

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES - JULY 1, 1991

Present: A. Schweikert, M. Donaroma, B. Bryant, L. Jason, J. Greene, J. Best, T. Sullivan, M. Colaneri

Mr. Schweikert called the meeting to order at 5:26 p.m. He noted the reasons for the meeting and that the applicant had brought a revised plan. He asked for constructive discussion to help the applicant.

Ms. Bryant noted the improvement of two storys vs three storys. Mr. Jason questioned the extreme cost of construction.

Mr. Hutker and Atty. Ament discussed the cost of the construction of each unit..Atty. Ament explained how the reservation and spending program of HUD worked. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of the off-site road improvement costs and whether HUD would fund that issue followed.

Atty. Ament noted that he had a letter from HUD indicating that the MVC fee would not be paid by HUD. Ms. Greene asked if there was any further word from HUD on other matters. Mr. Clifford noted that there had been no response as of yet.

Mr. Jason questioned whether there could be any condition that would cover the cost of doing business. Mr. Ament discussed how the applicant would approach HUD with any MVC approvals. Mr. Jason noted for the record that Island Elderly had done nothing wrong but questioned why they had abandoned a good plan (Hillside) for a new design. A discussion of the differences in funding criteria and programs followed. Mr. Hutker discussed the many conferences with HUD and how HUD used their program guidelines to determine design criteria. A discussion of this matter followed.

Ms. Bryant discussed the location and the differences between the Hillside Location and design and this proposal. Ms. Cage discussed the social implications and interactions of the proposal. She questioned the locations of storage on each floor and the potential use of the basement. Several persons questioned the possibility of a laundry on each floor. A discussion of this issue followed. A discussion of the locations of possible trash containers followed. Ms. Cage noted that the large basement space had no natural light and questioned whether it were possible to get such. The response was potentially to the rear.

Ms. Greene felt sky lights should be added to the second floor for natural light.

Ms. Cage discussed the drop-off area and possibly redesigning the

parking area. A discussion of a single entry and the reasons therefore followed.

A discussion of the emergency loop of prepared hardened base with grass which now circled the building followed.

A discussion of the maximum distance from the front door to most distant apartment followed.

Ms. Cage questioned the maintenance garage. Mr. Ament noted that the room would be a community use and not maintenance. A discussion of possible uses of the same followed.

Ms. Cage discussed the various doors shown on the plan and the potential uses of each. She asked where the maintenance uses would be. The response indicated a small shed possible. A further discussion of the egress doors from the second floor and access to the first floor followed. A discussion of the redesign of the stairways on the ends of the buildings followed.

Mr. Fauteux discussed access accessibility. Atty. Ament felt the points were valid and would be addressed. A discussion of these items followed and the need to make all first floor entrances accessible. Mr. Jason suggested similar conditions to Hugh Taylor (DRI).

Mr. Fauteux discussed making the mail boxes flush. Al agreed. He further discussed making the meeting room kitchen and the public restrooms accessible. The applicant noted the same.

A discussion of a galley kitchen instead in the meeting room followed. A discussion of the size of the units and the number of windows per room followed. The applicant to check.

Mr. Fauteux discussed the number of handicapped washing machines available. Applicant agreed to address issue. Mr. Fauteux further discussed the need for a sidewalk to the main road or at least a separated black top area to Edgartown Road. Ms. Bergstrom discussed the usage of the path to the roadway. A discussion of the matter followed. Mr. Colaneri felt that the road needed to be paved and that the sidewalk was absolutely necessary. He felt that not having any funds was a poor excuse and the cost was minimal compared to the total cost of the project.

Mr. Schweikert raised the issue of placement of conditions and the impact on the applicant. A discussion of the procedures for relief from MVC discussion followed. Atty. Ament indicated the possibility of other fundings sources for some of the items mentioned.

Mr. Colaneri further discussed a reconfigurration of the parking and driveway. He noted that driving through a parking lot was

hazardous. A discussion of this matter followed. Atty Ament discussed issue of sidewalk; the issue of the loop. He asked for requirement of sidewalk but problem of drive to door is not a matter of practicality to alter. Mr. Hutker read a number of HUD rules regarding this matter. A discussion of the number of parking spaces provided followed. A discussion of the parking layout followed. A discussion of the possible splitting of the parking area and conditioning that there shall be no through drive to the next lot whenever built.

Mr. Ament discussed energy efficiency. He read a letter from the architect regarding the making of this proposal more energy efficient. Mr. Best questioned the HUD regs regarding incentives for alternative energy. Ms. Greene wanted to be sure the windows are able to open for ventilation. They open according to the applicant. Mr. Fauteux questioned the use of individual air conditioners. The response was yes.

A discussion of individual heating and lighting bills followed.

A discussion of any potential future sale of complex followed. Atty. Ament noted the proposal could be only for a 501C3 project regardless of who owned the project.

A discussion of many small items followed.

Mr. Jason raised the issue of possible haircutting or beautyshop uses in the area. Ms. Bryant hoped that the activities in the complex would be tenant oriented and made to feel like it was home. A discussion of a tenants association followed.

Ms. Greene asked to see a copy of a tenants association document; its membership and whether there has been a member of the tenants group on the board of directors. Mr. Fauteux discussed this matter further. A discussion of a number of issues related to this matter followed.

A discussion of conditions related to this matter followed. A discussion of voting power followed. Mr. Schweikert suggested a group which could represent all tenants of the complex and a mechanism to air complains. Ms. Greene suggested a group similar to a board of trustees to be representatives of all tenants to meet with Island Elderly Board of Directors to discuss issues. Ms. Bergstrom discussed this matter at some length. She agreed that there should be a mechanism for the tenants. Mr. Fauteux discussed the association and its function.

Mr. Colaneri asked about conditions. Mr. Schweikert indicated that there had been certain recommendations but wished to wait before reviewing them until all matters had been aired. Ms. Greene questioned the need for basic items being offered in a small store for those who could not get out. A discussion of the issue and

what might come from the O.B. Board of Appeals.

Ms. Bergstrom discussed the future program meshing of the Island Elderly Housing and the E.C.A. and how these programs may match. A discussion of this matter followed.

Ms. Bryant stressed the need to be tenant oriented. A discussion of the routing of the "van" now and in the future followed. A discussion of the "store" proposal followed. Mr. Hutker discussed the size of the room potentially for use as devised by the tenants. Mr. Colaneri discussed the numbers of uses being proposed for the space available. Ms. Cage discussed the elderly adult day care and the numbers of persons potentially being served; frail elders now being served out of Edgartown. She cautioned that making the building so self contained that the tenants would not go out side was bad. A discussion of the usage of common spaces be left to the tenants followed.

Ms. Greene asked what size community rooms are acceptable to HUD. Mr. Hutker indicated that he would find out.

A discussion of how a tenants organization might function followed. Several opinions were voiced. Mr. Schweikert indicated that all should think about this issue.

Mr. Clifford questioned how some one would take the trash out and get back in without using the front door. Mr. Hutker indicated that it would be a management problem if all doors were usable. A discussion of using space in the center of the building followed. The architect would be questioned.

Mr. Best questioned the usage of the end stairs and that they did not make much sense. He discussed the fact that there should be a better design for usage of these stairways. A discussion of meeting state building codes and HUD requirements with respect to non-skid bathtubs and other safety amenities followed. Mr. Hutker suggested leaving it up to Mr. Lowe, the architect to meet all requirements.

Mr. Best suggested questioning HUD regarding energy efficiency and the need to address this matter now.

Mr. Jason suggested approval for 45 units with conditions and allow latitude to work with HUD.

Mr. Schweikert suggested making formal conditions at the next meeting rather than this time. All agreed.