

Regulations Committee Meeting

February 21, 2019

Minutes

Present: Michael Rossi, Alan Kravitz, Mary Ellen Dahlgren

Public: Mike Milano, Carrie Allen (left at 7:00)

Called to order at 6:30 pm

Discussion

New section 12.4 Planned Neighborhood Development (PND) Draft from John

General comments:

This is so general that it doesn't really just apply to the west end.

General is this a floating zone or a set zone.

There is a desire for some sort of preliminary plan that would include the phases. The process is lacking at this point in the regulation proposal.

Architectural review is needed to get the look the town is needed. Can this be a requirement for PND? Does it need to be in a village district?

Specific comments by section.

12.4.3 (a) We may not want public streets within the area to be required to have lower-level commercial uses. This could lead to many private or cul-de-sac roads that would impede the village atmosphere this type of development is trying to promote. We would still keep the requirement on Route 1.

12.4.3 (f) The limit on the number of bedrooms to an average of 1/75 may be too strict. This would essentially eliminate the chance of developing 3 bedroom units. This might impede the construction of condos in the development and just make it rental residences. Not clear how this impacts the 2 family structures called out in 12.4.3 (b). We would like feedback from our Planner on examples of this type of density.

12.4.3 (m) (1) The maximum of 75% impervious surface seems high, but would allow greater density (parking). It would have to be offset with some open green space within the development

12.4.3 (m) (2) The 3 story building height option would require elevators and sprinklers. It is not clear if this would be a plus or a minus in the calculations of developers. The sprinklers could bring down insurance cost enough that they are not prohibitive.

12.4.3 (n) Parking. This section give developers a lot of room to work in. is it too general or do we want this to promote the development?

## Clinton Planning and Zoning Commission

12.4.3 (q) This section on Open Space should have the language from the subdivision regulation be brought in that discuss the composition of the deeded open space compared to the entire property. As written it could just be unbuildable land that is given. This space does not contribute in any way to the 75% impervious maximum.

12.4.3 (r) The text has common green space as encouraged. The consensus was that it should be required and not limited to residents of the development.

12.4.3 (r) (2) It is not clear what is meant by “reflective areas.” This need to be clarified by the Planner.

12.4.3 (r) (4) Do we really want public pools to be an option in these developments?

12.4.3 (t) Should any part of this section be moved to the green space provisions. Sidewalks shouldn't but what about pathways?

12.4.3 (t) (2) We need a definition from the Planner for pedestrian paths that distinguishes them from sidewalks.

12.4.4 Requirements. Design standards should be added to this section.

12.4.5 Procedures. It would make sense to add the requirement for a preproposal for these development.

Adjourned at 7:50 pm

Submitted by Michael Rossi