

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES - JULY 8, 1991

Present: J. Greene; I. Jason; A. Schweikert; J. Best; B. Hall;
M. Donaroma

Alan Schweikert, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 5:24 p.m. He called upon R. Goodell for his revised parking plan. Mr. Goodell submitted two plans; one showing the necessary parking and one showing the revised parking if there were an easement given. He also discussed the exterior lighting.

Mr. Schweikert noted that the plans were in response to the conditions put forth in the decision.

A discussion of the type, direction and need for area lighting followed.

Mr. Clifford discussed the design of the parking area and noted that there would be problems if the easement were taken from the property due to the shape of the lot and the location of the building. He discussed having the easement on the abutting property and thereby leaving the applicant with room for parking. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of the number of spaces provided and the number required by the Zoning By-law followed.

Mr. Goodell discussed the relocation of a utility pole and the relocation of the sign plus a realignment of the driveway.

Mr. Clifford noted that there was a concrete pad and suggested that it be used for motorcycles. Mr. Goodell agreed.

A further discussion of the potential of a future access road to the rear of the property followed.

The LUPC indicated that they would take the proposal to the full Commission.

ISLAND ELDERLY HOUSING

Attorney Ament distributed copies of what he interpreted as the conditions. He then proceeded to discuss each individually.

Attorney Ament noted that all conditions were related to the two-story structure. He discussed that all entrances would be accessible except those leading to the stairwell.

Ms. Greene discussed multiple windows for corner units. Attorney Ament discussed the fact that wherever there were corner units there would be windows.

He discussed laundries on the upper floors and the problems associated therewith. He discussed the advantages and disadvantages.

He then discussed the handicapped accessible washers and the number of units of each. He discussed the requirements of the Architectural Access Board. Mr. Donaroma questioned the reasons for not wanting additional accessible units. A discussion of this matter followed. A discussion of the means of handling and dealing with the trash issue followed.

Ms. Greene questioned what were the alternatives to having additional machines and how could one serve the needs of those using if it were broken. She discussed addressing the needs of the potential tenants and not the needs of HUD.

Ms. Bergstrom discussed this matter further with respect to maintenance and repair of the units.

Mr. Fauteux discussed the loss of assistance through state funds and how the rights of the handicapped needed to be addressed. He discussed the past history of accessibility at Hillside Village. A discussion of this issue followed. Attorney Ament discussed the guidelines for such issues. A discussion of the numbers and the costs of same followed. A discussion of placing the laundry in the basement followed. A discussion of who could use which machine followed. It was a consensus that there would be two handicapped and two regular machines. Mr. Jason discussed the issue of having laundries on each floor and felt that they were best in the basement. Ms. Greene disagreed and explained her opinion. All present discussed their own views. Mr. Fauteux expressed his concern. There seemed to be a majority feeling for the basement. Mr. Fauteux explained what the present set up was.

Attorney Ament discussed the issues of flush mailboxes, handicapped kitchens in the meeting room areas. He discussed the possible use of a maintenance garage as a community room. He discussed the possibility of not finishing the rooms as community rooms until certain funding be obtained. A discussion of this matter followed. Ms. Greene suggested that any condition related to this matter be written so that if the area were not used as a maintenance area that it be used as a community room for the residents of the complex. All seemed to agree. Attorney Ament further expanded on the structural integrity of the room. Mr. Fauteux discussed the issue of handicapped access. A discussion of the usage of the various handicapped bathrooms followed.

Attorney Ament discussed the potential for area-way windows for natural lighting in the basement. A discussion of this matter followed.

Ms. Greene asked to have all corner apartments have extra windows.

A discussion of what type of condition would best serve to provide windows in the basement followed.

Ms. Greene asked that HUD be queried on energy saving. A discussion of this matter followed.

Attorney Ament discussed the issue of a sidewalk. He discussed the problem with off-site improvements. He discussed the purpose of the sidewalk and where it would go. A discussion of the width of the access road followed. Attorney Ament discussed the cost of such improvements.

Mr. Best questioned whether there could be sidewalks on the property. A discussion of funding on-site improvements followed. A discussion of road width followed. A discussion of paving of a 25-foot roadway followed. A discussion of the consideration of what may occur in the future on the abutting lot and its relationship to the width of the roadway followed.

Ms. Greene asked that the community gardens be sited to make best use of the light. Mr. Jason suggested contact with the Horticultural/Agricultural program at the High School to have some free work done.

The location of the dumpster and recycling bins were discussed. A discussion of two dumpsters followed. It was suggested that the Board of Health site the dumpster.

A discussion of the issue of tenant members on the Board of Directors followed. The applicant did not feel tenants could be designated by the MVC. He discussed the IRS rules regarding these matters. A discussion of the need for communications between tenants and directors followed. Mr. Clifford expressed a concern for the MVC interfering in the internal affairs of another organization. Ms. Greene noted that she felt there should be a tenants association which would meet periodically with the Board of Directors and not with management. A discussion of this matter followed. A discussion of the formalization of such tenant/directors relationship followed.

Attorney Ament offered to provide to the MVC a written statement of policy which affords the tenants a regular opportunity to discuss matters with the Board of Directors and to present their concerns. A discussion of a tenants association followed. Mr. Fauteux discussed the need for communications between both parties. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Hall suggested a simple grievance procedure might work and noted that if there was a policy in place, a simple copy of that policy being submitted would suffice. A further discussion of this matter followed. Attorney Ament discussed two or three meetings per year to discuss matters with tenants. A discussion of the operations of IEH followed.

Ms. Greene explained what the Commission was seeking. Mr. Best further discussed the issue. A discussion of the creation of some mechanism followed.

Attorney Ament offered that the sponsor will invite all tenants to meet with the Board of Directors not less than two times a year. A

discussion followed. Mr. Jason noted that if it was standard policy now then a simple statement for the file would suffice. A discussion of whether it should be a condition or not followed. A discussion of this matter followed.

Ms. Bergstrom discussed the mechanism for communication. Attorney Ament discussed the possibility of the need for a constant reminder. Mr. Best discussed how the IEH might deal with the issue of meetings and discussed how he saw some of the problems. Mr. Hall urged a formalized statement of the policies used. He discussed how the Commission has dealt with associations such as homeowners and tenants. A discussion of this matter followed. Ms. Greene asked for a copy of the present policy and asked to have a grievance procedure added. Mr. Hall suggested offering the formalized procedures and submit for review. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of revision of the parking area followed. Mr. Clifford offered an alternative which seemed to meet all of the objections. A discussion of this matter and whether there could be something less than full paving followed.

A brief discussion of skylights followed. It was noted that the possibility of adding them in the future existed due to the construction.

A discussion of the location of bathroom fixtures followed. A discussion of the conflict of HUD regulations and a better design being needed followed.

A discussion of making some issues recommendations rather than conditions followed. Ms. Greene questioned how utility bills were dealt with. A discussion of how the utility bills are paid followed. Attorney Ament discussed the methods of payments.

A discussion of making more bathrooms handicapped accessible in the future followed.

Ms. Bergstrom asked for the conditions as soon as possible. Mr. Schweikert indicated that there would be minutes available for the Board of Directors to see.

A discussion of procedures leading to future meetings and a decision followed. A discussion of which recommendations would be put forth to the full Commission followed.

Mr. Clifford explained how some of the conditions may be worded and how some of the items may be handled in the future.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.