

MINUTES

Members Present: P. Aho, V. Ward, L. Cooley, K. Rawn, R. Hall (joined meeting at approximately 8:55 a.m.)

Staff Present: L. Painter, J. Kaufman, J. Woodmansee

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Aho called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

MINUTES

Ward MOVED, Cooley seconded approval of the April 3, 2020 minutes as presented. Motion PASSED unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jane Moskowitz noted her April 15, 2020 correspondence and asked whether members had an opportunity to read it before the meeting otherwise she would like to read it into the record. After members indicated that they had read the letter; Ms. Moskowitz concluded her comments.

Painter also noted that a communication was received from Steven Ferrigno in his individual capacity as a resident, not on behalf of any commissions/committees on which he serves. Members asked Painter to summarize his letter, which she did as part of the discussion on proposed multi-family regulations.

REVISIONS TO ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

Proposed Multi-Family Regulations

Hall joined the meeting at approximately 8:55 a.m.

Aho invited representatives from Haven Campus Communities and their architect, Dwell Design Studio, to address their concerns with the draft regulations. Jay Williams and Chase Powell of Haven Campus Communities and Stephen Moriak of Dwell Design Studio reviewed their concerns and questions regarding the regulations, including questions posed in an April 16, 2020 email from Mr. Moriak. David Fresk of The Shepard Company also provided feedback on the draft regulations as part of the discussion. Fresk specifically requested that Standards 12 through 22 be eliminated.

The following is a summary of comments received:

- Potential impact on cost of development, which would increase rental prices for the units
- Potential impacts on project viability
- Need for clear, objective standards that are easy to understand and apply.
- Concern that guidelines and standards are too specific and do not leave the flexibility needed to deal with different sites; for example, the King Hill/North Eagleville Road area is very different than the Four Corners.

- Need for clarification on applicability of design guidelines and standards to studio and 1-bedroom units.
- Question as to why a unit mix had been established instead of leaving it to the market to determine.
- Concern that the minimum number of required family-friendly units exceeds not only local demand but that of large metropolitan areas and questions as to whether any market research was conducted to arrive at that requirement.
- Proposal that purpose-built student housing should be considered multi-generational housing requirements.
- Concern with excessive storage requirements that would be extremely costly, add tens of thousands of square feet to a development, and are not needed based on their experience in developing multi-family housing.
- Need for clarification on what would be considered “age-appropriate” equipment and if there were other ways to address recreational amenities that would serve multiple age groups. Also concerned that regulations are too specific and may be requiring equipment/amenities that would be limited to families with children and would not be useful for other age groups. Would prefer amenities that offer flexibility and that can be used by multiple age groups.
- Concern that the guidelines and standards do not reflect current desires and expectations of tenants and the ways in which lifestyles have changed over time (for example, desire for parity in numbers of bedrooms/bathrooms; en-suite bathrooms; use of breakfast bar for dining instead of dining table, etc.)

Potential Short Term Amendments (In Advance of Rewrite)

Painter provided an overview of updates to the draft amendments (version dated 4-17-2020) related to efficiency units, home occupations, accessory structures, parking, historic villages, and stormwater management and noted that an additional tweak was needed to the draft language regarding the dimensional exception for school parking lots to address unusual right-of-way conditions.

By consensus, members recommended that the proposed amendments (with the change noted by Painter) be forwarded to the full Commission to schedule a public hearing.

FUTURE MEETINGS

Painter requested guidance from members to help staff prepare for the next meeting with regard to multi-family housing regulations. Members discussed:

- Need for information on multi-family market and design trends-what tenants are seeking in today’s market;
- Need to provide additional clarity in regulations and reduce ambiguity;
- Need to revise storage requirements based on concerns raised by presenters and public comments received;
- Opportunities for balance and compromise given real concerns regarding impact on leasing while still having units that are viable for other demographics.

- Desire for tours/additional information on the projects referenced in Steve Ferrigno's letter; and
- Interest in hearing from other developers of traditional multi-family housing.

Painter will explore the possibility of scheduling a presentation from another multi-family developer for the next meeting to help members understand current market expectations.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:19 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:



Linda M. Painter, AICP
Director of Planning and Development