

Regular Meeting Minutes
May 23, 2023

Members present: Mark M. Schafron/Chairman, Robert J. Swartz/Vice Chairman, Robert J. Bettez, Sr., Paul A. Cormier, Stephen Cormier.--*Members*, and Trevor Beauregard/*Director-City Planner*.

Members absent: *None.*

Also present: Rob Oliva-City-Engineer, Christine Fucile-Administrative Assistant, Ronald Koivu-Harbor Classic Homes , Wes Flis-Haley & Ward, Peter Campobasso-Attorney for Harbor Classic Homes, Steven Rockwood, Mark Bowers, Robert Chicoine-*Gardner Residents*

ANNOUNCEMENT - Any person may make a video or audio recording of an open session of a meeting, or may transmit the meeting through any medium, subject to reasonable requirements of the Chair as to the number, placement and operation of equipment used so as not to interfere with the conduct of the meeting. Any person intending to make such recording shall notify the Chair forthwith. All Documents referenced or used during the meeting must be submitted in duplicate to the Director of Community Development & Planning pursuant to the Open Meeting and Public Records Law. All documents shall become part of the official record of the meeting.

Mr. Schafron, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

✓ *May 09, 2023*

Motion to approve minutes as presented.

R. Bettez/Swartz.

Vote: 5 – 0

2. NEW BUSINESS:

2.1 Concord Crossing Open Space Residential Development:

Wes Flis provided 7 plans for Attorney Campobasso to use for the presentation.

Attorney Campobasso, who represents Harbor Classic Homes, is seeking to file an application for an Open Space Residential Development project. Attorney Campobasso gave a brief recap of what has taken place so far and where he believes they are currently. Attorney Campobasso started with noting prior to tonight’s meeting, they have been actively involved in discussions with Mr. Beauregard as well as the Zoning Board with regard to variances for roadways. In addition, the pre-application conference and pre-application submittal has taken place in accordance to the open space procedure Attorney Campobasso commented they had a meeting several years ago where there was a preliminary discussion regarding an issue for the roadways with different zoning classifications, therefore went before the Zoning Board to get the variances to allow the entrances on both Clark Street and Century Way to be utilized for the Open Space. Attorney Campobasso pointed out they are now at what he considers to be the “pre-application” process, however, have not prepared the application for the open space special permit but hoping to finalize this to be able to do so. Attorney Campobasso continued to say in the pre-application discussion, had site visits so at the stage now where they are trying to discuss the different plans based on what they discovered at the site and what they think makes sense to come forth with a proposal. Attorney

Campobasso commented the purpose of the open space special permit is to preserve open space and if there are any historical or archaeological resources on the site, try to preserve these. Also, to protect municipal water supply, to promote common sense or sensitive siting of development in relation to the open space, and to have some type of harmony and flexibility with the lot. Attorney Campobasso further stated when they come in with the plan, they have to demonstrate certain things which promotes that purpose. Attorney Campobasso stated tonight they are hoping to walk everyone through how they arrived at the different plans, get some feedback to see what the Planning Board likes, and hope to come to some type of a consensus. Attorney Campobasso stated they have not checked every box yet but are in the process of doing that and believe they can give the Planning Board enough detail tonight to get some good feedback and hope to begin thinking about submitting the application.

1ST PLAN - EX 1:

Attorney Campobasso pointed out the first plan displayed which is an “Existing Conditions Plan” and noted wetlands have been flagged as well as the conservation/sensitive areas have been designated. Also, when the site walk was conducted, the Conservation Agent attended and there were some discussions about getting individuals out there. Based on the last meeting the landscape architect visited the site and had met with Mr. Flis. They are in the process of identifying existing trail system but do not have all of the exact locations of the trails as of yet because it is a big site with approximately 90 acres, however, was able to show different location points where the trail system goes into the project and runs through it, but will be identified on plan. Attorney Campobasso stated one of the things discussed and one of the things they have to do is show what a conventional plan looks like which is shown on the second plan in the packet provided.

2ND PLAN - CONV 1:

Attorney Campobasso stated according to the Zoning By-Laws, if a traditional subdivision plan were to be proposed based on the Subdivision Rules and Regulations this plan shows what a “preliminary” subdivision plan would look like showing roadway layout, lots, and lot sizes for the sole purpose of creating roadway, road utilities, and buildable lots that conform to the Zoning By-Law which this 2nd plan does. Attorney Campobasso mentioned if color maps were provided and they could overlay the preliminary, traditional/conventional plan over the site context map one could see where the location of all the wetlands and conservation areas are and where to stay away from to preserve and protect. Mr. Flis pointed out the wetland areas are shown with green lines and the buffer zone areas are shown with red lines on the plan.

Attorney Campobasso noted the fourth page of plans and said using the criteria that are established and set out for the open space by-law, this plan shows 87 units and all of these lots are per the dimensional regulations with 50 feet of frontage and 50 feet width, approximately 8,000 square feet of lot size which allow a proposal for residential units. Attorney Campobasso explained when doing the calculations, utilizing how much area needs to be set aside for open space, the lot size has to be a minimum of five (5) acres, and the maximum density is one dwelling unit per 40,000 square feet which puts it somewhere in the 93 unit area with minimum lot area of 8,000 square feet, minimum frontage 50 feet, and 50 feet width, front yard setbacks of 45 feet from an existing roadway, and 15 feet from a new roadway. The majority of the units will all be based on the new roadway so looking at no less than a 15 foot front yard setback and then have the sidelines as well. When looking at this layout, what it does is create the building envelope where units can be sited

on the lot based on the conservation areas that have been identified as well as the trail systems to preserve the land. Attorney Campobasso stated this type of layout with the lots conforming to the regulations probably is not the best design the applicant could come forth and promote, so they have some alternatives. Further, this plan shows 93 units with a mix of single family units and duplex units. The lots have larger frontage and duplex lots would have approximately 10,000 square feet in size above the 8,000 minimum, and anywhere from 80 feet to 100 feet of frontage, which provides for a mix, and it keeps all of the units outside of the environmentally sensitive areas as well as stays within what they think is the best building envelope area for the site. T. Beauregard asked what sheet they are looking at and Attorney Campobasso replied sheet three.

Attorney Campobasso pointed to sheet five and said it is the initial proposal or one of the preliminary proposals that was submitted that shows 76 single family units within the same building envelope area on the site. This one does have a 100 foot buffer between the new units in the boundary line for the condominium site below it. This plan is similar in size with the roadways straight and angled. Attorney Campobasso noted this plan was presented before they had any preliminary discussions with the landscape architect.

Attorney Campobasso continued and said based on the discussion they had the last time from the site visit there were some comments about making the lots a little bigger and providing better access to the open space, as well as creating alleyways with a regular mix of single family and duplex units. This is shown on sheet six and is still 76 units but a mix of 76 units. Attorney Campobasso pointed out the single family units which are in the outer part of the plan and in the middle section would be duplex units. Mr. Flis noted there are 40 single family lots and 18 duplex units. Attorney Campobasso noted this plan still maintains the 100 foot buffer between the boundary line with the condominium project as well as trying to create entrance ways into the open space from the different areas for people to get in with the intention of some parking spaces (*pointed on plan*) for other people that might want to get into the open space area.

Attorney Campobasso went to sheet six and said this is just a different layout based on some of the feedback which still has 76 units, with a mix of single family units and duplex units. This plan has an area in the middle showing an open space recreational area for the landowners where people could access into the open space, however, this plan does not have a 100 foot buffer between the units and the boundary line for the open space for the condominium project, which is the difference for this plan. Mr. Flis said there are still some parcels in the back of the single family houses there which are shown on this plan. Attorney Campobasso added as are the lots down on the entrance way to Clark Street where there are some separate parcels based on the roadway layouts.

Attorney Campobasso pointed to another conceptual layout with 78 units and all residential single family units right up against the boundary line with no buffer between the open space land and the condominiums. Mr. Flis noted with the last four plans, they wanted to show two different options, one with a 100 foot buffer and one without a 100 foot buffer, all single family and just a mix of single family and duplex, however, the applicants would prefer single family but from the last meeting there was a conversation asking to put a mix of duplexes in single family, so obviously using the mix they can make the lots a little bigger and add some benefit there with regard to the lot size, but less return on the investment with the duplexes for the applicant.

Attorney Campobasso stated those are the conceptual plans and essentially the building envelope is primarily in the same area. The significant differences are two variations that have single family units, two variations have single family units and duplexes, two variations have single family units up against the boundary line, and single family units and two family units up against the boundary line, so there is a number of plans which show the different types of layouts based on the feedback they have received to this point.

T. Beauregard

Pointed to the concept plan shown and asked what size the parcels are. Mr. Flis replied mostly 8,000 square feet with a frontage of 80 feet minimum for single family. The duplex lots would be more like 100 feet.

T. Beauregard inquired what types of homes would the client be proposing such as size and type. Mr. Koivo representing Harbor Classic Homes stated the square feet will be between 1800 and 2200 as well as a one to two car garages. Attorney Campobasso noted the duplex units would be approximately the same size with garages in front of the units.

T. Beauregard stated at the last meeting he spoke about potentially putting an alleyway along the rear to access garages to the rear of the buildings which is the way he has seen it done in other open space conservation developments where condo townhouse units are all done on a single lot and have access points to the rear of each one, basically alleyways so this way you have the front of the residential structures with green space in the front so there is no driveway access in the front.

T. Beauregard spoke of the single family/duplexes and asked what the frontage and lot sizes will be. Mr. Flis said he tries to keep the frontage at 100 feet and the lot sizes between 9,000 to 12,000 square feet depending on where they sat on the curb and where they sat adjacent to the open space. T. Beauregard said so the 9,000 square foot lot is 90 by 100 typically. Mr. Flis replied most of those are probably on the curb so it varied with frontage therefore it might have been like 75 foot frontage but fanned out to 125 feet to 130 feet on the back boundary because the curves are so sharp.

T. Beauregard asked if the garages for the single family units will be to the side of the house or to the rear and if they are attached garages. Mr. Flis said they are shown to the side of the house and are attached, but some of the grades may dictate garage placement.

Mr. Flis spoke of the trails and said the surveyor was out there last week to locate the trails and provided a sketch of the location of a major trail. Mr. Flis explained the trail actually crosses onto the subject property, crosses back off and then runs out and runs back in and then runs back out of the site and ties back into the location, so there was one real well-defined trail within the site that obviously would like to tie into that. Mr. Flis noted he will add these features to the plan before they submit the official preliminary plan to the Planning Board.

T. Beauregard noted all the work they have done with the plans as well as listened to the Planning Board's comments to actually incorporate a lot of their suggestions and recommendations, however all the plans are pretty much the same layout as was originally proposed to the Planning Board and asked what type of input have they had from the landscape architect to this point as far as how this open space residential development has been plotted out on this property since nothing has changed on the layout since hiring the landscape architect. Mr. Flis replied one area the landscape architect made sure they knew about is a decent ledge on the property so the landscape

architect suggested putting a couple gentle curves in the road. Mr. Flis added he did try moving the road to at least get the road construction away from the ledge as well as lay out the proposed paths. Courteous

T. Beauregard believes that ties back into the process of laying out the open space recreation plan identified in the Zoning Code spoken of in the past meetings which is identifying areas within the development that would best be suited for the development of the houses and then matching it up with a roadway system to access those houses in order to draw up the lot lines for those houses. Mr. Flis mentioned because of the clearing of the trees the previous owner completed, the landscape architect did not see any significant clumping of trees or anything of that sort, so when the landscape architect looked at where they are proposing the development he/she believes there are no areas within the development that he/she would not necessarily change, but just the area with the ledge. T. Beauregard stressed he believes the landscape architect should be involved with that but also thinks he/she should be involved with how the layout of the subdivision is on the parcel. T. Beauregard provided a copy of a conceptual layout plan from 2007 on this parcel which he came across in his predecessor's electronic files and thought they may want to consider for the sake of envisioning some of what he has been discussed in past meetings, which shows the trail system and common open space on the site. Attorney Campobasso noted it is good to have since it identifies the same type of environmentally sensitive areas because it also has some part in promoting some type of efficient design which eventually it is intended for the roadways to be turned over to the municipality so that is one of the considerations that needs to be taken in as well.

T. Beauregard thought if the parcels could be placed closest to Century Way back to the property lines and remove the 100 foot buffer it could actually bump out the loop a little bit to provide that necessary area between the duplexes for that access point so everything kind of widens out to get additional open space and more alleyway access points for the duplexes if that's the route the developer takes. Mr. Flis stated the reason he did not get into the open space as much in here (*pointed to plan*) is because previously it was the intent that open space generally goes to North County Land Trust as well as the 100 foot buffer which they were not excited about, so he was trying to limit the amount of open space that would go to North County Land Trust. However, did try to create a kind of green space or some kind of park for the residents to decide what they want to do there. Mr. Flis noted the alleyway as well as trying to reduce the amount of impervious space, but the suggestion of additional driveways behind all these units, basically another road that is not a road, creates additional pervious that typically being pushed away from this. Mr. Flis reiterated the Applicant would prefer to do single family instead of duplexes so possibly doing a shared driveway for every two units if the grading works, maybe with side entrances that would at least eliminate some of the driveways too so there is one driveway instead of two driveways. T. Beauregard said or maybe do some single family homes in the middle parcels. Mr. Flis replied what they were trying to provide is different variations and if the open space needs to be in another section they can do that as well. T. Beauregard commented there is a lot of parcels on top of each other without any type of break up for the area being developed.

Mr. Schafron noted the half acre open space dead center and asked if the landscape architect had any particular vision for how it would look. Mr. Flis replied the Applicant wants to leave it up to the residents that move in and work with their Association to decide what they want to put there. Attorney Campobasso stated it makes more sense to leave it up to the owners to figure it out because it is going to be their money that will be paying for maintenance and insure it.

Mr. Schafron directed to Attorney Campobasso and Mr. Flis and said he appreciated them taking the Planning Board's suggestions to heart incorporating some open space, alleyways to reach the space in the back, making some of the lots sizes larger, however, he would like to see more involvement from the landscape architect and how this is actually being laid out and suggested the landscape architect meet with the Planning Board about their thoughts and input on this beyond identifying the conservation areas, the ledge, and trails. Attorney Campobasso added what they have on the site is really a mix of logging/cutting roads that the previous owner/owners were using to go out there to cut timber as opposed to the real existing trail system that is up in the back which would become a question of getting the landscape architect's input on incorporating the logging roads and trailing system to get to the existing trails. Mr. Schafron questioned if the landscape architect would be getting into the actual layout of lots or anything like that. Attorney Campobasso replied the landscape architect will. Mr. Schafron stated he would like input from the landscape architect on the designs and take it from there, but said they are getting closer.

R. Swartz questioned their intentions by putting duplexes in with a mixture of single family homes. Attorney Campobasso answered primarily it is based on some of the feedback received from some of the Board members, and the regulation does allow or provide for a mix of residential options depending on what type of residential units are available in City and what might be more affordable for certain residents or people moving into the City, so it really would be based on preference by the Planning Board. Mr. Swartz and Attorney Campobasso discussed why a person would prefer a duplex over a single family home and thought it could be price point or first time buyer which offers a better mix of housing for the community. T. Beauregard asked if this has anything to do with the unit count. Mr. Flis replied yes economics of the project.

Mr. Schafron thanked them and suggested they continue with their liaison Mr. Beauregard as well as he would like to see one more round with the landscape architect present so the Planning Board can have discussion with this particular individual about their plans. Mr. Schafron added he and the Planning Board appreciates their continued cooperation and their work on this.

T. Beauregard noted the next Planning Board will be June 13, 2023, and asked if there would be any openness to bumping out the back road as another concept to open up the development a bit beyond where the back lot lines are. Mr. Flis noted the 100 foot buffer and Attorney Campobasso said his impression was the representative from North County Land Trust was not happy with the 100 foot buffer. T. Beauregard added she did not see much value in it from an open space standpoint. P. Cormier said personally he feels the buffer is a good idea because once that is built you will never get that piece of buffer back. T. Beauregard stated he believes the buffer will have to be maintained by the land trust but people will end up using it as their back yards, but does think a buffer is a good idea and suggested possibly reducing the buffer to 50 feet instead. R. Oliva suggested keeping the buffer and if they wanted to put a trail in for the residents it can be kept under the residents' homeowner association.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS~~NEWS~~ARTICLES~~EVENTS:

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 13, 2023 at 6:30 p.m.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn.

R. Bettez/S. Cormier.

Vote: 5 – 0

The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

All documents referenced or used during the meeting are part of the official record and are available in the Department of Community Development and Planning pursuant to the Open Meeting and Public Records Law.