

## FALMOUTH PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 2009, 6:30 P.M.

FALMOUTH TOWN HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tony Calcagni (Chair), Bill Lunt (Vice-Chair), David Fenderson, Stan Bennett, Jay Moody (Associate)

**ABSENT:** Bernard Pender

**STAFF PRESENT:** Ethan Croce (Senior Planner)

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 pm.

Jay Moody was designated as a voting member for the meeting.

### 1. Approval of March Meeting minutes

Bill Lunt moved to approve the minutes, Stan Bennett seconded. Motion passed 5-0.

### **Administrative Action Items**

**2. Ion Design** – 75 Clearwater Drive – Request for site plan amendment for wall signage for “Mercy Falmouth Internal Medicine”. Parcel TV-2 – Tidewater Village. Tax Sheet 320; Map-Lot R02-009-D. Zoned TMPDD.

**3. Thomas Woodruff** – 8 Kelley Road – Request for re-approval of a private way to serve one lot. Tax Sheet 482; Map-Lot U01-211. Zoned RA, LR (Shoreland) and RCZO.

**4. Addison Capital, LLC** – 12 Northbrook Drive - Request for amended site plan re-approval of two-building office park. Tax Sheet 161; Map-Lot U59-010-A1; zoned BP & SP (Shoreland).

**5. Falmouth Foreside, LLC** – Foreside Road - Request for re-approval of amendments to the “Mussel Cove” subdivision. Tax Sheet 240; Map-Lot U12-003; zoned RA, RCZO & SP (Shoreland).

Stan Bennett moved to approve the items, David Fenderson seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

### **Agenda Items:**

**6. Falmouth Schools** – 74 Woodville Road – Request for site plan approval for development of athletic fields. Tax Sheet 300; Map-Lot R05-021. Zoned FF and RCZO.

Ethan Croce presented the key issues. The item was tabled at the last Planning Board meeting to address several issues and to divide the application into two separate applications, one addressing the athletic fields and the other addressing the wood chip boiler plant. One key issue is the applicants’ proposal to restrict parking along the access drive by the placement of boulders in the shoulders.

Tony Calcagni asked about the extension of the roadway off the cul-de-sac toward the athletic field.

Ethan confirmed that it was there in the last application.

Bill Lunt asked about the three proposed tennis courts – these would be approved by this application, but that they would not have to be built. He wanted to know if another entity, like a non-profit or

another town entity, built the courts if they would have to return to the Planning Board for another approval or not.

Ethan Croce said he didn't think so, unless the rest of the site had not been substantially completed within the two-year time frame allowed for site plans.

Jacques Gagnon, of Oak Point Associates, explained that they have attempted to address the changes from the previous meeting with this submission and he summarized the various changes that have been made to the plans since then.

Tony Calcagni asked about the extension off the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Gagnon said it was for emergency access to the fields, for ambulances, and to move equipment on and off the fields.

Public comment period opened: no public comment.

Stan Bennett felt they had done a good job addressing the concerns.

Bill Lunt agreed; he asked if they would have to come back before the Board to get approval for lighting the field and for a loudspeaker if they wanted to add those in the future.

Ethan Croce said yes; the loudspeaker is specifically called out on a plan and to change it would require Board approval; all lighting would have to come before the Board as well.

Ethan Croce read the proposed conditions of approval into the record.

Stan Bennett moved to approve the application, David Fenderson seconded. Motion carried 4-1 (Moody).

**7. Falmouth Schools** – 52 Woodville Road – Request for site plan approval for development of a wood chip boiler plant. Tax Sheet 300; Map-Lot R05-020. Zoned FF and RCZO.

Ethan Croce presented the key issues – there will be a net loss of three parking spaces as currently proposed; as the Board does not have the authority to waive parking requirements, the applicant should verify the adequacy of parking on the site. Secondly, the applicant should indicate the sufficiency of the turning radius for the wood chip delivery trucks.

Jacques Gagnon, of Oak Point Associates, spoke about the loss of parking spaces. They reviewed the site plan for the High School. At the time it was approved 260 spaces were required and 400+ spaces were created. This left 200 or so more spaces than required, so the loss of the three spaces will still meet the requirements. As to the turning radius, they have submitted an anticipated truck route for the delivery of wood chips, indicated on the plans.

Tony Calcagni asked if the narrower road will be used by the trucks.

Mr. Gagnon said it will not.

David Fenderson asked if the biomass will be delivered at night.

Mr. Gagnon said it would be delivered during off hours, and would be scheduled while parking lots were empty, either night or early morning.

David Fenderson suggested the prohibition of engine brakes in this area, as it is a residential area. He asked about emissions from the plant, dust and soot.

Mr. Gagnon said there is a collection system in the plant; the boiler does not emit soot that would cover cars and such. The boiler generates between 7-15 cubic yards of ash per year, or  $\frac{3}{4}$  cubic yard per week during the heating season. The ash is stored in 55 gallon metal containers and then transported off site.

Bill Lunt was concerned about the turning radius for the trailers. He thought it would be a bit tight for a 55 foot trailer.

Mr. Gagnon though it was 30 feet wide in that area; it is two-way traffic. This simulation was done with a 53 foot tractor trailer truck.

Bill Lunt asked how the trailer gets back onto Woodville; Mr. Gagnon said the same way it came in.

Stan Bennett thought it would have to be that way.

Bill Lunt was concerned about the islands being hammered by trucks.

Mr. Gagnon said they currently back 53 foot trailer trucks into that area of the school site, and don't use all the area proposed.

Bill Lunt asked if the whole area where the hash marks are will be plowed; Mr. Gagnon said yes.

Bill Lunt thought it should be stated somewhere that trucks will come in and out the same route.

Mr. Gagnon said it would be part of the agreement with the delivery company.

There was some discussion about how the trucks should exit the property, by turning left or right.

Diane Morebedo, traffic engineer for the project, explained that it is actually easier for the trucks to turn left out of the driveway rather than turn right. It would cause less disruption to traffic.

Bill Lunt asked for clarification; he thought deliveries would be during off hours.

Ms. Morebedo explained that off hours for the schools aren't necessarily off hours for commuters; deliveries could be at 6pm.

Bill Lunt asked where they would be coming in and when they could come out.

Mr. Gagnon explained that they could come either way, either from the Turnpike or from I295.

David Fenderson asked how often trucks would be coming.

Mr. Gagnon thought it would be one per week, or five per month during peak season. Deliveries are also made for food service, oil delivery and paper delivery.

Dan O'Shea, from the superintendent's office, explained the amount of deliveries per week.

Mr. Gagnon said he has spoken to the transportation department and Woodville Road is fairly quiet during off hours; trucks turning right out of the school haven't been as issue.

Public comment period opened; no public comment.

Stan Bennett said if the traffic engineer felt there was adequate room for the truck to take a left hand turn, he had no objection.

Bill Lunt felt that the trucks would not want to go to I295, but back out to Falmouth Road to get to I95. He wanted to make sure the turning radius was adequate for trucks to turn right out of the access road. He thought there would be changes to the road area when the site plan for the school site comes through.

Jay Moody agreed; if there was no problem with trucks turning right now, then he had no objections.

Bill Lunt stated his opinion that the site plan for the school site should have been submitted as a whole plan, instead of in pieces.

Ethan Croce read the proposed conditions of approval into the record.

The Board discussed how to handle regulation of the traffic pattern. Mr. Gagnon said they could submit an exit plan.

Bill Lunt asked if it was likely that this traffic pattern would change with the new school site plan.

Mr. Gagnon didn't think it would.

Jay Moody asked how the applicant thought the current circulation would be impacted by the new school site plan.

Bill Lunt asked about the access drive on the Cumberland side; he wondered if that would be a more logical road to bring in the wood chips.

Rob Tillotson, of Oak Point Associates, explained why this project was coming in pieces. The School Board requested the wood boiler be constructed this summer in order for the high school to benefit from its use without waiting for the elementary school to be built. The athletic fields need a year of growth before they are used. He thought the submission of the entire school site would be submitted within the next couple months, but it is not a complete application yet.

Bill Lunt stated that he was not prepared to vote for the application presented tonight as they are already discussing potential changes to the traffic pattern.

Mr. Tillotson said that they wanted to show the boiler plant as a stand-alone project.

Tony Calcagni felt that it could stand as a stand-alone.

Mr. Gagnon showed a conceptual plan which showed the complete build out of the new elementary school on the school site. He described the traffic pattern of the site, explaining that the access to the high school will not change very much. They are planning to submit a sketch plan to the Board within the next month or so.

Jay Moody thought the truck pattern looked doable.

David Fenderson thought if there was a change to the traffic pattern it would come back before the Board.

Jay Moody asked if the Board wanted to require a right hand turn onto Woodville.

Tony Calcagni didn't think so; that is how it is now, and they will have to look both ways anyway.

David Fenderson didn't think it made sense to restrict the wood chip trucks and not any other trucks.

Stan Bennett moved to approve the application, with the conditions as read by staff. David Fenderson seconded. Motion carried 4-1 (Lunt).

**8. Harold J. Goss III** – 463 Blackstrap Road – Request for approval of a private way to serve one lot. Tax Sheet 180; Map-Lot R08-012. Zoned FF and RCZO.

Ethan Croce presented the key issues for this application. For a private way of this length, a turnout is required to be shown on the plans. Also, Tony Hayes, town engineer has suggested that two 15" culverts be added to connect the wetlands. The applicants' consultant submitted revised plans today by email to the Planning office that showed those changes.

Jim Goss, applicant, stated that he didn't have paper copies of those revised plans with him, but he had seen the electronic copy and was agreeable to those changes.

Public comment period opened; no public comment.

Ethan Croce read the proposed conditions of approval into the record.

Bill Lunt moved to approve the application; Stan Bennett seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

**9. Falmouth Firehouse, LLC** – 234 Middle Rd. - Request for site plan approval for various site improvements. Tax Sheet 234; Map-Lot U23-002. Zoned MRSD.

Ethan Croce presented the key issues and summarized some of the changes made to the plans since it was last before the Board. The application was tabled at the previous meeting to address issues raised by the Board and staff. The applicant has submitted a lighting plan showing that they will meet the requirements of a residential area, as requested by the Board, but this plan does not account for the wall-mounted lights, and they should indicate their plans for that lighting. There has been no comprehensive signage plan submitted, so any signage for the property will have to come back before the Board as a site plan amendment, despite several "proposed signs" indicated on the plans.

Matthew Winch, architect, presented the application. Regarding the waiver list, he explained the rationale behind the request of a waiver on the use of a landscape architect, and they have moved the driveway in order to improve the sight lines entering and exiting the property. The applicant is willing to remove the one wire, which seems to be primarily a guide wire, and to relocate the second one to a more proper location. They have proposed 8 foot evergreen trees to provide screening for the adjacent properties and address the light concerns. Solid screen fencing is also proposed to cut off any headlights from spilling onto adjacent properties. They had a discussion with peer reviewer Tom Emery about the site of the fence in relation to the site entrance, ending it before the property line in order to not cut off sight lines. They have changed the original three-rail fence to a two-rail fence. In regards to the barn-red siding, they have changed the proposal from vinyl to natural material clapboard-type siding with a shaker red color. They will correct the miscellaneous detail notes as suggested by the peer reviewer. The lighting on the current plan meets the .6 footcandle requirement; they have not factored in the lighting at the entrance, and they are working with the manufacturers to incorporate those. They are not asking for approval of signage tonight; they will be back before the Board for changes in the current signage when tenants are established. The current signage can be taken done and replaced within certain parameters, according to the contract zone, and that is the only signage that would currently be considered for the property. They have provided a layout of the existing impervious surface, along with the new parking layout, showing no increase in the currently existing impervious surface.

Bill Lunt asked about discussions with the DOT regarding changes to the front of the site, which is on the Route 9 right of way.

Ethan Croce said he spoke with the Director of Public Works, and that since it is within the urban compact, the town has discretion over that right of way.

Jay Moody shared the concern; the property line is really the front of the building, and all the vegetated buffer and curbs are in the Route 9 right of way. He thought the applicant would need a letter from the State or the Town authorizing work in the road. He also asked about any shoreland zoning requirements along Scitterygusset creek, which is a fairly large creek.

Ethan Croce said that shoreland zoning does not extend that high. It goes up Norton Brook and Mill Creek, but does not include Scitterygusset. He showed Jay Moody the shoreland zoning map.

Jay Moody asked if there was anything in the ordinance for streams.

Ethan Croce said that there are buffering requirements, but they only apply to new residential construction, not commercial.

Jay Moody asked about the screen fence.

Mr. Winch explained the screen fence was on the last plan; it is 6 feet high, and designed to not allow light through.

Jay asked about the proposed uses.

Mr. Winch explained that the Zoning Board approved a mix of commercial/residential uses.

Jay Moody asked about the snowplowing in front of this building. He thought perhaps the Town or the State needs to weigh in on this.

Bill Lunt said that where they are filling in now will prevent parking in front of the building. He also felt that a letter from the Town allowing them to do this is necessary.

Mr. Winch said the planting proposed in front of the building was required as part of the contract zone approved by the Town Council and the Zoning Board.

Ethan Croce mentioned that the applicant will be bound to maintain any improvements that have been included in the plans, or they would have to come back before the Board.

The Board discussed how to address the issue of the landscaping in front of the building. Stan Bennett suggested a condition of approval for something to be added to the file confirming the right of the applicant to do this work; Bill Lunt suggested an easement from the Town.

Jay thought they were adding new curbing further away from the building, but Mr. Winch clarified that they are "connecting the dots" of the old curbing.

Tony Calcagni felt that it was not out of the ordinary to see landscaping in the Town ways in other parts of town, and easements have not been required in the past.

Bill Lunt asked if the design requirements that governed this site required granite curbing.

Ethan Croce said no; the Director of Public Works had asked that they change the curb plans from granite to bituminous to match curbing in the area.

Tony Calcagni asked about lighting.

Mr. Winch said they have been working with Tom Emery to remove the most southerly light pole, retain the three building lights to maintain the difference, and then leaving the pole mounted lights further in the parking lot. They are trying to keep the wattage down.

Bill Lunt asked about the cupola.

Mr. Winch said they have reduced the size of the cupola and have removed the weathervane.

Bill Lunt wanted the proposed signage removed from the mylar that the Board signs, for clarity.

Tony Calcagni asked about the fence that was reduced in height.

Mr. Winch said that it would be a two-rail fence, and more in keeping with other fences in the area.

Public comment period opened; no public comment.

Bill Lunt felt this was a great improvement over what was before the Board last month.

Ethan Croce read the proposed conditions of approval into the record. He suggested adding a condition to #4 removing the proposed signage from the plans, and adding #7 requiring a revised lighting plan be submitted showing the lighting from the wall-mounted fixtures and conforming to the lighting standards and the peer reviewer's approval.

Tony Calcagni asked about the landscaping in the right of way.

Steve Baumann, property owner, explained that they were requested by the Town to remove the pavement in front of the building and add a fence to direct pedestrians into the parking lot. He felt what was proposed would look a lot better and would be a lot safer.

Stan Bennett felt the application was fine with the conditions as presented.

Stan Bennett moved to approve the application; Bill Lunt seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

**10. Martyn Payson** – 177 Foreside Rd. – Request for private way amendment to amend approved plan notes. Tax Sheet 164; Map-Lot U14-039. Zoned RA and RCZO.

Ethan Croce presented the key issue. The applicant received private way approval in 2005; this approval simply created the private way without actually creating the lot. At the time a condition was attached to the approval requiring any further lots receive their access off of the private way and not off a driveway from the Road. The applicant is here to remove that condition, which would allow them to create a new lot without returning to the Planning Board.

Stan Bennett asked how many lots are there now.

Mr. Pearce, the applicant's attorney, explained that there is a multi-plex unit on the property.

Stan asked if they could get three lots.

Mr. Pearce said no, there isn't enough room for three lots and they would never get meet the conservation zoning requirements. The lot is approved for 7 condominium units. Mr. Payson does not want to build four more multiplex units but rather convey one lot, either to a family member or to a buyer, and allow the new lot to receive its frontage either off Route 88 or the private way. They would like to have the flexibility to build a house that conforms to the neighborhood. They want to remove the requirement that any new lot receive its frontage off the private way. He explained that they would have greater ability to create a building envelope that conforms to the neighborhood and complies with the required setbacks with a lot that had frontage on Route 88. He explained the setback issues faced by this lot if its frontage came off the private way.

Tony Calcagni wondered about a note allowing the front setback to come off Route 88.

Mr. Pearce explained that the ordinance says that in the case where a building is bordered by two streets, the front setback is determined by the street from which the home takes its frontage. They are asking for nothing more than the ordinance would typically allow. He has discussed this with Ethan Croce for the past few months, and this was the proposal that they felt best achieved the desired outcomes.

Bill Lunt explained that the reason it was approved this way was to avoid the closeness of two curb cuts off of Route 88.

Tony Calcagni wondered if it would fix the problem if they could remove the setback issue from this proposed new lot, and thereby remove the need for this approval.

Mr. Pearce said they want to avoid having to come back before the Board for one lot. If he decided to have a driveway come off that private way, the applicant would have to come back before the Board. They are not asking to relax any zoning standards.

Public comment period opened; no public comment.

Stan Bennett was comfortable with the application as proposed.

David Fenderson wondered if there were any other issues with the driveway, other than the curb cut.

Jay Moody referred to the excerpt from the Planning Board minutes of November 1, 2005. He thought the conditions were about more than the curb cut, but were put in place as part of a compromise at the end of those discussions with concerned abutters.

Bill Lunt thought the reason it was drafted in there was to prevent the owner from carving off another lot.

Mr. Pearce felt the requirement that was put in last time was put in under pressure from the applicants counsel. The private way was created to provide frontage to the multiplex out back with the intention of creating a front lot sometime in the future. The lot was not depicted because it didn't need to be. There is no requirement under section 5.27 to include that lot on the plan.

Tony Calcagni understood that the intention was to create the front lot, but he didn't think it was a burden to require the applicant to come back before the Board.

Mr. Pearce said that this is family property; they have been stewards of this property for five generations and they want it to conform to their family values.

Stan Bennett asked if there were any conditions on this approval.

Ethan Croce explained that the conditions of the previous approval would carry forward, with the requested sentence of Condition #1 deleted and general plan note #11 removed.

Stan Bennett moved to approve the application; David Fenderson seconded. Motion carried 3-2 (Lunt, Calcagni).

**11. (Item Tabled) Charles de Sieyes** – 185 Woodville - Request for approval of a fill permit for a pond. Tax Sheet 140; Map-Lot R03-031. Zoned FF and RCZO.

**12. (Item Tabled) Falmouth Rod & Gun Club** – 358 Gray Road – Request for approval of a fill permit. Tax Sheet 190; Map-Lot R09-059-A. Zoned FF and RCZO.

**13. Ridgewood Associates, LLC** – Falmouth Rd. – Request for approval of amendments to the 75-unit Ridgewood Estates Subdivision. Tax Sheet 310; Map-Lot R04-026; zoned OSRD.

Ethan presented the key issues. The applicant is first requesting to shift one of the units back 12 feet from the attached B4 unit; the staff have asked the applicant to describe how that shift would impact other site details. Secondly, the applicant has requested to move the mailbox to the pump house, and staff has requested that they describe the site distance from the driveway. Thirdly the applicant is requesting the following amendments related to the architecture of the project:

1. Switch to a one-door garage from a two-door garage for the units.

2. Addition of “Cedarwood” unit as a pre-approved unit design
3. Option to remove living space over garages
4. Addition of a one-story “Birchwood” unit.
5. Request for discretion to substitute smaller units in place of larger units with Planning staff approval
6. Request for the Planning Board to delegate certain authority to Planning staff

While there are requirements on design in this planned development, there are general standards in regards to providing a mixture of housing types, locating the open space and providing private outdoor space. Ethan Croce reviewed the 6 design revision requests submitted.

Peter Biegel, from SYTDesign Consultants, presented the application. He indicated the location of the B3 unit, and the approved location and the proposed location of the mailbox. He said that everything associated with B3, trees and a drainage swale, was moved back 12 feet. An extra 10 feet of clearing on the woodline would be required by this change. They used the wetland setback as a guide. The major trees would still be along the woodline. This change would provide the owners with a little more privacy as well as add interest.

Bill Lunt asked where that unit is in relation to the foundation that is going in right now.

Mike Payson, applicant, said the foundation going in is unit A2.

Mr. Biegel indicated on the plans which units are currently built, the unit proposed to be shifted back, and the unit whose foundation was just put in.

Bill Lunt asked if the foundations installed are one of the five proposed home designs previously approved.

Mr. Biegel indicated that it was.

Tony Calcagni asked if there was a peer review of the architectural layout.

Ethan Croce said peer reviewer Tom Emery reviewed the design units, more in regards to the outdoor living spaces and providing sufficient privacy than in regards to the architectural design.

Mr. Biegel indicated the existing pump house, with the hammerhead. They propose extending the hammerhead to install a circular turn-around so people could pick up mail easily. The proposed trees on the plan are already installed. Sightlines from this area are good. They want to move the mailbox simply because the owners feel this location would be more convenient.

Bill Lunt asked if all the mailboxes for the whole development would be there.

Jim Wescott, applicant, said yes.

Mr. Biegel presented the architectural revisions. They want to be able to use a single garage door on the Oakwood unit as opposed to a double door garage. It is designed as a large garage, 28x28, and they would like to narrow that by 4 feet and add that extra space to the living area.

Stan Bennett asked if it would still be a two-car garage.

Mr. Biegel said yes. Mr. Wescott said it would have a single, 16 foot garage door.

Mr. Payson said the footprints as designed are fairly large, and they want the flexibility to create smaller footprint homes.

Bill Lunt asked if the footprint would change.

Mr. Biegel said no; the Oakwood unit is a smaller unit and this would add flexibility to the floorplan. Bill Lunt felt the two door garage was to enhance the cottage look of the unit; the single door would look massive.

Mr. Wescott said with the panels it wouldn't look massive.

Mr. Payson said that they felt the garage as approved looks large in relation to the home; this change would make it better proportioned.

Bill Lunt didn't feel that changing the door would make it look less massive, as they are not changing the footprint. He felt the single door made it look larger.

Tony Calcagni asked if the roof above the garage would change.

Mr. Wescott said yes, it would be four feet shorter, and the home roof would be four feet larger.

Mr. Biegel moved on to the Cedarwood unit design. This unit was not approved as part of the original project, as the footprints for the project were larger than this unit due to market conditions at the time.

Stan Bennett asked for clarification on the design units. Owners could choose any one of the 6 unit designs for their lots.

Mr. Biegel showed a plan, which indicated which design unit footprints were approved for which sites. The locations of the unit types are part of the approval, but they would like the flexibility of subbing out smaller units, or units without living space over the garage, into some of the sites. If buyers want to sub out different designs than the footprint approved for a site, they would have to come back before the Board.

Tony Calcagni asked about the requirement on housing style diversity in this type of district.

Ethan Croce said it was an element of the OSRD, which has since been repealed. One of peer reviewer Tom Emery's comments at the time of the approval was in regards to there being no 1 story or 1.5 story units allowed, as the market was driving larger homes at the time.

Mr. Payson said that there are only 4 unit types shown on the footprint plan, as the 5<sup>th</sup> unit type, Oakwood, which is a one-story unit, sits on a Maplewood footprint. They are sticking to the same footprint plan, but they want flexibility to provide smaller units. The Cedarwood design is essentially a Birchwood footprint, without space over the garage.

David Fenderson thought the intention was to market these homes to older residents. He wondered if their intent has changed.

Mr. Biegel said that the design intent was always for professional, older residents and not for large families.

Mr. Payson thought the natural demographic was empty-nesters, late 40s and up. That is the kind of interest they are getting, people who are downsizing, and don't need backyards. They are not specifically targeting a particular demographic.

David Fenderson asked if the downsizing of the homes is to respond to market conditions.

Mr. Payson said yes; if people want 4,000 sq feet there is a design that is approved, but that a 1,800 sq foot home better suits the demographic.

Stan Bennett wondered if the varying footprint sizes mandate that there would be at least three different types of homes in the development.

Mr. Payson said actually there would be 4. They are requesting the flexibility to move to a smaller footprint, but they don't anticipate doing that very often.

Bill Lunt asked about the request for staff flexibility on approving changes to the plan.

Ethan Croce thought it was up the Board's comfort level as to what the staff could or could not approve. He listed the types of issues that might come up; currently the ordinance does not give the staff authority to approve *de minimus* changes, but at a question from Bill Lunt, he said the ordinance allows the Board to give staff that authority.

Bill Lunt would like to give someone the authority to get this project moving, as long as staff is comfortable.

Tony Calcagni thought there were two requests here – to allow a change between two units that share a footprint, and to allow them to downsize on the footprints. He thought it was okay as long as there was enough variety in the designs. If staff wasn't comfortable with a change, they could suggest it as an administrative action item. He went on to say that he was surprised that there was not an architectural review of the unit designs. He would like to see some kind of confirmation that the proposed sixth unit conforms with the other five.

Bill Lunt thought it was designed by the same architect.

Mr. Biegel confirmed that statement. He said the financing company stipulated a 2,800 sq foot minimum on the unit sizes at the time of the original approval.

Tony Calcagni asked if they were asking for any other unit types to move to a one door garage, or if it was just for the Oakwood unit.

Mr. Biegel thought it was for anyone who wanted it, regardless of unit type.

Tony Calcagni asked if they were changing the garage width for all the unit types.

Mr. Payson said yes, the idea was for smaller garages for all the units, and changing the rooflines.

Tony Calcagni wanted to somehow insure that all the units didn't end up with one garage door; he wanted to see variety among the units.

Bill Lunt asked if the staff approval they were looking for was Planning staff, and not Codes staff.

Mr. Biegel said that was correct.

Tony Calcagni asked how the Board wanted to address the request for staff approvals.

Stan Bennett suggested that any of the changes proposed here could be approved by staff, but any changes to a footprint would have to come before the Board.

Tony Calcagni suggested that in any instance when they wanted to substitute the Cedarwood unit, or remove the living space over the garage, they would have to present it for staff approval.

Ethan Croce requested clarification on the footprint change; would a smaller footprint than originally planned have to come before the Board, or only if it were to be bigger than the footprint planned.

Stan Bennett felt it should be any footprint change, up or down.

Mr. Biegel thought there were only benefits to scaling down to a smaller size footprint. He thought the only issue might be if all the footprints were scaled down.

Tony Calcagni thought the option was for staff to approve any smaller footprints as long as there was not too much uniformity in any one area, and have other changes come before the Board.

Stan Bennett would like to have the opportunity to see these changes as an administrative item; he thought the Board is handing out a lot of their authority with this, which they haven't done before.

Mr. Payson thought it would be an infrequent occurrence, as they have a variety of design units to meet people's needs.

Bill Lunt felt that they needed to be very careful to protect the variety of the units, as that was part of the negotiations around what was a controversial original approval. He thought they might want to come back with two or three different footprints. Any changes in the footprints approved for the sites should come back before the board.

David Fenderson asked about the relocation of unit B3.

Bill Lunt asked if they had covered all the requests in the proposal.

Mr. Biegel handed out design options that they felt people might want to have to make their units their own. The applicants want to remove the restriction on vinyl siding, for example. He wondered if these issues would be something they could address with staff or would have to come back to the Board.

Bill Lunt didn't see a reason to prohibit vinyl siding, and he felt the staff could cover that issue.

David Fenderson thought the client base is looking for a maintenance free home, and this was okay.

Mr. Biegel said they also want to offer roof mounted solar equipment.

Tony Calcagni asked where they want to put vinyl siding.

Mr. Wescott said they were envisioning it just on the second floor gables.

Mr. Payson said they are curious as to the process, in case some owner wants vinyl for the whole home.

Jay Moody felt the Board was perhaps not prepared to review item #6 tonight, as there are not specific proposed changes presented here.

Mr. Payson wondered how much a unit must conform to the approved elevations.

Jay Moody thought their request for staff approval of changes was too broad. They should have a list.

Mr. Payson asked if there was a list of approved design guidelines. He thought the only elevations that were approved for this project were the front elevations.

Tony Calcagni thought that maybe they should present the Board with some design guidelines to be peer reviewed. These guidelines would indicate what could be approved by staff, and what they could do without further approval.

Ethan Croce said that his review of the project file, which was approved prior to his time with the Town, showed that there were no approved design guidelines for this project. There was also nothing in the file that showed an architectural review of the designs by Tom Emery. Most of the focus seems to have been on the open space, and private space for the units.

Mr. Biegel felt that was correct.

Bill Lunt thought that some of the renderings from the architect had multiple elevations.

Jay Moody suggested that the Board make a decision on the mailbox and unit B3 locations, and that the applicants come back on their request #6.

Public comment period opened; no public comment.

Mr. Payson wondered if the intent of the approval was to provide the flexibility to the developer in connection with the designs by not specifically requiring design guidelines.

Tony Calcagni felt that the elevations were intended to be strictly followed.

Bill Lunt thought that having design guidelines with built-in flexibility would allow them to avoid coming back to the Board for administrative items.

Tony Calcagni requested that proposed design guidelines be peer reviewed before they come back to the Board.

The Board indicated agreement with the architectural requests 1-4. They discussed whether to approve those tonight, or have them incorporated into the design guidelines. Jay was interested in giving the applicants approval for those items in order to allow them to move forward without waiting for approval of the design guidelines.

Jay Moody moved to approve the following requests for amendments to the subdivision and site plan: the relocation of Unit B3 as shown, the relocation of the central mailbox station as shown, and the architectural revisions 1-5 as outlined earlier in these minutes and modified as follows: Planning Staff shall have the authority to approve the use of single garage doors as requested in revision #1 and the authority to approve the substitution of pre-approved dwelling unit types where the building footprint of the substituted dwelling unit is identical to the building footprint of the prior-approved dwelling unit indicated for that site on the color-coded plan presented before the Board tonight, as requested in revision #5. Stan Bennett seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Jay Moody moved to table architectural revision #6, pending further information. David Fenderson seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

**14. (Item Tabled) Hundred Acre Woods, LLC** – Blackstrap Rd. – Request for preliminary approval of Hundred Acre Woods, an 18-lot conservation subdivision. Tax Sheet 90; Map-Lot R08-059-002. Zoned Farm and Forest and RCZO.

Meeting adjourned 10:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa Tryon  
Recording Secretary