

## IPSWICH PLANNING BOARD

### MEETING MINUTES

Remote Meeting using ZOOM

Thursday, June 24, 2021

7:00 PM

Pursuant to a meeting, notice posted by the Town Clerk and delivered to all Board members, a remote meeting of the Ipswich Planning Board was held on Thursday, June 24, 2021 using ZOOM. Board members Mitchell Lowe, Jeffrey Anderson, Carolyn Britt, Kevin Westerhoff, Toni Mooradd and Helen Weatherall were present. Staff, Ethan Parsons, was present.

Britt convened the meeting at 7:02 PM with a quorum present.

Britt requested an acknowledgement of attendance for all members present. She noted the PB members that were present as well as Town staff Ethan Parsons, and minute taker Odile Breton. Britt welcomed new Planning Board member Toni Mooradd.

**Citizen Queries:** None noted

**Continued Public Hearing: Request by Sarah L. Winderlin for a Special Permit to construct a new four unit building as part of a multifamily development and incorporate the existing two-family and accessory conversion units into the multifamily development at 87 High Street (Assessor's Map 30D Lot 12), which is located in the Intown Residence and Rural Residence A Zoning Districts, pursuant but not necessarily limited to Sections V.D, VI, VII and XI.J of the Zoning Bylaw**

Weatherall is a voting member on this application. Sarah Winderlin (applicant), Ken Savoie (architect) and Lisa Mead (attorney) were present. Mead made a presentation and noted the application was modified to request constructing two additional units to the site. Mead reviewed current conditions of the property, which consists of a two-family building, a single family home (referred to as the barn home) and a workshop/studio. The proposal is to convert the workshop to residential use and to construct a new two family building for a total of five units. She noted the lot is 51,640 total sq. ft. divided by the IR and RRA zoning districts. There is no proposed change to the existing two family.

Mead said there is no definition of conversion in the zoning bylaw. Mead reviewed the dimensional requirements under footnote 11. She noted the new units will be rental units and are two bedroom units. She reviewed Town benefits from the project and the special permit criteria.

Savoie reviewed architectural plans and elevations of the proposed two family structure. He said the driveway will be 16 feet in width to comply with requirements.

Britt commented on the scrutiny of dense development within the Intown Residence districts. The Board is taking to heart the interpretation of the zoning bylaw. She noted that the density bonus afforded an applicant for converting a shed doesn't seem to fit the intent of the bylaw.

Britt asked if the new special permit criteria is applicable to this application. Parsons said the water conservation measures do apply. Britt noted the presentation referred to the consistency of the project with the Housing Production Plan and said there are other plans to consider: Community Development Plan, Climate Action Plan and other issues to consider. Britt said the Board review of the application will look to minimize fossil fuel use and adequacy of utilities.

J. Anderson commented on the conversion. He asked what the Town is getting for the bonus. The Town is not getting a loss in traffic or parking density. The project is taking an individual use studio that has no traffic or retail component and making it residential use and gets to build two additional units. He does not believe that is intent of the bylaw. The justification of the density is a concern.

Lowe commented on the conversion. In the bylaw, under Section IX, subsection P is for conversions of accessory buildings into residential units. Lowe read the section of the bylaw and said the project does not comply.

Weatherall said Anderson and Lowe articulated her concerns. She is concerned about community detriment.

Westerhoff said the scale of the project is more appropriate by going from 7 units to 5 units. He does see the benefit with adding housing stock.

Mooradd said she is on the same page as Anderson, Weatherall and Lowe. She asked about affordable units and payment-in-lieu. Mooradd said there is no tie between what was already approved for the site and the current application. Saying there is only an additional 508 sq. ft. being added from what was already approved does not make sense. It's not an appropriate comparison.

Mead said the project will be in compliance with water conservation standards. Mead noted Footnote 11 does not cross reference special permit provisions or Section IX.P. The application is under Footnote 11 and Chapter 9, section p is not applicable. Mead noted it is an option to provide affordable housing units or make a payment to the Affordable Housing Trust (AHT). A payment of \$40,000 will be made.

Weatherall said density is a concern. She appreciates the architectural design. The Town has traffic issues and High Street area has historical value.

Britt asked if the parking spaces are visible from High Street. Savoie said cars will be less visible from street. The driveway has to be wider because it is a fire department regulation. Britt summarized items brought up during the hearing: concerns of conversion, criteria 7 of special permit (water mitigation), and utilities (electrification and use of other utilities).

Parsons suggested an extension because the public hearing opened on April 1, 2021 and the next meeting is on July 15, 2021.

Britt requested the applicant to extend. Winderlin agreed to extend. Lowe noted the engineer and design review is required and will take time.

**Public Comment:**

Joanne Tuttle, 103 High Street, said the neighbors are not happy with the multi-family development.

Cara Connors, 93 High Street, said a letter was emailed to the Planning Board and asked if members read it. Weatherall and J. Anderson confirmed reading the letter. Connors is concerned about development and said other properties are maintaining their green space and minimizing traffic.

*Mooradd moved to extend the application review period and continue the public hearing to July 15, 2021. J. Anderson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

*Documents: 6/16/21 submittal including letter from attorney Lisa Mead to PB and updated schematic plans prepared by Savoie Nolan Architects, 6/16/21*

**Continued Public Hearing: Request by C & J Reality Trust for Site Plan Review at 57 & 59 Mitchell Road to construct a new industrial building and expand an existing industrial building, with associated increase in parking and site work at 57-59 Mitchell Road (Assessor's Map 21, Lots 18R & 108), located in the Industrial District, pursuant but not necessarily limited to Sections V, VII and X of the Zoning Bylaw**

Larry Graham (H.L. Graham & Associates) was present for the applicant. He noted the receipt of an initial peer review report on drainage. As a result of the peer review comment, changes to the site plan were made. The changes will enable a more compliant stormwater management plan. Graham explained the changes were due to overflow of storm water. He said the infiltration basin increased in size to address the overflow. He is still working on the plans and will be ready to present at the August 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Architectural plans were presented. Graham noted Building 1 is one story. Westerhoff asked if parking is sufficient. Graham noted some parking spaces were lost for the drainage plan.

Graham said the landscaping plan and feasibility study for solar need to be submitted. Parsons stated an extension is needed and suggested the date of August 6, 2021. Graham said he has authorization to extend.

No public comments noted.

*Lowe moved to continue the public hearing to July 15, 2021 and to extend the application review period to August 6, 2021. Westerhoff seconded. The motion passed with 3 votes (Westerhoff, Lowe, Britt).*

*Documents:*

- *Permit Plan Layout, prepared by HL Graham Associates*

- *Renderings showing massing and layout prepared by Savoie Nolan Architects, 6/3/21*

**Continued Public Hearing: Request by ANFM Realty LLC to modify the 1/3/2019 special permit for 51-61 Market Street and the 8/22/2019 special permit for 21 Market Street, by meeting the Inclusionary Housing requirements for both projects by providing the required affordable units at 15 Market Street, and to modify the 9/22/2011 and 9/27/2018 special permits issued for a residential mixed-use building, to add only a second floor and not build offices, at 15 Market Street (Assessor's Map 42A, Lot 214), located in the CB District, pursuant but not necessarily limited to Sections V, VII, VIII, IX.I and K, and XI.J, of the Zoning Bylaw**

Parsons recommends continuing as Frank Pasciuto was not present.

*Westerhoff moved to continue the public hearing to July 15, 2021. Lowe seconded. The motion passed with 3 votes (Westerhoff, Lowe, Britt).*

**Continued Public Hearing: Request by 108 Central Street LLC for a special permit and site plan review to create 6 units in a multifamily development at 108 Central Street (Assessor's Map 30D Lot 75), which is located in the Intown Residence District, pursuant but not limited to Sections V.D, VI, VII, X and XI.J of the Zoning Bylaw**

J. Anderson is recused. Weatherall is a voting member for this application.

Parsons noted the applicant was not present and the extension is through June 25, 2021. Parsons spoke with Mike Becker and suggested he withdraw the application. Becker did not do so. Parsons recommended denying the application and cited Section XI.J in the bylaw for support to deny the application. Parsons said the application is incomplete and noted there is no site plan, no resolution with the Conservation Commission, and no stormwater management plan, among other deficiencies.

*Westerhoff moved to deny the application based on Section XI.J (2) and (3) of the bylaw and Lowe seconded. The motion passed with 4 votes.*

### **Discussion: Special Town Meeting Fall 2021 Zoning Priorities and Proposed Regulations Revisions**

Parsons presented a memo to the Planning Board dated June 24, 2021. The memo includes a schedule of meetings and dates for specific actions.

There was a discussion for balancing development in Town. Parsons reviewed proposed changes to Footnote 11, specifically for the IR district. He noted more work needs to be done on establishing boundaries for conversions.

Weatherall said Footnote 11 serves no benefit in the IR and suggested a re-write.

Lowe said the Housing Production Plan (HPP) recommends housing increase in Town because of infrastructure but conflicts with the residents not wanting density.

There was a discussion on removing Footnote 11. Parsons provided examples of lots in Town and what is allowed with Footnote 11 to demonstrate the impact of the density bonus.

Parsons discussed article 2 for Infill Housing. He suggested controlling the size of the house by instituting a floor area ratio. He also suggested having the Design Review Board (DRB) review proposed houses.

Parsons reviewed article 3 Certain Accessory Apartments by-right. He suggested making accessory apartments easier to do. He said there are limitations and can only be done with a single family home.

Parsons reviewed article 4 Incentive for single family development in IR with affordability benefit. Currently, if a multi-family development seeks three units, all units must be in one building. The proposed article would allow design flexibility for three units; a single family home plus a two-family home. This would be limited to the IR district.

Parsons noted a Board special meeting to discuss proposes articles on June 28, 2021.

### **Adopt minutes of May 13 and June 3, 2021**

Parsons noted no minutes were ready but he will have them for the next meeting.

### **Announcements/New Business**

None noted.

### **Adjournment**

*At 9:36 PM Mooradd moved to adjourn. Lowe seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

Meeting notes taken by: Odile Breton

Accepted on: July 15, 2021