

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MINUTES - OCTOBER 7, 1991

ATTENDANCE: Schweikert, Jason, Sibley, Colaneri, Sullivan,  
Donaroma, Best

Alan Schweikert called the meeting to order at 5:23 P.M.

There was a brief discussion of the public hearing regarding the Standards.

Mr. Clifford raised a question regarding the use of a new form for staff reports. A discussion of the possible use of the sheet as a cover for the staff reports and usable for the review followed.

A discussion of the usage this summer of the MVC map followed.

Mr. Clifford noted that the letter from Leo Convery had been distributed in fairness to Mr. Convery and because it was the only comment received following the public hearing. A discussion of this matter followed.

A discussion of the Standards and Criteria followed. A discussion of the procedures of the hearing followed. A further discussion of specific items regarding the Standards and Criteria followed.

Mr. Schweikert asked for discussion of the affordable housing policy.

Ms. Greene and Ms. Sibley indicated a favorable response to the last page dealing with commercial aspects of development.

Mr. Jason suggested a change on the first page of the draft - from "may" to "shall".

Mr. Clifford explained the reasons for some of the items contained in the draft. A discussion of on-site vs. off-site provision of lots followed. Mr. Best discussed his feelings on this matter.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the issue of penalties for off-site provision. A discussion of special circumstances followed.

Mr. Best questioned the reasons for the 20% number and discussed his feelings. Ms. Sibley discussed the matter of equivalent value.

Ms. Sibley discussed the phrase "satisfactory to the Commission". A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Clifford discussed alternative wording or the rearranging of certain paragraphs. A discussion of the meanings of various words and phrases followed.

Mr. Jason discussed the background of the 20% figure and why it was chosen.

Ms. Sibley discussed the need for money at the Housing Authority.

Mr. Colaneri questioned how an applicant can fall under the special circumstances. A discussion of this matter followed. A discussion

how negotiations may occur followed. Mr. Jason noted that offers made by the applicant were not negotiations but offers and should be considered as either acceptable or not acceptable.

A discussion of listening to offers that are creative and

beneficial followed.

Mr. Best discussed the revision and the issue of equivalent value and should this be a part of the matter. Mr. Colaneri discussed the issue of on-site vs. off-site and whether on-site was more beneficial.

A discussion of this issue followed.

Mr. Schweikert discussed the issue of doubling the number of lots for off-site provision. A discussion of requiring on-site vs. off-site followed. A discussion again of equivalent value followed.

Mr. Best discussed the issue of proportional share of bearing costs. Mr. Donaroma discussed the issue of forcing people together, social engineering. Mr. Best discussed what he felt the policy really was. Mr. Donaroma felt that two on-site lots were the same as two off-site lots. Others did not. Ms. Sibley discussed the responsibility of the Commission and what was to be achieved by the housing policy. She further discussed the issue of ghetto creation and purchases of cheap lots.

Mr. Colaneri discussed the possibility of imaginative thinking on the part of the applicants.

Ms. Greene asked to have a paragraph moved in the draft to help make things clearer.

Mr. Clifford discussed the issue of on-site lots and the reason to force the provision of such on-site lots by means of some form of penalties for off-site provisions. He further discussed equivalent values and the need to not use this as a means of making any determinations. He then discussed the past practices of the Commission with respect to value, location and cost. He discussed the need for something that would be affordable to people or which could be used by the Housing Authority to provide housing.

Mr. Schweikert questioned why double the lots for off-site.

Mr. Clifford noted that if the Commission truly wants on-site lots then there needs to be a penalty for going off-site.

Ms. Sibley felt that most would use the off-site option if allowed without penalty.

Mr. Jason felt that no one knew what a developer would do and that not many had ever gone off-site in the past.

Mr. Colaneri felt that the draft addressed the issue of not considering equivalent value.

Mr. Best discussed the penalty and having to meet the criteria set forth.

A discussion of whether the draft policy would stifle creativity followed. Mr. Best discussed requiring other than what was the policy. Mr. Colaneri felt that the Commission was not requiring but giving choices to an applicant. Mr. Clifford discussed how the policy of choice would work. Mr. Colaneri discussed the possible buy-out option. A discussion of the 20% option followed.

Ms. Sibley discussed the movement of the paragraph regarding special circumstances and felt that may help avoid confusion.

A discussion of the creativity of an applicant followed. Mr. Jason discussed the analogy to a zoning ordinance.

Mr. Colaneri felt that it was necessary to make it clear early on that there was not a "let's make a deal", but it's a time for a proposal and a determination by the Commission of the validity of the proposal. The role of the LUPC in the process was discussed.

Mr. Schweikert moved on to the commercial section.  
Ms. Greene asked where the "\$" figure had come from. Mr. Clifford explained how the draft figure had been developed.  
A discussion of how to develop the proposal followed. Mr. Clifford discussed the replacement of a bedroom for the loss of a bedroom.  
Ms. Sibley discussed the issue of whether there was a need to address housing in a commercial development - does it generate a need.  
Mr. Best discussed the need created and further discussed what employees sought by employers.  
Mr. Jason discussed the loss of units due to commercial development.  
Mr. Colaneri discussed that issue vs. the issue of commercial development of a vacant lot.  
A discussion of the replacement of units lost being replaced followed.  
Mr. Best discussed this issue and felt there needed to be some clarification of new replacement or not. A discussion of this issue followed.  
Ms. Sibley raised a question of the studies cited and whether the need was really created by commercial development. Mr. Clifford discussed the data provided by legal counsel and the housing report. Ms. Sibley further discussed the issue of relating need to the economy. She asked for some form of a formula that would relate need to development. A discussion of this matter followed.  
A discussion of the impact of commercial ventures on the affordable housing market followed.  
Mr. Donaroma discussed the issue from the standpoint of a businessman.  
Mr. Schweikert discussed the issue of - lose one replace one. He further discussed this issue and indicated that the idea seemed to be valuable and asked how the replacement units should be handled. A discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Best discussed a possible administrative problem. He discussed a rental situation and feared the loss of existing units to the applicant thus taking them off the market.  
A discussion of the creation of a formula for monetary contributions to the Housing Authority followed. Mr. Schweikert and Ms. Greene both felt that it should be based upon Island numbers and realistic numbers at that.  
Mr. Colaneri felt that it should be based upon some dollar figure. A discussion of the use of 10% of the cost of construction followed.  
A discussion of the use of square footage followed.  
Mr. Best discussed the use of a difference between the cost of replacement and the affordable market and what it can carry. He further discussed how this may work. A discussion of this issue followed.  
Mr. Jason felt that caution needed to be taken so as not to hurt commercial ventures.  
Mr. Best discussed the cost of construction in a sagging economy.  
Ms. Sibley asked for someone to develop a few scenarios based upon the most recent discussions. She discussed ability to pay and the need to consider what the persons ability was.

Mr. Colaneri discussed how to develop a fee and not create problems for the commercial sector.

Ms. Greene asked to have some of the comments or alternatives drafted for future considerations.

Mr. Best discussed the full range of possibilities that may be open to any applicant. He discussed the use of a formula to create a housing fee. Mr. Best further discussed the issue of the loss of any type of housing.

Mr. Jason discussed the regional housing policy.

Mr. Clifford discussed the potential problem of administration and urged all to remember that it was a concept to be created and that there should be no concern to the Commission.

Mr. Donaroma discussed the issue of housing replacement and the dollar figure from the standpoint of a businessman. He felt that the policy may be used and never have a unit loss if the developer is a small developer.

Ms. Greene discussed the fact that the ultimate payer would be the consumer and she felt that too steep an exaction would be a problem.

Ms. Sibley further discussed the issue of affordable housing, the loss of seasonal housing, employees on the market and various other aspects of the problem.

A discussion of this issue followed. Mr. Donaroma stated that the policy may be that commercial ventures may not eliminate housing units period. A discussion of this idea followed.

A discussion of the rental possibilities of second floor commercial vs. second floor apartments.

It was suggested that all think about this issue and discuss it later.

Ms. Greene discussed the problem of not having letters from owners designating certain persons as agents. A discussion of this matter followed.

There being no further business the Committee adjourned.