

From: [Michael Behrendt](#)
To: [Tracey Cutler](#)
Subject: FW: Comments re: Proposed Workforce Housing Ordinance (overlay district) - WEBSITE
Date: Thursday, August 15, 2024 3:17:29 PM

Tracey,
Please post to the website. Thanks.

Michael Behrendt

Durham Town Planner
8 Newmarket Road
Durham, NH 03824
(603) 868-8064

From: Joe Friedman <joe.friedman42@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2024 12:29 PM
To: Michael Behrendt <mbehrendt@ci.durham.nh.us>; pnrasmus@gmail.com; Sally Needell <sallyneedell@gmail.com>; Todd Selig <tselig@ci.durham.nh.us>
Subject: Comments re: Proposed Workforce Housing Ordinance (overlay district)

At this past Monday's Town Council meeting it was suggested that I put my comments in writing regarding the proposed Workforce Housing Ordinance that will have its public hearing for the Planning Board tonight. Some of the comments are minor but some are major. Here are my comments:

Article I: change "meets" to meet in the second line. In the phrase "...that represent the majority of NH's diverse workforce" it seems to imply that it is only for the majority.

Article 3.A.2: I believe a sale option would be a very important part of any Workforce Housing Zoning Amendment. There are ways to allow workers to buy homes that are set aside for workforce housing. In Silverthorne, Colorado for instance, they had a workforce housing development for county workers that "won" a lottery to buy those homes and live in the community where they work. There is an income standard they must fit into. They are limited on any resale with the amount of profit they can take at any time. The maximum resale has caps of 2-3% per year on any profit. Workers are required to work 30 hours per week for the county. It has allowed those workers to own their homes and be fully invested in their community.

Article 3.C: 2nd to last paragraph: The map referred to is not very clear as to the locations. There are no street names anywhere on these maps.

Article 3.F.2 and 3: 3.F.2 is not clear to me what the rules are. Article 3.F.3 is very clear.

Article 3.H: Why would we restrict third party guarantees from those that don't live in the unit? Third party guarantees for instance from parents, is how many people have been able to obtain mortgages to buy homes. Third party guarantees are also used frequently in renting properties too. And if Section 8/ Housing Vouchers are ok, why not third party guarantees?

Article 3.J: Why was the Church Hill District dimensional standard chosen for this type of housing? It seems that the overlay districts proposed look nothing like the Church Hill District. And why are only 3 stories allowed? This would encourage sprawl, be considerably less economic to build and goes against the Town's stated climate goals. It is most efficient to build 4 and 5 story buildings for workforce housing. The reason that we see so many new 4 and 5 story new housing complexes in our region, our state and where we travel in the US is because the Building Codes are very different above 5 stories. It is much more expensive to build units greater than 5 stories tall. The 4th and 5th floors could be set back from streets and be offered as bonus incentives to build workforce housing into market rate developments. Also, the maximum # of units being capped at 200 seems arbitrary and not necessarily fair. This would indicate that whether the property is 50 or 200 acres for instance, they would both be capped at this artificial number of units. The number of units should be related to the buildable land on a property.

Article 3K: Why does the maximum "3 unrelateds" no longer apply in these overlay districts only? It does look like Durham's "3 unrelateds" ordinance is under attack by the State Legislature and the Planning Board is considering changing it.

Article 3.P: These buffer standards are unclear and arbitrary. What does "buffered substantially" mean? And when exactly does it apply?

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Joe Friedman
Woodman Rd.
Durham, NH