

**PLANNING BOARD**  
Minutes of September 17, 2014

**ATTENDEES:** Arnold Rosenblatt – Chairman, Sally Wilkins – Vice Chairman, Gordon Leedy, Cliff Harris, Michael Dell Orfano, Richard Hart – Conservation Commission, John D’Angelo – Ex Officio, Marilyn Peterman – Alternate, Allen Merriman – Alternate, Colleen Mailloux – Community Development Director

**ABSENT:** Eric Hahn – Alternate

Arnie opened the worksession at 7:30.

**DISCUSSION:**

The goal of tonight’s worksession is to discuss incentive bonuses for provision of amenities within a development. The Board reviewed a table that included housing types, unit types and amenities and incentives that a developer may receive for providing desired amenities. Michael indicated that the purpose of the table is to be definitive about what baseline densities are allowed and what density bonuses and other incentives will be provided.

The Board reviewed the flow chart and Marilyn discussed the application flow: discussion phase, site specific feasibility, optional CUP/workforce housing review, CUP/site specific feasibility formal application submission. A discussion took place on the difference between a conceptual review and a design review under the RSAs. The subcommittee proposes a process that allows the Board to have a discussion with the Applicant and to make a determination of what is in the best interest of the Town. A discussion followed of the flow chart and the process.

Colleen indicated that Town Counsel Drescher recommends that any negotiation of density and developer allowances be based upon clear, concrete requirements. Michael discussed the form which would be used to quantify a developer’s proposal on a property. The Board will set a baseline of incentives. For a proposed project in the right circumstances, location, infrastructure, the Board needs the flexibility to allow dense development. The proposed incentive chart and conditional use permit will allow for that. A discussion followed regarding a project being entitled to density versus it being site specific. The intent is for these criteria to be waived on site and project specific basis. The density is a bonus not a baseline. An example was given of a large house in the village on a .25 acre lot. If the house can be converted to four apartments safely and sensibly, it is a high density project, but the Board would like the flexibility to evaluate projects on a case by case basis.

Rich stated that the flow chart will not be easy for developers to follow and it should not be a handout. The flow chart is intended as an administrative tool. Alan stated that for each step in the process there should be expected input and output. It should be explicit what needs to be submitted for a conceptual discussion, what degree of engineering is needed for a design review, what will be accomplished at each step. For a conceptual discussion, the Board would want to see an overall plat, delineation of the net tract area, fundamentals. Sally stated that a concept could be a rough standard grid, wetlands, rough topography. The first step is very high level, more engineering is done within the design review phase.

46 The Board discussed including site walks in the process. If a site walk is done and the Board feels the  
47 site is not appropriate, adequate mitigation will be necessary in order to get a desired density. An option  
48 for the site walk should be considered in the flow chart. The point of the flow chart is a guide to think  
49 about the process as a whole and is an administrative tool that will stay with the planning director.

50  
51 The Board reviewed the proposed density allowances and possible minimums and maximums. A  
52 developer needs to have an expectation of what they will be allowed at the beginning of the process. If  
53 the process is overly complicated, no one will use it.

54  
55 John expressed concerns about the flow chart. Inputs and outputs would be useful in the flow chart.  
56 Generally the output is agreement on a direction or what the developer is bringing to the table and what  
57 bonuses they receive because of it.

58  
59 Marilyn stated that the process envisions that two or three development types (Senior Housing,  
60 Affordable, PRD) could be included in the same proposal. If a PRD was submitted with some elderly  
61 units, some conventional units and some workforce housing, this would allow the Board a mechanism to  
62 handle such a proposal.

63  
64 Cliff likes the concept of the flow chart and asked how does this lead to the next step. At what point  
65 does the applicant have a commitment from the Board? Under the proposed process, there is  
66 commitment at the CUP approval, and then final engineering, design and site plan approval is required.

67  
68 The aim of the subcommittee at this worksession is to define the minimum criteria for what is allowed  
69 under the CUP. Gordon stated that the function of the Board is not to design the project or to negotiate  
70 design but to review the project for conformance with criteria. Arnie agrees that flexibility in the hands  
71 of a regulatory body is not a good thing. Criteria should be set and the Planning Board determines if the  
72 project complies. Form based codes are an alternative to accomplish what the Board is intending.

73  
74 The Board discussed the spreadsheet and there was a consensus that the baseline density should be what  
75 is allowed by zoning for each type of housing. Is there a maximum density that should be allowed?  
76 Rich stated that there should be some density cap. Sally recommended small bonuses so that the  
77 incentive can be cumulative. The Board discussed which incentives were priorities. Colleen  
78 recommended that the Board focus on concrete numbers, offer incentives that are easy to quantify and  
79 measure.

80  
81 The Board discussed, given the current zoning schedule, the Board could move forward with legislation  
82 to move senior housing out of the special exception category and into CUP and could move forward  
83 with the current workforce housing ordinance or wait one year to refine the language. Arnie suggested  
84 that the senior housing amendment is an easy fix, the workforce housing language is more challenging,  
85 and the innovative housing ordinance umbrella process needs additional review. It was recommended  
86 that the workforce housing language will be reviewed by the Board for the next worksession. Colleen  
87 will review and revise the senior housing language and provide draft language for the next worksession.  
88 Colleen will also address consistency between net tract area definitions and other housekeeping  
89 amendments.

92 **OTHER BUSINESS:**

93  
94 **2015 Zoning Amendment Schedule** – The Planning Board reviewed alternate schedules for public  
95 hearings in accordance with the SB2 Official Ballot Town Meeting deadlines for proposed zoning  
96 amendments. The following important dates were no  
97 ted:

- 98 • Monday, November 10, 2014 – First day to accept petitions to amend the zoning ordinance
- 99 • Monday, December 1, 2014 – Planning Board proposed amendments are posted
- 100 • Wednesday, December 10, 2014 – Last day to accept petitions to amend the zoning ordinance
- 101 • Wednesday, December 17, 2014 – Planning Board Worksession, 1<sup>st</sup> Public Hearing on Board  
102 proposed amendments
- 103 • Tuesday, January 6, 2015 – 1<sup>st</sup> public hearing on petitioned amendments (if any)
- 104 • Wednesday, January 7, 2015 – Planning Board Regular Meeting, 2<sup>nd</sup> Public Hearing on Board  
105 proposed amendments
- 106 • Tuesday, January 20, 2015- 2<sup>nd</sup> Public Hearing on petitioned amendments (if any)

107  
108 Arnie asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

109 Cliff made the motion with Gordon seconding; all were in favor and none were opposed.

110 Meeting was adjourned at 10:15pm.