

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES - October 1, 1990

Attendance: Bob Morgan, L. Jason, E. Eber, J. Green, T. Sullivan

Bob Morgan, Chairman of the Committee opened the meeting at 4:40 P.M.

A very brief discussion of the status of Spring Cove Realty and the reason why it was not being discussed at this meeting. Mr Morgan explained that the proposal would be discussed at the next Commission meeting.

Checklist Review

Mr. Morgan discussed the status of where the review was at this time. The Committee discussed in general terms which of the items on the current Checklist had been covered.

A discussion of item number one on the current checklist followed. The Committee decided to continue and then return to each of the items for reevaluation prior to presenting the checklist to the full Commission. A discussion of this matter followed.

The Committee now discussed item #10 (on the list of J. Schilling). A discussion of how to eliminate the issuance of permits for a house from being sent back to the Commission followed. A discussion of the concerns the Committee regarding the wording followed. The Committee agreed to use the proposed wording which included the addition of the words "denied" and "amended".

Mr. Jason noted that the Commission needed to be sure that the decisions should be clearly written to indicate that development permits for items such as houses, pools, tennis courts did not have to be sent to the Commission. A discussion of this matter followed.

The Committee then discussed item #11 it was noted that certain parts of this proposal come from the Cape Cod Commission checklist. The wording was acceptable to the Committee.

The Committee then discussed item #12 - the wording was to remain unchanged.

The Committee then discussed item #13 - the thresholds in the present checklist was a point of concern. Mr. Morgan raised a question of the possibility of a sliding scale for this item. a discussion of this matter followed. A discussion of the various means that have been used to avoid the DRI process followed. A discussion of the use of traffic generations in downtown areas and square footages in other areas followed. A discussion of the use of criteria and sub-criteria to judge proposals followed. Mr. Morgan discussed the issue of the 1,000 sq. feet being a possible obstacle to small businesses. A discussion of using traffic generation as a criteria followed. It was noted that in certain cases the Commission has waived traffic studies for small businesses and wastewater studies in some cases where does not appear to be an issue. A discussion of the return to a 3,000 square foot threshold followed. The discussion returned to the use of the 1,000 square feet.

A discussion of the possible use of parking spaces as a threshold followed. Mr. Morgan suggested that the staff attempt to put some ideas together with respect to traffic generation. Mr. Jason felt that the Commission should be looking at proposals that would require a new curb cut or a variance from Board of Health regulations - multiple use. A discussion of the suggestion followed.

A discussion of some of the past Commission decisions followed. A discussion of proposals that would reduce the number of square feet on a site being DRIs followed. The Committee finally agreed that multiple use proposals should be a DRI. Other criteria agreed upon were curb cuts and variances from Board of Health regulations or Title 5. A discussion of cumulative square footage followed. A discussion of the use of parking areas of 6,000 square feet or greater followed. A discussion of the use of the 1,000 square footage criteria followed.

A discussion of the inclusion of storage space in the calculation of square footage followed. A discussion of the calculation of gross floor area followed. It was again suggested that staff attempt to prepare criteria from what had been discussed.

Mr. Jason suggested that perhaps there should be some wording contained in the checklist that would indicate that there were exemptions to the checklist. The suggestion met with favorable responses. A discussion of how the procedures of same would work.

A discussion of the procedures for drafting of DRI decisions followed. A discussion of the use of cross-town referrals when proposals did not fall under any other criteria followed.

The Committee postponed any further discussion and adjourned the meeting at 6:37 P.M..