lot and they had 8,000 SF that would be 4 units. He said if it was a new development lot or an existing lot of 30,000 SF you'd have 3 units.

Mr. Pimental said if you're connected to water and sewer that 8,000 SF is per unit because you get 25% per utility.

Mr. King said they need to look at if there are any lots in the SR where there's water and sewer going by.

Mr. Pimental said he thinks there are some but not as many as in the UR. He said it's more likely that the SR areas are going to have one or the other but not necessarily both as opposed to the UR where you're connected to water and sewer so you'd get the 50% reduction in per unit in per duplexes and multi-families. He said they may want to say that this doesn't apply to single family homes because that one is going to get complicated because of how it is written in that you can't have 2 single family homes on the same lot unless it can be subdivided. He said the density bonus should be applied to duplexes and multi-families as it makes more sense.

Mr. Pelkey asked why they would apply a density bonus to a single family dwelling anyway.

Mr. Pimental said he didn't know but if they don't close that loophole someone could try to take advantage of it and he didn't think that's what their intent is. He said he could come back and move these numbers out a little bit as we come out from the Village Center to the UR to the SR and show how those numbers change. He asked if there is general consensus that at least this is going in the right direction changing the density to apply it to the utility not to the minimum lot size and making this more flexible where you'd be able to have a duplex and

multi-family without needing multiple acres of land to do so.

Mr. Pelkey said and all of this in effort to address the fact that we have so many non-conforming lots and that's the Genesis for this.

Mr. Pimental said the primary is to increase flexibility for more housing but to address all of the different small lots you'd have to come way down.

Mr. King said there are a lot of people who live here including him that don't want this to be another Rochester or Dover and the lot size requirements being larger than other communities prevents us from becoming the next Rochester or Dover. He said there are different trains of thought and he is not opposed to doing it as long as it makes sense to where our infrastructure is but with housing he doesn't feel the need to address the housing needs Rochester can do it. Let Dover do it, let Somersworth do it. It's good but there is need for people that live in Farmington that want to stay in Farmington even though our resident population has dropped in the last few years. We haven't seen the growth as in the other towns and in some ways there are a lot of people here that don't really want to see that growth he said.

Mr. Pimental said Finance Administrator Kelly Heon was looking for the median household income for homes that are connected to water and sewer because that has something to do with looking at the rates and there are 2 census tracks in Farmington-one encompasses essentially all of the urban area and the other census track is everything else. He said the total median household income in Farmington as of 2021 was \$60,271 per household.

He said if you look at the difference between the 2 tracks the track that is in the downtown the median household income is \$42,309 and if you look at outside of that area the median household income jumps to \$92,000. He said there is a \$50,000 difference between folks that live on the outskirts of town and the ones that live in the core. He said to give it a different perspective, providing housing in these zones is to help those people that are in that area. We're not looking at the Ag (agricultural residential) district he said.

Mr. King said outside that zone is not just the Ag you're also talking suburban residential.

Mr. Pimental said that's a big discrepancy in the town between those areas and that's where they're concentrating their efforts.

Mr. King asked if those are homes that are owned or if the rental statistics are in there. He said when he looked at the income of the households that are owned it was drastically different than the households that are renters.

Mr. Pimental said it's about the same number but for the owner occupied the median household income is \$82,000 and renter is \$29,000.

Mr. King said the owner occupied includes the urban and the village.

Mr. Pimental said that's correct-town wide.

Mr. Pelkey said it does make the point that if you're looking to increase the density on multi-family homes that in the UR it's going to affect the folks that are at the lower end of the income.

Mr. King said and they are already there.

Mr. Pimental said he would not recommend anything even remotely close to this in the AR because it would be a non-starter. He said that is why they are concentrating on the UR and SR and he will re-work these numbers and show a gradual change from the village to the UR and to the SR.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said the 30,000 SF seems practical to her based on what he was saying is in the state regulations and the multi-family maybe 5,000 SF because at the 4,000 SF it seems like you're going to have a lot of units on a $\frac{3}{4}$ acre lot.

Mr. King said in the SR he thinks it needs to be higher and in the UR which is a more dense zone to begin with he is okay with having it lower because it's already dense.

Mr. Pimental said he may go up and look at 6,000 SF in the SR and look at the percentages of what that might look like. He said based on this feedback he will come back to the board at the next meeting with some revised numbers.

He said by going up to 30,000 SF instead of keeping it at 20,000 SF you're essentially doing the same thing with not allowing that many units. He said if they keep it at 20,000 SF and then go to 6,000 SF you're only allowed 3 units but if you 6,000 SF and then you go to 30,000 SF now you're increasing the amount because the minimum lot size is increased.

Mr. King said his number would be 7,000 SF maximum which would be 4 units on 30,000 SF.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said 4 seems like the max you would want on a $\frac{3}{4}$ acre lot.

Mr. King said if you had more land area you could have more units. He said he was thinking 8,000 SF but that only gets you to 3 units on $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre but 7,000 SF gets you to 4 and then you have to have septage disposal so chances with what they need with the best soils they could do it with 4 units because the field for 4 units is probably not that much bigger.

Mr. Pimental said that's a good change where they're going to allow 4 units instead of one.

That's a good step in the right direction and I'll come back with some new numbers at the next meeting he said.

Mr. King said the development strategy for these lots for the most money may be duplexes that are condos because they can't discriminate on the form of ownership so they may do a 3 or 4 unit and condo it. He said they could come in as condos or they could turn condo and they need to keep in mind that in some scenarios they're not adding anything to the rental stock.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said even that's more affordable than a single family home.

Mr. King said when he looked at the chart the value of the average house went from \$183,000 in 2016 to \$360,000 in 2023 in Farmington and that boggles his mind.

7). Any Other Business before the Board:

Old Fire Station Update- Mr. Pimental said last Thursday the Town's consultants were out there and they dug 4 trenches and part of that work was to see if they could identify or find any of the suspected underground tanks and they heard back from them on Monday. He said the good news is no tanks were found in the 4 locations. He said there was also some suspected smell of

petroleum so they chose those 4 areas and there were no tanks. He said they found some ash and coal, piping, woven cable and some old auto parts and they think those things were used to fill in the area when the tanks were removed.

He said there was a faint odor of petroleum in a couple of the test pits but there was no petroleum source in any of those locations.

Mr. King asked if they took any soil samples.

Mr. Pimental said they are waiting for the ground water sampling results and they took some soil samples. He said if the samples come back clean we're at the end of the Phase II and there likely won't be any recommendations for remediation and cleanup. If there is the Town is going to have to take the next step which the SRPC can help with is to find some remediation funds through the state to do the cleanup if needed.

Mr. King said they got this information at Monday's Selectmen's meeting and his gut feel is there will be an annual monitoring requirement to monitor what is there and to report it and if there was an increase there would be some action. He said they were just leave it undisturbed and monitor it over time and mandatory reporting or not has yet to be determined.

Mr. Pimental said they are continuing to make progress and we should have a report from them by the end of the calendar year and then the Town would have to make some decisions if anything needs to be done after that.

ERZ Virtual Workshop- He said a virtual workshop was held last Thurs. for the town's Economic Revitalization Zones hosted by the BEA and it was an unfortunate turnout where they had 16 people registered but only a handful showed up. He said they did record it and it's on the SRPC website and they sent the link to the Town to host on the EDC web page.

Mr. Pelkey asked if the EDC had anything they want to put before the Planning Board.

Mr. Pimental said he has not heard any comments about the proposed changes they are looking at for the Sarah Greenfield Business Park area. He said there are some ERZ signs along Rt. 11 in Rochester and they asked him to contact the economic development person in Rochester to see what the cost was for those signs and how they came up with that and pass it along to them and see if it's something Farmington might want to consider putting in the ERZ zones.

TRC Meeting-He said the Technical Review Committee met last week for the proposed propane storage and distribution facility that would be located between the Circle K and New England Furniture and that application will be heard at this board in 2 weeks on Nov. 15.

Mr. King said he was trying to envision it and there's not much land there.

Mr. Pimental said it's about 2 acres in size. He said they need a conditional use permit because of the amount of impervious coverage exceeds the 10% for the ground water overlay district. He said liquid propane is not a regulated substance in terms of a ground water contaminate because once it hits the atmosphere it evaporates. He said an explosion could be a concern but not a spill that would affect the drinking water.

Mr. Pelkey said it would not completely dissipate because of the chemical added to give it a smell.

Mr. King added and for lubrication purposes.

Mr. Pimental said they said it wasn't considered in the state's groundwater contaminate standards and nitrogen is kept on site as a safety mechanism. He said they are proposing 2 tanks and maybe 2 more tanks in the future where they fill them up with liquid propane, trucks come and they fill them up and then they leave the site to deliver the propane. Norway Plains and the owner will be here to answer any questions and the plan is relatively small he said.

Remediation Update-Mr. Pelkey said he drove by the Rt. 11 site where they cut into the dike and saw that it has been repaired. He said they have a deadline of this month to complete the remediation of that property and they have to get permits to do the construction work they want to do and those permits would be contingent upon completing the remediation work they have to do for the state.

Town Cleanup- Mr. Fisher said the Conservation Commission is doing a town cleanup on Nov. 18 and they will be meeting in the Municipal Office Building parking lot at 8 a.m. to pass out the trash bags, gloves and vests. You choose the area to cleanup, give me a call and I will pick up the bags and take them to the Transfer Station for disposal. Wrap-up is no later than 2:30 p.m. and that gives me an hour to get it all picked and get it to the Transfer Station before they close he said.

8). Adjournment:

Motion: (Fisher, second Day) to adjourn the meeting passed 5-0 at 8:40 p.m.

Kathleen Magoon
Recording Secretary


Richard "Rick" Pelkey, Chairman

