



RECEIVED
BARBARA STATS

2021 FEB 17 AM 9:16

Town of North Reading
Massachusetts

TOWN CLERK
NORTH READING, MA

Community Planning

MINUTES

Tuesday, January 19, 2021

Mr. Warren Pearce, Chairperson called the Tuesday, January 19, 2021 meeting of the Community Planning Commission to order at 7:39p.m. via Virtual Meeting (Zoom, participants may call 1-301-715-8592, meeting code 9854300926.

MEMBERS

PRESENT: Warren Pearce, Chairperson
Christopher Hayden, Vice Chairperson
Ryan Carroll, Clerk
David Rudloff

STAFF

PRESENT: Danielle McKnight, AICP
Town Planner/Community Planning Administrator
Debra Savarese, Administrative Assistant

Mrs. McKnight read the Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the North Reading Community Planning Commission IS BEING CONDUCTED VIA REMOTE PARTICIPATION. No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings as provided for in the Order. A reminder that persons who would like to listen to this meeting while in progress may do so by calling in 1-301-715-8592 and meeting code 9854300926.

Mr. Pearce informed all present that the meeting is being recorded.

303 Main Street – Site Plan Review – cont. P.H. 7:30PM

Mr. Pearce stated that it's his understanding that revised plans have not been submitted for this meeting.

Mr. Michael Gabardi stated that he attached through the permit eye website several documents.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she didn't receive the documents and should have received a notice, but would check and see if they are there and put them into the Sharefile for the members to view.

Mr. Gabardi stated that he could put them onto the share screen for everyone to see.

Mr. Pearce stated that they haven't had a chance to review these documents.

Mr. Hayden stated that he would not be able to vote on this project without reviewing the documents.

Mr. Pearce asked Mr. Gabardi to give a presentation of the updates that have been done.

Mr. Gabardi stated that the site plan shown at the last meeting was not an updated plan. He recently spoke with Rich Williams of Williams & Sparages who did the most recent site plan and what is now on the site plan should be more accurate.

Mr. Rudloff asked if a one page plan was being submitted for these changes.

Mr. Gabardi stated that the 2017 site plan was single page.

Mr. Rudloff stated that you can have a sheet called proposed work, but wouldn't you also have the sheet that is not grayed out. It's showing as-builts here, but on the architectural it's showing plantings going in on that same strip that he mentioned. This plan shows angled parking, where the previous plan showed the parking spaces going straight.

Mr. Gabardi stated that the 2010 plan shown at the last meeting was not updated. This plan shows the actual conditions of the site in gray and the proposed changes are shown in bold.

Mr. Pearce asked if Williams & Sparages have done an actual plan that they want approved and signed.

Mr. Gabardi stated that this is the only plan that was given to him by them.

Mr. Pearce asked if they are in the process of providing a plan that could be approved. Williams & Sparages are very well versed in this whole process, so they know that this is what would be required.

Mr. Rudloff stated that there is a big gap from the 2010 plan until now and he would like to have everything that has changed and will be changed shown on the plan that they will be approving.

Mrs. McKnight stated that a different marking style is what they CPC needs.

Mr. Rudloff asked if modifying the site without the permission of the CPC is allowed.

Mr. Gabardi stated that their involvement with this site is less than a year old. The changes previously made are approximately 3 years ago. He was told that a site plan review was done in 2017 because some of the parking direction was changed.

Mr. Jim Dietz stated that when they did the re-engineering of the in and out to the parking lot it was approved by the CPC and this is the actual plan from that review.

Mr. Rudloff asked Mrs. McKnight if there was a more updated site plan in the planning department.

Mrs. McKnight stated that the plan should be in the office and she would check.

Mr. Gabardi stated that he will speak to Rich Williams and get the plans that the CPC is requesting.

104 Lowell Street/Martins Landing – Priority Development Site Master Permit Revision
P.H. 8:00PM

Mr. Hayden read the public hearing notice into the record.

Mr. Matthew Leidner of Civil Design Group stated that he is representing Pulte Homes of New England, LLC. In August of 2017 a Priority Development Site Master Permit was issued for construction of 450 dwelling units which were contained in 9 buildings. They would like to amend the permit by adding 52 additional dwelling units. The 52 units will be accomplished by adding a fifth story of living to 4 of the approved building footprints. This would add 13 units to each of the 4 buildings and bring the total of units to 502. The 502 units is still well under the allowable density for this site based on zoning. The floor area ratio is only about a third of what is allowed under zoning and the building coverage is about a ¼ of what's allowed under zoning in terms of density. The building footprints will not change from what was approved back in 2017. They are not adding any additional building lateral changes to the site, it only goes vertical with one additional story. Based on that additional story, they're seeking on a parallel track to this approval, a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, to allow 5 stories were 4 stories is allowed under the zoning in the Industrial Office Overlay District, which is what governs the building number of stories in this in this location, so even though they're in the Multi-family Overlay District, zoning looks to the underlying district for building stories, and so they will need a variance to increase those stories from 4 to 5, but what is noteworthy of building height will remain within what is allowed by zoning, it will be less than 60'. So, despite the 5th story on these 4 buildings, the height of the buildings will not exceed what is allowed by zoning, so the variance request is solely for the number of stories and not for the building height. The additional modifications to the Site Plan is to increase the number of parking spaces by adding 52 more spaces that will be dispersed throughout the community, this will bring the total number of parking spaces to 952. Along with the Master Permit amendment request that was submitted, they did also request a special permit under zoning, section 775B. That section of zoning allows a parking ratio of 1.6 and 2.0 spaces per dwelling unit. So, at 952 spaces they're at 1.9, so they're well within what could be allowable under that special permit provision in zoning they're at the upper end of that almost 2.0 spaces per unit, but because they're not at 2.0 they're requesting that special permit to be between 1.6 and 2 spaces per unit. Other changes associated with the addition units is stormwater runoff, so the additional parking spaces, create some additional impervious area and they have modeled that additional impervious area into their approved stormwater model from 2017, the impact on stormwater. The only change to any of the stormwater infrastructure that's proposed on the project is a basin that they had to reshape slightly because of 3 additional parking spaces in that area. There is no change to the runoff rate or volume at the perimeter of the development. Other modifications associated with the additional unit are the water supply, the water usage will increase under the scenario by approximately 10%. A water suitability study was submitted and confirmed that adequate flow and pressure for both domestic and firefighting needs would

be available for the entire project. This will require an expansion of the approved 2017 plans for the leach field. The wastewater treatment plant is sufficiently sized to handle the additional flow, so no changes will be necessary.

Mr. Robert Michaud, Managing Principal of MDM Transportation Consultants stated that they are the firm responsible for the original traffic valuation of this project. When they originally studied the site they looked at a number of off-site locations that not only included the driveway serving this particular development, but other nearby intersections in North Reading and on the Wilmington side and were visited as part of this increase in units, as part of a traffic and connectedness access study update. In addition to looking at those locations, they also looked at the parking characteristics of the property to confirm that the proposed parking ration will be well supportive of the increase in units at the site. Form a traffic generating perspective in 2017 what was permitted at 450 units was estimated to generate on the order of about 60 peak directional trips during peak hours, so in the weekday hours in the morning. The outbound volumes were estimated at the time in permitted for about 60 exiting vehicles per hour during commuter house and conversely in the evening, that same number coming back in the evening hours for a total of 90 to 100 vehicles. The current plan of 52 unit increase will bring that up to 502 units and applying the same industry standards that they did at that time worked on this which shows a relatively small increase in traffic. The number of additional vehicles that these units would generate is about 10 total. They began looking at both an industry standard parking rate peak and they also have the benefit of having a lot of empirical information. Peak parking information for a number of different facilities are very similar to this project throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In December of this year they conducted a detailed parking accumulation study that allowed them to understand the flow of actual parking demand for the number of units that were occupied at the time the site was inventory, which was 97 units. They observed over a two day period of time, mid-week was that the peak parking use was 129 spaces for those 97 units. Their conclusion is that there is likely to be an ample reserve and onsite spaces that could accommodate the flow of visitor activity and other events that occur throughout a typical year and place the project well within the bounds of the ratios that the town has latitude and granting for this particular project.

Mr. Pearce stated that correspondence was received from tenants of Martin's Landing with issues regarding an elevator, water pressure and parking.

Mr. Mark Mastroianni, Senior Land Entitlement Manager of Pulte Homes stated that they did receive the correspondence from the tenants. The latest building that they moved 41 homeowners into was 230 Martins Landing Drive, also known as building 4. It was the third building that they've built and was completed in December of 2020. They did experience trouble with the elevator when the homeowners were moving in and they took the issue very seriously. Ultimately, it was a construction hiccup. The elevator was under warranty and Schindler Elevator did come up to the site many times, but the last time they were able to resolve the issue and has been working fine since December 18th.

Mr. Pearce asked how many elevators are in each building.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that there's one elevator in each building.

Mr. Pearce stated that with 50 units in the building and you're going to go to 63 units, with only a single elevator. It sounds to him that there's not enough elevators for the number of people.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that it was unfortunate that they had this incident with the elevator, but single elevator condominium buildings are built routinely and that's what's required by code which is vetted and deemed to be safe. They've build these similar types of buildings in this area in many different communities, successfully and it works well.

Mr. Pearce stated that the issue regarding the water pressure should still be under review to make sure that there is not something wrong with some of the individual supply. The parking is up to code and knows how it all fits together, but the code may not recognize the way people are these days and how dependent they are upon personal transportation unit and the fact that you're more likely to have two vehicles in a household. From the very beginning of zoning to now that number keeps getting pushed up, not dragged down and the fact that there's no public transportation in that particular location also means that the parking is probably an issue. One of the things that was brought up was the possibility of assigned parking to a particular unit, so that the people that live in the building could park by the building, as opposed to having to park in one of those outlying parking lots and the long walk back to their building. Have you considered that at all?

Mr. Mastroianni stated that he did see the comment from one of the residents that there wasn't enough parking of parking close to the building that they live in. In reality, there is plenty of parking at Martin's Landing. One thing that they didn't mention is that in each of the 50 units sold, there are 23 one bedroom units and 27 two bedroom units. The template zoning of two parking spaces for every unit really doesn't apply to 2 and 3 bedroom units. They have garage spaces that are deeded to the units if the residents want this. If they tried to reserve spaces for the homeowners that are there because of one or two comments, it would have more people upset that the space that they were assigned was actually further away from the door. He doesn't believe that they have every provided 2 spaces at any of their other communities. Usually the Planning board and conservation are asking them to remove parking to try to minimize impervious pavement.

Mr. Pearce stated that he understands that he agrees that a lot of 1 bedrooms only require single parking.

Mr. Hayden asked how many of the deeded parking spaces were not purchased when they purchased their condos. Because he's hear complaints of the expense of that parking space

from people who have looked at Martin's Landing or people who have bought Martin's Landing. Do they have to buy the parking space when they buy a condo? How many of those parking spaces have been sold to the 135 residents that you have today?

Mr. Mastroianni stated that they do not have to buy a parking space. He does not know how many have purchased a parking space, but would get that information and submit it to the planning department. When the buildings are completely occupied and if there are any leftover spaces there will be a lottery system to sell off the additional spaces to the residents.

Mr. Hayden stated that would be a good idea because they've got 135 people and their going to have 450 people, so that's about three times as many as there now and you're asking for another. The way you're representing your parking it sounds like it's great, but you've got a third of the place full right now and it sounds to him like you haven't sold, or people haven't purchased all of those lovely underground parking spaces, where they stay out of the snow, rain and heat, so they can go right to an elevator and go up, but you've got one elevator and no backup and it's a 55 and over complex which means there's going to be people there that 70 and 80 as this gentlemen pointed out. Who can't climb the three or five stories, so he's questioning the reality of the single elevator? He knows what Pulte Homes has done in other places, and they may not have all those elevators, but He doesn't know what their rating is on the building. This is exclusively 55 and over.

Mr. Hayden stated that looking at the plans he thought that there were 50 parking spaces for each building. So, if people haven't purchased them already, are you going to drop the price, so that the lottery works and sell them to people who already had a chance to buy a parking space?

Mr. Mastroianni stated that is what they would do.

Mr. Carroll stated that assuming they've done this in the past, do they have an elevator study, for their kind of standard buildings with wait times and there's industry standards that go along with both commercial and residential use.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that they don't have that study, but could ask for something like that.

Mr. Pearce stated that he is concerned with the residents being over 55 and having the elevator not working.

Mr. Vincenzo Stuto stated that he is the Liaison to the CPC for the Select Board. He wanted to know if these concerns were brought up during the original special permitting or whatever happened in 2017, because he agrees having someone elderly have to presumably, when the elevator doesn't work go up flights of stairs.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that he has been with Pulte Homes for 18 years and was here during the entire acquisition and in entitlements of Martin's Landing. The issue with the elevators are the building design that was not an issue that was discussed at that time. They have built 20 plus more of these buildings, many of which are age restricted and having one elevator has not been an issue with a single other community. As far as the parking, that item was not discussed because if you provide two spaces for each unit, then it's a matter of "by right approval", so we didn't ask for a special permit to go down to 1.6 that zoning allows. They knew that they had a lot of extra room and they put them on the plan just to comply with the buyer number.

Mr. Hayden stated that they didn't disclose that they were selling the parking spaces in the garage. We were told that there was one parking space per unit.

Mr. Pearce stated that he understands that things break and things need to be fixed. When the problem was revealed, that it would be much worse, should another floor and another 13 units, with however many people occupying those 13 units, trying to use that same elevator again and again. His thought process was that there is probably going to be more again that goes on and how that's going to affect the future when he read the comment from the resident living there.

Mr. Rich Wallner of the Select Board stated that he drove through the site and the buildings are pretty tall, as is. It'd be good if you're going to add them onto the back as proposed. He wanted to know if they have ever added onto any other buildings as they're proposing to do to this site.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that they have not done this before. The COMP recently changed a few years ago to allow full stories over parking for wood frame building construction and the code recently changed within the last few years.

Mr. Wallner stated that he was on the committee that sold the property. Pulte Homes' proposal was two proposals: 18 million with affordable units and 30 million with 450 at market. We obviously took the 30 million, but now we're increasing it to fine tune it and it doesn't come without an impact on the town. The increase in property taxes is going to be welcomed, but we can't adjust the original 30 million that the original proposal, and what we accepted was based on. He hasn't figured this out yet, but there seems to be a little bit of an equity issue in changing the spec after we agreed to the 30 million. So he just needs to think about it more because it's a change to the original agreement that we had and he believes that the Select Board would want to think about it a little bit more too.

Mr. Pearce and Mr. Hayden also agreed with Mr. Wallner's comments.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that they did review the Purchase & Sales Agreement and the Agreements that they had and they're not tied to any units or a specific site plan. One of the

reasons that we're doing this now and going to the ZBA for a variance and to get the variance for an extra story, we have to prove a hardship. We feel that we have a significant hardship. As you are aware this site is the former home of the JT Berry Center that was owned by the Commonwealth. In 2007, when the Commonwealth did the demolition and abatement of the former JT Berry Center the abatement was not properly completed. After they purchased the property and started site work we came across some buried asbestos containing ACM in some of the topsoil. They have been working with DEP to make sure that they're following all local state and federal regulations and have done over 1000 tests, in the last 18 months to remediate and mitigate to resolve the issue. It's likely that most of the pile is going to have to be removed, out of State to a licensed facility in compliance with all regulations and the estimated cost to remove the soil is between eight and twelve million, right now. This is something that we did not budget for or weren't planning on when we purchased the property. So, this amendment and these additional units will help offset some of the costs to complete the project.

Mr. Pearce stated that Mr. Mastroianni mentioned that the code changed to allow a four-story wood framed building, but now the code changed again to allow for a five-story wood frame building. Does the building code allow an already framed four-story, go to a five-story. Is it going to stand up?

Mr. Mastroianni stated that the five-story plan, stamped by all of our engineers and designed by all of the building designers would need to be submitted to the building department which would be reviewed for a building permit. There is obviously more weight added to the structure, so the design and structural elements would need to be adjusted. We would not build a building that was not be able to stand up.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she's getting a comment by email from a resident, Debbie Dahl. She stated that she is listening to the meeting via Channel 22 and is a recent unit owner at 230 Martin's Landing, Unit 309. She has concerns about one elevator, no push buttons for heavy door and parking. She's met several elderly people who have complained about the elevator and the heavy doors and poor communication. She was originally looking at a unit with grantees parking space and was told she had to pay for parking. She was never told that she didn't have to buy a parking space on her ZOOM call with Pulte, last Thursday. We were told the additional floor is to offset the 10 million it will cost to remove the asbestos dirt and not to increase our condo fees, the sales office doesn't divulge everything we need to know.

Mr. Pearce stated that this email will be sent to Pulte Homes for comment.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she spoke to DCI, last week, about the review of the project and doing a peer review of the traffic and stormwater changes and they just brought to her attention that although they didn't believe it to be a conflict of interest that they had done

some recent work with MDC and the applicant indicated that they didn't have an issue with that.

Mr. Pearce asked if DCI was going to do a peer review of the changes.

Mrs. McKnight stated that if the board feels that it is necessary. She hasn't told them to go ahead with the work, she was asking for a quote first to be sure that the amount of money was acceptable.

Mr. Pearce stated that his concern is that he's seen a million traffic studies over the years and in the very beginning he didn't put much faith into them, but many of them have proven to be exactly how it all works. But, this does seem like there's a lot of people going to be going in and out of that location, when this is built, all the way out and he wouldn't mind if he took a quick look at that just to see what the traffic situation would be.

Mr. Hayden stated that they were talking about 60 trips in and out, in an hour of traffic, in the morning. That's a car a minute at that intersection and people complain about that intersection now. The bottleneck isn't in North Reading, it's actually in Wilmington. He thinks that really slows traffic down, but some of the people can't even get out of their roadway onto Rte. 62, so maybe they need to do something if they're going to add more traffic to the roadway.

Mr. Pearce stated that when the board first started looking at that site, we talked about even putting a commercial location in there which would have had actually fewer cars. We talked about it possibly needing a traffic light there. Accumulation of the Edgewood apartments need to be included with the Martins Landing traffic counts which would make it two vehicles per minute. Although, it might not be easy to calculate out right now, because of all of the people working from home because of the pandemic.

Mr. Michaud stated that the original study and projects of what they've presented that were approved in 2017 are the 60 directional trips that he described were subject to peer review by DCI at that time. None of those assumptions have changed now, but the volume of vehicles on the roadways are down from historic levels, but they have always planned for they call a future year condition that accounted for not only the effect of this particular project and the 60 trip that they described, but other area growth that's all been built into the assessment that was done and it was subject to the original approvals of the board and peer review, so none of that has changed. The addition of 52 units here is absolutely, in our opinion and his experience in like cases is inconsequential. They've actually conducted delay studies for movements on Rte. 62 that indicate that it takes an average of about 40 seconds to make a left turn during the heaviest traffic period of the day, pre-covid. And while that does represent a delay, it does not rise to a level that would require a special treatment, meaning a traffic signal, or something

along those lines, and that, in fact, was a discussion point during the original deliberations of the project. Their opinion here is that, while other growth may happen over time that's been accounted for by virtue of what they originally studied, originally permitted and as a result relates to what they're asking for approval for now, the 52 units there's really no material change in where they were in 2017.

Mr. Pearce asked if they took the traffic out of Edgewood into account when they added the 60 trips.

Mr. Michaud stated that he would have to go back and look to see if they called it by Edgewood, or not, but he knows that they had used at that time. A five year growth projection that included specific approved or in process projects developments and normal area background growth, so a combination of those factors at that time in 2017 were all built into the study in the analysis.

Mr. Pearce stated that he would like DCI review the changes.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that they are meeting with the ZBA on February 11, 2021.

Mr. Hayden moved, seconded by Mr. Rudloff and voted 4-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to grant the requested continuance of the public hearing for 104 Lowell Road until Tuesday, February 2, 2021 @ 8:00PM.

148-150 Park Street – Rezoning Discussion/Workshop

Attorney Chris Latham stated that this is an overview of the proposed senior housing overlay zoning district, the North Reading Master Plan of 2018-2028 reiterated several findings. The senior population in North Reading is increasing, the median income is less than other North Reading citizens and North Reading's housing stock lack sufficient variety and diversity to meet North Reading's demographic changes, the master plan lays out several recommendations to achieve North Reading's long term goals, including providing more housing choice of right in North Reading seniors giving North Reading seniors more opportunities to remain in North Reading by downsizing and to open up more single family homes to younger families with children. Enter the subject of our discussion tonight the senior housing overlay district tool to address some of the demographic issues facing North Reading. As well as give North Reading seniors more housing options. The proposal is designed as an overlay district, as has been done with zoning districts in town like Articles 20, 21, 25 and 26. The proposal is designed as three warrant articles, the senior housing overlay district before you was drafted using applicable definitions under state and federal law. The Commonwealth Smart Growth models and Good Land Use criteria to seek to provide independent housing units for persons over the age of 55 allow aging North Reading senior's options to downsize and still remain in town, simultaneously

revitalize the downtown and he wants to say the downtown in the traditional downtown and preserve the character of the town. To achieve these objectives, the overlay district is designed so a senior housing project must consist of four or more acres of land within walking distance that would be 250' of a public park, public common or a public library, with at least 200' of frontage. Specifically, we've designed this relative to 146, 148 and 150 Park Street in mind, but obviously there could be other properties in close proximity to allow for multiple buildings, including mixed use in a senior housing project, so long as all principal buildings have a minimum site distance of 20' between buildings. The buildings do not cover more than 40% of the gross site area. New buildings for senior housing have setbacks of 25' from the front lot line, 20' from the side lot line and 20' from the rear lot line, with a maximum height of 45' and the project have a minimum open space at least 20% of the total site area and new buildings must be in harmony and design with the neighborhood, including use of peak roofs and gables. The senior housing project must also have onsite senior common area amenity for the use of senior residents and elevators for all new multi four residential structures which must also have handicap access from parking garages to dwelling units. Density would be limited, so dwelling units cannot have more than two bedrooms. The total number of dwelling units in a senior housing project does not exceed 50 dwelling units, in addition, the applicant for the senior housing development must contribute to the stock of affordable homeownership units in town equal to 10% of the market rate of the residential units in the senior housing project via combination methods, but consistent with the commerce inclusion area zoning model bylaw. Subject to the affordable housing restrictions in the town's bylaws and in the DHCD regulations. Procedurally it's designed so that the senior housing project of being an overlay district could be approved by CPC via a special permit concurrently with site plan review.

Mr. Pearce asked if this would be considered spot zoning.

Attorney Latham stated that this would not be considered spot zoning because even though we're talking about a particular overlay it could apply to potentially other properties that are located within 200' of the common library or public park, so it's not spot zoning and theoretically could apply to other properties, as well. The property obviously that we have been thinking about is this property because it's in a perfect location. It's sort of smart growth central because we're talking about revitalizing the traditional downtown. It's close to emergency services and public amenities.

Mr. Pearce stated that this has to go to Town Meeting for approval, so that means that if you tried to do an overlay that included people's houses on either side or further up the street or something like that, you might run into opposition from them or from someone who thinks that that would encourage the sale of those properties in the building of more multiple family housing and to a density that might be less than what they might like to see there.

Attorney Latham stated that the reality is we're talking about four acres. So that would require quite a bit of consolidation, to be able to do that, but it is an overlay district.

Mr. Hayden stated that he was thinking that it was spot zoning. But since it's an overlay and they are allowed within that overlay allowing other areas to be done and not specifying those area, but they are allow it to happen within a radius or a range around what they're utilizing, it sounds like it might fly, other than do we have areas large enough within that area to do it.

Mr. Pearce stated that particular piece of land is certainly big enough to do that and he's assuming that 150 Park Street (The McLean home) will stay.

Attorney Latham stated that it is a historic structure and will remain.

Mr. Pearce asked what the total acreage of the land is, minus the McLean House.

Mr. Peter Ogren of Hayes Engineering stated that the McLean house was designed to be part of the whole project, so you can't really minus the McLean house.

Mr. Bruce Wheeler stated that they haven't decided if the McLean house will be used as an office or changed to accommodate 2 units, but are strongly leaning towards keeping it as office space.

Mr. Pearce asked if they are requesting the CPC's support for the overlay zoning.

Mr. Wheeler stated that they are hoping that the CPC would sponsor the warrant article. They are also going to communicate with the Select Board, Finance Committee and Council for Aging (Elder Services).

The consensus of the CPC is that they all concur to be in favor of this zoning change.

Mr. Stuto of the Select Board asked if this would count towards the affordable housing. He also wanted to know the definition of what affordable homeownership unit means for this, because it seems like there's 10 different types of affordable homeownership unit.

Mr. Pearce asked Mr. Wheeler if his intention is to make these all market rate.

Mr. Wheeler stated that the overlay district is going to require 10% affordability. If they did 50 units then they'd have to produce 5 affordable units, either within this site or somewhere in town.

Mrs. McKnight stated that it can be whatever definition the town chooses to put in the bylaw of what's being proposed. The minimum is to be affordable to people earning 80% of the area median income.

Mr. Stuto asked if the town is able to make changes to the language in the overlay bylaw. Such as, besides the median income there can be an asset requirement. He does not want someone that has enough money to buy a home to be able to acquire an affordable one.

Mr. Pearce stated that it has strict rules and a lot of times there is a lottery system and most people are vetted before they're allowed to enter into the lottery.

Mrs. McKnight stated that it depends on the type of affordability program. There are some that look differently at assets and for those programs where counts on the subsidized housing inventory, it's legitimate and recognized and the people aren't supposed to be able to have huge assets. If you want verification for the wording in the bylaw, she can run it by the affordable housing consultant and communicate that we have concerns and want to be sure that it goes to people who actually have the need. If there's a certain type of program or certain types of subsidizing agency that they would recommend that we require then that might something we would look at.

Mr. Stuto stated that is exactly what we need and he wants it to go to the right people because there are a lot of ways around it, where you can make a balance sheet look pretty interesting and the next thing you know, you're qualifying for a benefit that is laughable once you take a look at what that person is actually worth.

Mr. Pearce stated that the CPC is definitely on board with not allowing someone with deep pockets get an affordable home.

Mr. Wallner asked if they can build in local preference as criteria.

Mr. Pearce stated that they've done that in the past, but doesn't know what the mechanism is for it, now and we do have local preference in our senior housing.

Attorney Latham stated that he believes that there are some local preferences allowed. He wants to be careful that they're giving affordable units that the town can actually use and that they comply with the DHCD regulations lines and state and federal.

Mrs. McKnight stated that they do allow local preference, generally, but they don't allow 100% local preference. She thinks 70% to 80% local preference is allowed, to do for most of the government.

Mr. Wallner stated that when you go to the Select Board there should be some maps, so they can see what you're talking about.

Mr. Wheeler stated that they have maps and plans that they can share to give some perspective.

Mr. Lawrence Reeves presented the plans for review.

Facilities Master Plan appointment

Mrs. McKnight stated that she recently received communication from Abby Hurlbut on the Facilities Master Plan Committee. Mrs. McKnight wanted to discuss this again because we don't have a representative for the committee. That committee has not been meeting for a while because of the Covid restrictions, but it looks like they're going to be able to get some work started on questions relating to the fire station, so they're looking to start meeting again if you're ready to appoint someone that would be great. If not, she will go to the meeting and report back to the CPC.

Mr. Wallner stated that he had a two hour discussion with Abby yesterday and they went through a lot of things. Her priorities are 1) renovation of the fire station 2) intergenerational community center and 3) town hall. These are the three most probable targets for activity from this group.

Mrs. McKnight asked if she wasn't doing the Master plan.

Mr. Wallner stated that she said they only do one building at a time, so no, it doesn't sound like she's ready to get started on the other two buildings.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she thinks Abby was talking about evaluating the fire station first and we're still talking about the Master plan, but not taking any action on any individual building. We're talking about assessing.

Mr. Pearce stated that he talked to her a while ago about this and were discussing something else, and we started talking about that, and then they spent another hour talking about everything that is going on, but they were not doing anything about it, there was not going to be any meetings, no plans. So, the fact that they may be focusing on one item doesn't surprise him.

Mr. Wallner stated that this was news to him too, but then Abby told him they've already run up a bill of \$31,000. And they've already been pulling engineering drawings and doing things, so apparently they've been working in the background.

Mr. Pearce stated that we've been working with advocates and trying to see if there was any movement that we could stick our plan into, but I guess Mr. Wallner tried the same thing and got the same result.

Mr. Pearce stated that he would try to go to the meetings, but he needs to be reminded a few days ahead.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she would also attend the meetings.

Mr. Carroll left the meeting

CPC budget

Mrs. McKnight stated that she didn't really adjust too much, it's very close to last year. She has to clarify the EDC budget because the way it's presented it looks like they spent a lot of money, but they didn't – these funds were funds for the housing services office. She did ask for \$5,000.00 to have the subdivision and site plan review regulations reviewed by an engineering firm who's helping the town engineer with the stormwater permitting because they felt that we needed to update those and she really doesn't think that we can do that on our own.

Minutes

Mr. Hayden moved seconded by Mr. Rudloff and voted 3-0: (Mr. Carroll absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to approve the minutes of December 15, 2020 as written.

Adjournment at 10:31PM

Respectfully submitted,
Ryan Carroll, Clerk

