

MINUTES

PLANNING BOARD PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

CONFERENCE ROOM A CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE

7:00 PM

SEPTEMBER 12, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dexter Legg, Chairman; Elizabeth Moreau, Vice Chairman; Rebecca Perkins, City Council Representative; David Moore, Assistant City Manager; Colby Gamester; Jody Record, Jeffrey Kisiel; and Jane Begala, Alternate; Corey Clark, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT: Juliet T. H. Walker, Planning Director

MEMBERS ABSENT: Nancy Colbert-Puff, Deputy City Manager and Jay Leduc;

I. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to implement Gateway Mixed Use Zoning. The proposed amendments include inserting a new Article 5B – Gateway Mixed Use Districts, consisting of proposed ordinance text, illustrations, and tables; and making conforming amendments to other sections of the Zoning Ordinance, including Sections 10.440.

B. Amend the Zoning Map by changing the zoning designation of select parcels as shown on the document “Gateway Mixed Use Zoning Districts Map” dated 8/10/2017.

This hearing is a continuation of the Planning Board Public Hearing held on August 24, 2017.

Chairman Legg welcomed everyone and noted this meeting was being recorded, but would not be live.

Ms. Walker summarized the changes between the last public hearing and now. Consultant Ted Brovitz from Brovitz Planning and Design was there to help with the presentation and answer questions. Ms. Walker explained there are a number of revisions included in the amendments. Primarily there is a new section Article 5b that outlines the standards for the new Gateway Districts. The table of uses is outlined in Article 4. A definitions section was added. Some changes were made to the general sections to clarify items that needed further detail. Criteria for the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) were moved to the Development Types section. Article 5A has also been impacted by this. The different building types, facades and open spaces standards will be pulled into Article 5A to keep everything together. The table of uses will be kept in the Gateway Uses section. That is the Planning Board recommendation. The goal was to make sure the uses were compatible to what’s allowed in the Gateway Districts. More residential uses are being added to what is currently allowed. No changes were made to the map. There were suggestions to expand to other areas, but this project is being viewed more as a pilot. The districts can be expanded to other areas in the future. Originally there was

a minimum for workforce housing for all projects. The Planning Department met with a roundtable of developers and decided to remove that as a mandatory requirement. It will be treated more as an incentive. The building type standards were scaled back a little to make it less complicated. The distinction between yards to building and setbacks were clarified. A development could be staggered with that. The parking setback was removed because there is already a standard in the ordinance that addresses parking. The intent was to minimize the complexity of the ordinance. A few new standards for development sites were added. If one building were being built on one lot then the contractor would reference building types. If multiple buildings are being built on one lot then that would trigger the development types. That would require a CUP. It's another step for development, but it could provide more flexibility with the Planning Board. A new section was added to address pre-existing buildings and lots. It addresses how to comply with the new standards without having to follow every single one of them. The Planning Board wants to be an avenue for flexibility, and the ordinance is really trying to help people avoid needing to get a variance through zoning. A couple more façade types have been added in. A split between rental and ownership options for workforce housing was also added. This is already an incentive in Article 5A. The same ratio of 30% ownership or 10% rentals will be applied. The goal is to try to incentivize rental units. The submission requirements have been clarified to clearly state what is being asked for. Clarified for the public realm improvements. Added the ability for the Planning Board to modify the density threshold. So have not changed the density threshold because there was such mixed opinion on this. The proposal is to let the Planning Board have the flexibility to make density changes based on the applicant's proposal and justification. The density bonus incentives remain the same other than workforce housing. The parking and loading standards were added from the existing gateway standards, but the parking ordinance will be getting revised so that is just a placeholder. The community space definitions will be added into article 5A to keep it all together.

Vice Chairman Moreau questioned if there was specific criteria around development types. Ms. Walker pointed out the section of the article that talks about development types. Then clarified that any development type would be coming through the Planning Board for a CUP. The standard development type criteria would allow the Planning Board to look at everything from a site plan review perspective. These would also be coming in for a CUP, so they would be subject to further review. Vice Chairman Moreau questioned if phased development would be accounted for. Ms. Walker replied that would be in the section on pre-existing buildings. Vice Chairman Moreau clarified that it would only be available on pre-existing sites. Ms. Walker responded that pre-existing sites don't have to meet all the standards. It won't waive the CUP requirement, but it will waive some standards.

Ms. Begala had three general questions. The first was what is the definition of workforce housing that is being used for this ordinance? The Board should make sure the Purpose and Intent matches what the definition should be. It should be clear what workforce housing means. The NH Housing and Finance talk about a definition of workforce, but the definition is from 2008. Ms. Walker responded that the definition is in the zoning ordinance definition and references section. The definition is the state definition for workforce housing. Ms. Begala felt that was good because it will impact what it means throughout the ordinance. She asked if a police officer or teacher could the requirement as it's 60% of the median household income which is 50,000 dollars. The same requirement for owners sets aside 30%, but doesn't have an income criteria. She asked if it is the same as renters. Chairman Legg questioned if it was addressed specifically what it means for an ownership unit. Ms. Walker responded that it's 100% of the median income for a four-person household. Ms. Begala clarified that it's based on a four-person household if it's a rental and a three-person household if it's for ownership. Ms.

Walker confirmed that was correct. One of the reasons for using the state definition is to be consistent and compliant with workforce housing. Ms. Begala noted that the Board should keep in mind that according to the study the housing is only 3000 something short. Ms. Walker noted that the Planning Board needs to make sure they are on top of that. A study from 2014 may not be up to date, and senior restrictive housing can't be counted as part of that. City Council Representative Perkins commented that the Board should make sure to keep focus because there is a Master Plan and the Housing Authority have had numerous work sessions on this. The focus should be concentrating on where the ordinance needs to be for the Planning Board.

Ms. Begala commented that maybe some of this should be stated in the purpose and intent. She wondered if the Board are all in agreement with the purpose and intent or does it need to be shifted because it sets the tone for the rest of the discussions. The second section talks about housing and standards and it does not seem to call out a diverse mix of costs. It is important to make sure the Board is all on the same page. The development case studies were very interesting and it is assumed they represent different best practices that may be considered in moving toward a collective vision. It would be appreciated if Mr. Brovitz helped to interpret these, and share any thoughts if something is missing from the ordinance based on the case studies.

Mr. Brovitz responded that the case studies are there to provide representative examples of projects that have been built and, in some shape or form, could be incorporated into this project. The cottage court tried to capture the best of open spaces. There are things that could be taken away from each one. The intent was to see what the Board was comfortable with and see if any certain streetscapes or open spaces were more appealing than others. It's not that any one of them should relate directly to Portsmouth. They are different projects of different scales and the intent is to see what people like about them and what should be included in the ordinance. Ms. Begala commented that it was hard to relate this to the draft zoning ordinance according to the specifications. Ms. Walker noted that it was more to show examples of some of the design elements that were incorporated into the draft. Mr. Brovitz agreed with Ms. Walker and explained they were trying to show how some of the elements could come together with a mixed-use space in a neighborhood center.

Vice Chairman Moreau commented that the connection is that this zoning was written so that some of those examples could be built in Portsmouth. Mr. Brovitz added that they are also a lot of examples of what's been done already. It's showing that other communities are trying to address housing needs. Ms. Walker commented that the other thing these case studies will do is to help the Planning Board to envision what could be done. They will help to think of the other objectives of walkable neighborhoods, how it relates to open space and how it's situated to the lot. It could help expand the way of thinking beyond one building to the collection of sites to create a neighborhood feel.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Brovitz if there were any things that came to mind that he had seen as common failures as these communities were put together. Mr. Brovitz responded that a lot of times the scale of a building is too big. What's really important about walkable communities is assemblage of different blocks, and the length and depth is important. Typically a block should be 200-300 feet. Also how does the open space incorporate and how do they engage the neighborhood. A square could be identified for open space, but there needs to be elements that draw the people who live there and the public to come into those spaces. It has to be a publically oriented space, so people will shop there and visiting there will be attractive. It does not have to be a large-scale project. If the public space is done well it will still work.

City Council Representative Perkins started by complimenting the changes made to the draft. Then questioned the intent of page 38-39 section 10.5b.70. It was mentioned earlier in the ordinance what the dwelling units per building requirements were. Then in this section it mentions dwelling per acre and dwelling per building again. It can allow up to a maximum of 36 units per building with incentives, but wanted to make sure it's not allowed on the other section. Ms. Walker responded that the concern is if more units were allowed per building then the acreage would make the point moot. That is a very good question and the Planning Department will look at this to make sure that does not happen.

Ms. Record questioned if there was a block length range under the development site standards. Ms. Walker responded that there was and thanked Ms. Record for pointing out a typo. It should say "shall."

City Council Representative Perkins noted that on page 42 there is a revision that states when presented with compelling information the City would be provided with more flexibility. The last sentence talks about the following incentives. Is it supposed to say the above incentives? Ms. Walker responded that was correct.

City Council Representative Perkins noted that the language should be strengthened in the development types and standards based on public and Planning Board feedback. It is important to ensure that the ordinance is providing as objective criteria as possible to ensure fair judgement. Ms. Walker agreed that language could be strengthened.

Ms. Begala commented that the ordinance calls for the pedestrian access to the buildings entrances should be provided at the street facing side. If parking is going to be behind the buildings, then shouldn't there be some back entrances as well? Ms. Walker confirmed that was correct. Entrances should definitely be in the front, but could be all over. Chairman Legg commented that the intent was to account for the front entrances in the facades to make it pedestrian friendly. There could be entrances everywhere.

Ms. Begala worried about the flat roofs and dealing with the snow and ice. Vice Chairman Moreau responded that the site plan review already addresses that because it's part of the drainage review. Chairman Legg noted that's a building code issue that doesn't need to be part of this ordinance.

Ms. Begala questioned the section of the ordinance that talks about the community space encompassing 10% of the open space for the site. It doesn't seem to be reflect in the various tables. The table about the community building says 20% community space. Ms. Walker responded that it is talked about in the development types. Mr. Brovitz further clarified that each development building has it's own requirement for open space and then there should be a 10% overall community space. Ms. Walker noted this could be clarified more based on the feedback.

City Council Representative Perkins questioned if it was 10% of the open space coverage requirement, or 10% of the site? Mr. Brovitz confirmed it was 10% of the site. Chairman Legg asked for an example. Ms. Walker responded that for a mixed use 20% of the site has to be open space just free of buildings with no parking or driveways, and 10% of that has to be community space. It could be more if the developer wants, but the 10% has to be met.

Ms. Begala questioned the section on development sites where it talks about the community space coverage and types was the same. Ms. Walker responded that it was not. That was for a re-

development of a site. The intent was to increase and incentivize more community spaces there. This could be revised. Vice Chairman Moreau noted that it should be uniform.

City Council Representative Perkins brought up a previous comment from Dan Rawling that the intent in here is to encourage centers and public space, which is a good way to encourage neighborhoods. She asked how the ordinance is encouraging the creation of ideal centers. Ms. Walker responded that one thing that has been talked about for pre-existing buildings is to encourage new buildings along the front of the lot line to bring them up to the street, and encourage pedestrian access. The mix of the development sites is intended to create types of developments that create a community. The goal is to create the community space and a linear connection to other sites. Also, consider the public realm and how that development would fit in to the surrounding properties. That's the best that can be done without buying up a site. Mr. Brovitz added the Kmart example provides a lot of options. The streetscapes and pedestrian access could be improved. It may be a difficult site to incorporate public spaces, but publically oriented spaces could be a focus. The intent is to broaden the palette to make sites publically oriented and not publically owned.

Vice Chairman Moreau commented that sometimes the Board gets the opportunity to get an early look at things. Would a developer be able to provide a 10-year plan and show how the project would look upfront too? Then it would be easier to see how the piece of pie fits into the whole concept. Ms. Walker replied that it is not required today, but that is a good suggestion. Vice Chairman Moreau added that it could just be conceptual and the Board wouldn't hold people to that, but it would be helpful to see. Mr. Brovitz commented that he had worked on a large project that was residential, mixed use, and commercial. The project was happening in different phases and was getting approved in phases as well. It is helpful to know generally the relationship to the other parts of the project. Ms. Walker commented that it could be added as an incentive bonus. Chairman Legg added that it could be included in the development type standards because they will all be considered for a CUP. Vice Chairman Moreau commented that it could be an easier approval for a developer if the Board knew the big picture.

Ms. Begala questioned if it was already in the site review process or should it be spelled out in the ordinance. Chairman Legg responded that would be a procedural item for the Board. They can look at the procedures and see how they would relate to this.

Ms. Begala questioned the bonus incentive requirements under public realm improvements section. The third one is easily measurable, but the other two are not. If everything is a case-by-case basis how does the Board say what's an acceptable expansion. Ms. Walker responded this could be talked about further.

Assistant City Manager Moore asked for clarification around which of the above incentives the requirements are referring to. Ms. Walker responded that reference should be taken out. It's supposed to refer to the ability for the Planning Board to adjust the density, so it shouldn't necessarily be tied to the incentives. Assistant City Manager Moore asked for clarification in a paragraph on page 31. Ms. Walker responded that it's saying that the Planning Board can ask for cost factors, but it's not required. They could clarify this so that the Planning Board may request certain information. It is called out in the ordinance, so the Planning Board would feel comfortable asking for it. Assistant City Manager Moore noted that the hardship sentence did not make sense. Ms. Walker responded that it would be clarified.

Vice Chairman Moreau noted that some of the larger developments should have work sessions.

Chairman Legg commented that this was a huge improvement from the last draft. This will allow the Board to do what Vice Chairman Moreau has suggested. It doesn't give the flexibility to the developers, but does allow for the Planning Department to request that the developers revise their plans and come back. The ordinance will not be foolproof, but it would allow for the Board to work through changes. This gives a lot more authority and flexibility than site planning. This project started with the goal to increase the housing stock and it still will, but it will also create villages. Because the City is not buying the land and doing the projects, the developments may not be exactly what the Board may want. This ordinance puts the Board in a good position to respond to what is presented.

City Council Representative Perkins agreed with Chairman Legg and also commented that they will need to make sure to respect the spirit of what is brought to the Board and work with developers. Ms. Walker added this is a baseline of what to start from and they can continue to work on it.

PUBLIC HEARING

Rick Beckstead, 1395 Islington Street, wanted to pick up where Chairman Legg left off that the objective was to increase the housing stock. This ordinance has moved away from the workforce-housing goal. It was also supposed to be about affordability, but that seems to have gone away a little. Two years ago those were the goals that were set. Too many incentives can sometimes be detrimental to a neighborhood. What he was hearing was if this proposal goes through then the ordinance is eliminating the use of the BOA. Mr. Beckstead is concerned that the neighborhoods won't get a say to weigh in on proposed development. The BOA has considered neighborhood concerns in the past and has denied certain developments as a result. There is a process that exists today that is fair and works. The BOA should not be taken out of the equation. It could depreciate values of the homes.

(Inaudible.) The Board has mentioned the Kmart site and thinks there's a big void in that area. The retail place in front is a perfect place for affordable housing. Someone with a creative mind could really make something out of that space and it would fill up relatively quickly if it were workforce housing because the businesses are in that location. The Route 1 Bypass should be watched closely because Hodgson Brook is right there. It is important to make sure that sustainability is going hand and hand with these projects. The Board should pay attention to LED lighting and run off. With the amount of buying that happens online, it won't be long until some of the strip malls are ghost towns. A TED Talk on community spaces talked about using buildings for bedrooms and small kitchens, but then had community spaces that worked like community living rooms. Chairman Legg confirmed that was worked into the ordinance.

Dan Rawling, 411 Middle Street, was in general very favorable towards the document. The principle interest with it has been on the creation of village centers. It is one of the things that early on could make some of the places successful. Mr. Rawling identified 3 items that should be added to the vision statement and intent. The public space is considered the primary element in the development of these projects. The circulation systems should also connect with existing properties. It should be a circulation system that distributes everything through the neighborhoods that lets people enter more than just one road. The sites should encourage walkability and promote the 10-minute walk. There may be more difficulty to do this for a property that is already owned. It may need to be incentivized to encourage this.

Chris Fisher, Attorney for Raymond Ramsey who owns property that he feels should be re-zoned. Mr. Ramsey has been involved in a long litigation to build a hotel on his property. A variance had been received but has since expired. There was an extended period of time that passed in litigation, so a lot of the details needed to be updated. Mr. Ramsey has always intended to move forward with the hotel and this intent has been clear to Board members. Mr. Fisher is here to express this intent again. The G2 zone specifically excludes hotels. Mr. Ramsey's position is there is no legitimate or rational reason to ban a hotel there. Across the street is fine, behind the district is fine, but it's not allowed where his property is. Mr. Fisher asked the Board to consider Mr. Ramsey's concerns when making a decision on this ordinance.

Doug Roberts, 247 Richards Ave, is no longer associated with PS21, but last year they had a session on affordable housing and surveyed what kinds of buildings people were attracted to. This ordinance aligns with the survey results. People preferred smaller buildings with walkable areas. Mr. Roberts offered to forward the survey to the Board. In general, Mr. Roberts was in support of the project, but was concerned about the incentives. Specifically, the incentive that offers the choice between workforce housing or eligible public realm improvements. It seems that the public realm improvements would be easier to accomplish to get the additional 50% increase in density. It would be less appealing to work to create more workforce housing. One solution might be to make the incentives both required instead of offering the choice between them. If there are incentives it should be for workforce housing rather than just more housing.

Rick Beckstead, 1395 Islington Street, was still perplexed about some of the numbers City Council Representative Perkins was talking about because they weren't included in the public packets. It should be better displayed on the site. Chairman Legg commented that the current version of the packet is not on the site. Ms. Walker added that when the City transitioned the web site it happened in the middle of this project, but the blank page with the URL is where all the docs are being held. The agenda on the meeting may not have had it on there, but all the documents are on the URL. Mr. Beckstead responded that he attended last week's HDC meeting and everything was all on one page, which made it much easier to find the information. Mr. Beckstead was concerned about the rental vs. ownership ratio. The rentals do not turn over the tax revenue that is sometimes needed to pay for the impact made to the neighborhoods. Also, eliminating the use of BOA is concerning. The Planning Board sometimes talks about traffic and the impact of the value to existing homes etc. The BOA looks at the legal aspects and obligations to make sure they are being fulfilled. With these zoning amendments he wondered if they were opening Pandora's box. The Planning Board is opinion. The BOA talks about what is legal. He was concerned about workforce housing. Mr. Beckstead was speaking on behalf of other people and other neighborhoods because his could be next. Portsmouth has the restaurants and corner stores and housing today and the City has developed neighborhood centers already so it doesn't need to be forced. The only benefit is the Cate Street connector and that could become a center. Mr. Beckstead was not sure the Planning Board was going about this the right way.

Doug Roberts 247 Richards Avenue, had concerns about the parking requirements because the affordability is not just the cost of housing. It has to do with transportation too. People spend on average 30% of their income on housing and 15% on transportation. How is this zoning plan working to lower transportation costs for people? Some of the areas here with lots of free parking encourages driving and would take up development area. The City should encourage being as efficient as possible with parking. Mr. Roberts is not sure the public realm improvements need to be tied to providing surface or structured parking in addition to parking requirements. If it were advantageous to the

developer, then they would just build it anyway. There may be an opportunity to subsidize parking with affordable housing. Everyone needs parking now, but wondered if we need this much in 10-15 years. The design seems to exclude the possibility of shared parking. If efficiency were the goal, then having the business parking during the day and residential at night would be good.

Chris Fisher, was present to represent Raymond Ramsey, but is also a resident on Islington Street. The assessment on G2 remains unchanged. However as a private citizen he wanted to express gratitude to the ordinance that, aside from the G2 zoning, the Board has done a fantastic job.

Rick Beckstead, 1395 Islington St, stated that at the last meeting there was a debate about parking and he asked if that would be addressed tonight. Chairman Legg responded that the intent is to hold a public hearing and formal discussion that would be dedicated to parking. There will be an opportunity to talk about parking in a public hearing separate from this ordinance change. Ms. Walker added that it is on the agenda for the next Planning Board meeting. There is a draft of the revised amendments for Article 11. A lot of the things have been raised in public comment tonight and from the Board in past meetings that will be addressed with a revision of Article 11. Mr. Beckstead commented that he would wait until next week to comment on parking.

The Chair asked if anyone else was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Walker commented that there were a few suggestions for procedures. This ordinance does not change the Planning Board role for projects. These projects will always have to go through site plan review and the Technical Advisory review. The drainage, traffic, etc. will all go through the technical review and will be part of these proposals. The BOA's role in this ordinance is to grant special exceptions, which is in some of the uses in the table. The BOA also has a role to grant variances to zoning. Applicants present to the BOA to say why the current zoning doesn't work for them. The goal is to not have as many applicants go to the BOA for variances. Then it can be more collaborative with the developers and the public. The suggestions by Mr. Rawling to modify the goal should be incorporated. It is similar to Vice Chairman Moreau's revision statement suggestion. As for the property referenced in the G2 district hotels have been taken them of the special exception section for G2 zoning. It is up to the Planning Board if it should be added back in. The measurements for the public realm and how that is quantified for Planning Board should be clarified. The comment about whether public realm should be required with workforce housing should also be clarified.

Vice Chairman Moreau commented that last time it was talked about if there was a way to work in the encouragement to include expanded public transportation. It should be added to the draft. Ms. Walker agreed. Mr. Brovitz added that one thing that has been done before is if a lot is on the transit line, then it was allowed to discount the amount of parking needed on site. Vice Chairman Moreau agreed that would be good. Mr. Brovitz agreed more transportation would help people working downtown to not have to worry about parking downtown.

Vice Chairman Moreau made a public point to say that the BOA is not being excluded in anyway. They will be doing the same work the process will be the same.

Ms. Begala questioned if the Planning Department had room in the budget to do a housing demand survey to get more accurate information than the 2014 housing survey. Chairman Legg commented that he thinks about the ordinance a little bit differently. The City doesn't dictate how many units of building are in a development. The market demands that. The developers are going to determine what is viable for the market. The goal shouldn't be to require a certain number of units that will be needed 10 years from now. The Board should allow for developers to build as easily as possible and build what the market demands. Ms. Begala noted that it would be beneficial to work in partnership with developers, and not be dictated by them. Chairman Legg responded that the Master Plan and Ordinance would foster that partnership. The developers will determine if there is demand for development or not. The studies that have been done identify that there is a need for housing of all incomes. Ms. Begala commented that this is a complex pie of factors. One piece of the pie is the identification of gaps of housing and the possibility of future housing. There needs to be good strategic planning. This could go to the extreme and allow the market to operate without the ordinance. If there is going to be an ordinance, then updated data is a good thing.

City Council Representative Perkins commented that UNH just completed a business retention survey and business owners talked about the need for workforce housing. Historically it has been talked about as a regional problem. Portsmouth has the benefit of having people who want to live here and to make the community interesting. This is an opportunity to let people be part of this community and improve it. This ordinance states the goal we set as a City in the Master Plan. We are here as a Planning Board to address the problem and move forward. City Council Representative Perkins deferred to the expertise of Ms. Walker and Mr. Brovitz and trusts that it honors the Master Plan and the Housing Committee. She asked if the Board will vote on this tonight.

Chairman Legg noted that enough changes have been suggested to this ordinance that the Board needs to see a fresh version of it before it is voted on. It should be taken as consideration for next Thursday's meeting. These are not dramatic changes, but there were enough of them that a vote should wait.

Vice Chairman Moreau questioned given the intent on the specific intention of Mr. Ramsey's property in G2, what would be the hardship to change it to G1. Ms. Walker responded that G2 was supposed to be more of a center than a corridor given the surrounding neighborhoods. A hotel could be added back in as a special exception option for G2. Chairman Legg suggested that G2 be consistent with G1 as far as the uses go. If it's determined that it would have negative impact to the City then it wouldn't be approved.

Mr. Kisiel requested an explanation on the special exception process. Ms. Walker responded that the BOA would hear the special exception that has six criteria items that need to be met and has a little bit of a less rigorous review.

Chairman Legg noted that he was hearing agreement that G2's use should be updated. Assistant City Manager Moore requested clarification on what is being proposed. Ms. Walker responded that right now a hotel is only available as a special exception in G1. Chairman Legg is proposing it should be added to G2 as well. Assistant City Manager Moore noted that the Board should take care to not make the wrong changes this late in the process. He asked if the Planning Board should take this into consideration before making the change. Ms. Walker responded that they should look at what's allowed there now and compare. Assistant City Manager Moore recommended that the proper analysis should be done before a change is made.

Chairman Legg commented that the Board should consider the possibility to change the bonus workforce housing incentive to a requirement. It should not be an either/or. He asked the Board if there was an appetite for that. Assistant City Manager Moore commented that it seems like a similar decision that was made with the west end zone and asked if there was data on that. Ms. Walker responded that there was not. Assistant City Manager Moore noted that he was empathetic with Chairman’s suggestion. It would be a shame to come so far with this purpose and not ensure that it would happen. City Council Representative Perkins agreed with the line of thinking with the West End. There is informal feedback because the ordinance was complicated it would be hard to incorporate workforce housing. This ordinance is clearer. It should work to incentivize or require workforce housing.

Vice Chairman Moreau noted that workforce housing was made an either/or option in the North End and no one has incorporated workforce housing to-date. If the Board is serious about workforce housing, then it should be included from the start. Chairman Legg noted that’s the center of this discussion and agreed with Vice Chairman Moreau.

Mr. Clark agreed as well. The public realm improvements will take care of themselves to some extent because developers aren’t going to build places that no one wants to live. Maybe connecting the public realm would be important to call out.

Ms. Record also agreed. Workforce housing requirements have been tried and that wasn’t something developers would be interested in. It should be tied to a bonus incentive and it should be in addition to the public realm improvements.

Chairman Legg asked if there was any other guidance to provide to the Planning Department?

Vice Chairman Moreau moved for the Planning Department staff to prepare a revised draft based on the Planning Board comments and to present the new draft at the next Planning Board meeting scheduled for September 21, 2017, seconded by City Council Representative Perkins. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Walker noted that there would be a full agenda next week. The parking revisions may be presented next week, but full public hearing may happen later.

.....

II. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 p.m.

.....

Respectfully Submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the October 19, 2017 Planning Board Meeting.