IPSWICH PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, September 1, 2016, 7:30 p.m.

Pursuant to a meeting notice posted by the Town Clerk and delivered to all Board members, a meeting of the Ipswich Planning Board was held on Thursday, September 1, 2016 in Room A, 2nd floor of Town Hall. Board members Heidi Paek, Keith Anderson, Jim McCambridge, Kathleen Milano and Jay Stanbury were present. Associate member, Carolyn Britt, arrived at 8:24 PM. Senior Planner, Ethan Parsons, also attended.

Paek convened the meeting at 7:30 with a quorum present.

Citizens' Queries:

None

Adopt Minutes of June 23, 2016 meeting

Stanbury noted a typo on page 2 where "furniture" should read "future".

Anderson moved to approve the minutes as amended. McCambridge seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents: Draft minutes of June 23, 2016 meeting

Request by Ipswich Country Club, 1 Country Club Way, for minor modification to 1987 Open Space Preservation Zoning Special Permit

Bob Landers and Doug Thayer for the Country Club appeared before the Board. Paek explained the pump mechanism for the waste water treatment plant needs to be brought up to date as soon as possible. Thayer and Landers explained that the leeching field pumps have valves that are failing. They are shocking people who are working on them. They will be moved into a building that will be built in an open spot up against the leach field. The MA DEP has jurisdiction and has issued an approval of the design. Paek asked if the homeowners association has any input, or at least the nearest abutters. It was explained that the homeowners association was behind this project. Thayer said there is an architectural review committee and they have approved the design.

Anderson moved this is a minor modification. Milano seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Anderson moved to approve the minor modification. Milano seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- *Email from Pamela Merrill, MA DEP, to Donald Martinage, re. Ipswich Country Club Final Leach Area Repair Revised Drainage*
- *Ipswich Country Club Plot Plan, prepared May 14, 2016*
- *Plan; Elevation, Section, Framing; prepared by Robert May, Jr., August 3, 2016*
- *Letter from Thayer & Associates, Inc., re. Description of Repair Project at the Existing Final Leaching Field, 8/17/16*

Request by Pamela Casey to extend the temporary certificate of occupancy for a Site Plan Review project at 23 Old Right Road

Pamela Casey appeared before the Board. She said she was hoping to be able to tell the Board that the project is done but due to the drought the landscape improvements have been put on hold. She said the detention pond has been cleaned out as requested and it drains properly. She is looking to have the landscaping done at the end of September to mid-October. Paek said the Board is sensitive to the environmental needs and is understanding of the need to limit outdoor watering at this time. There is a water ban in effect. It makes sense to have another extension of the temporary certificate of occupancy. Paek said the Board meets again November 10th and it makes sense to extend until around this date.

Stanbury moved to extend the temporary certificate of occupancy until November 15th. Milano seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents: Letter from Pamela Casey requesting extension of temporary c.o. at 9/1/16 meeting

Continued Public Hearing: Request by Keith Hinzman for a special permit for the proposed conversion of an accessory structure into a dwelling unit at 132 County Road (Assessor's Map 54A, Lot 020B), which is located in the Rural Residence A District, pursuant to *Section IX.P* and *XI.J*, of the Zoning Bylaw

Karen Morad, owner, appeared before the Board. Paek explained a site visit took place and the Board received a letter from the applicant proposing a payment of $7,500 to the Affordable Housing Trust in order to satisfy the requisite community benefit under Section IX.P. Anderson felt it was a nice building and recognized the foundation needs some work. He didn't notice any negative effects to abutters, and he said he has no issues with the proposal. Paek said her only issue was with the driveway and the potential for more vehicles having to back out onto Route 1A. She felt this would be somewhat dangerous, and asked if there was any plan to allow vehicles to turn around on the site. Morad said the septic system would be abandoned when they connect to the sewer, opening up the possibility of adding a turn around area in the current of the leaching field. Paek said that she would like this area noted on the site plan prior to occupancy. Paek asked for public comments. There were none. Stanbury asked if the Affordable Housing Partnership had reviewed the proposed payment. Parsons said it had not. Anderson had a concern about the public benefit of this project. Paek explained the Board has never approved an amount less than $10,000. She would like to see this payment be $10,000 if the Board was in agreement. Anderson reminded the Board that it is proposing changes to the payment in lieu amount to make it a minimum of $15,000. He noted that the applicant's letter also suggests that they may rent the unit at market rent or let family use it. Because of this a $10,000 payment would be appropriate. Anderson felt this project was more of a guest house and he is on the fence about whether he could support the application. Milano felt a previous application had part time family residency. Paek said other units have had part time family use but there are affordability restrictions in place in case the units were not occupied by family. Parsons said he did not talk to the Housing Partnership about this because the timing of meetings hadn't allowed it before this meeting. Parsons clarified that the applicant proposes a payment in lieu of an affordability restriction, which would allow them to rent it or use it for family without any affordability restriction. Stanbury worried the Board would set a bad precedent if it approved a $7,500 payment because the intent of the community benefit requirement is to create affordable housing. Milano felt they needed to be consistent with the fee or make the unit affordable. Stanbury agreed. McCambridge said this creates another unit where housing is scarce in town. Anderson asked if the parking layout could be reexamined in case this unit is occupied by anyone other than family.

Anderson moved to close the public hearing. Milano seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Parsons read the draft decision. Paek requested that the third line be changed to the owners of 132 County Road. Parsons would strike the line "would be occupied by family members of the owners". Parsons emphasized condition 5, which ensured the lot could not be divided to allow either of the buildings on a separate lot. Parsons would add a requirement that the site plan have a turnaround added to it. Paek requested it be closer to the street. McCambridge asked where in the bylaw the Board had the authority to consider driveway changes. It was noted that safe and convenient circulation is a special permit standard in Section XI.J. Paek asked that the final plan was approved by the Planning Department.

Stanbury moved to approve the special permit as presented with the requested changes. McCambridge seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- *Letter from Karen Morad to E. Parsons, 8/29/16*
- *Architectural Plans, prepared by KWH Design, 7/18/16*
    - *CS1.1- Site Plan/Cover Sheet*
    - *A1.1- Floor Plans*
    - *A2.1- Exterior Elevations*
    - *A2.2- Exterior Alterations*
    - *A9.2- Existing Photographs*
    - *A9.1- Volume Study*

Continued Public Hearing: Proposed zoning amendments for Special Town Meeting: amendments to housing and sign regulations and miscellaneous amendments

Paek explained this is the third public hearing on these matters. There was no one present from the public to comment. The Board needed to settle on final language tonight. Parsons walked through the changes made by staff since last week. Paek struggled with a paragraph under footnote 11, she is not sure this is correct. The word "unless" means the Board will not allow increased density unless the affordability is there but that is not the case as the Board may allow increased density if there is a recreational benefit. Paek suggested omitting this sentence. Stanbury also found the clause confusing. McCambridge agreed. Parsons would strike the sentence. There was a discussion about reducing a payment if a developer elected to make a unit affordable even if not required to for a development of fewer than ten units. Milano asked if the Board may need to create a formula. Paek explained this is only for the cases of nine units or less. Anderson wanted to take out the word "eliminate". Paek did not want to have the wording "eliminate the payment" and she felt this may put the Planning Board in the position of having to defend a fee from the beginning of a project. The Board decided that McCambridge would work with Staff to rewrite the sentence to make it clearer without changing its meaning. The Board agreed the word "eliminate" had to be removed. For the proposed amendments to Section IX.P, under paragraph B, applicability, the Board noted it is seeking to add protections for abutters. This is the first time they are proposing lot size requirements. Anderson suggested the minimum lot size for a conversion project should be 10,000 square feet. Milano said she is not in favor of making a dense area, the IR District, even denser and would also like to see the minimum lot size be 10,000 sq. ft. The Board decided to propose that the minimum lot size for a conversion candidate be 10,000 sq. ft. McCambridge said he came up with a proposed sentence for the footnote 11 question. He read it and the Board accepted it. The Board discussed the clarification of the allowable size increase for conversion projects. With regard to the infill housing changes Paek said she is

wondering if the language should require that the subdivided lot be split into two equal sized lots. Parsons said they had to think about lot size and existing building setbacks, but the intent was for the lots to be equal in size. He said that staff could develop language to require this. The Board agreed this would be a good idea. Stanbury suggested saying the divided lot would not be within 40% of the original lot size. McCambridge said that number seemed arbitrary. There was further discussion about requiring the lots to be similar in area. Paek recommended Parsons make color changes to the proposed infill map so everything was more distinct.

Parsons said he mainly made formatting changes to the proposed sign regulations article. Stanbury said he feels strongly that intermittently illuminated signs should be prohibited. Right now this is allowed by an exception and this was discussed at length by the Board. It was agreed to move internally illuminated requirements out of section I and move it under the special permit section. Anderson still had a problem with the setback of 10 feet, thinking it was too great. Parsons explained why he felt this was reasonable. Anderson said he would be willing to move forward with it as proposed.

Miscellaneous changes were discussed. The definition for mixed use/residential had been made more clear. Paek questioned whether the amendment would prevent residential uses on the ground floor. Parsons explained that residential is not currently permitted on the ground floor and it is not proposed to be allowed. Anderson said that has always been intended and felt the paragraph should remain as written. Paek agreed. Hearing no further comments Paek asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Stanbury moved to close the public hearing. Anderson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Stanbury moved to recommend the three articles for zoning amendments to the Board of Selectmen for inclusion on the Warrant with the changes discussed. Anderson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents: Draft Articles for Special Town Meeting- Housing, 8/22/16 draft; Signs, 8/18/16; Miscellaneous, 7/1/16

New Business

Parsons explained that he and Glenn Gibbs met with an attorney from a company called Varsity Wireless and the company is interested in pursuing a wireless communications tower at 265 Topsfield Road, which is not zoned for that use. Gibbs and Parsons felt the optimal way of proceeding was to ask Town Meeting to rezone 265 Topsfield Road as this would allow the applicant to apply for a special permit and propose a use that Town Meeting could consider. He said this parcel makes sense for this use because it is close to Turner Hill and there has been knowledge of poor service in this area for many years. Parsons said he doesn't have any project details and at this point the proponent is only asking for signatures in order to file a citizen's petition to amend the Zoning Bylaw and Map. Paek suggested Parsons leave the petition at the table and after the meeting members could sign the petition if they so choose. McCambridge had concerns about how people would view the Board's opinion on the project if they signed the petition. It was explained this should be viewed at this point as the Board supporting a democratic process not an opinion of a potentially forthcoming project. Anderson also said that it could create a negative perception if the first signatures on the petition were those of Planning Board members. Parsons said he would leave the petition on the table after the meeting.

Paek suggested the week of October 3rd the Planning Board should meet to practice presenting the articles to Town Meeting. It was suggested the Board meet October 3rd at 6PM in the Planning Conference Room.

Stanbury said there's been some discussion in town about adding a crosswalk from the River Walk to the Green across 1A. Stanbury said he would like the Board to consider writing a letter to the Selectmen advocating for this crosswalk. This is a public safety issue and it is a dangerous crossing. Anderson wanted to also include the crossing by the train station and this was agreed upon. Paek and Stanbury will submit a letter to the Selectmen.

Adjournment: *Anderson moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:05. Milano seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Dionne

The Board approved these minutes on November 10, 2016