

**CITY OF GLOUCESTER
PLANNING BOARD**

March 1, 2018

6:00 P.M.

Kyrouz Auditorium 9 Dale Ave, Gloucester

Richard Noonan, Chair

MINUTES

Members Present: Doug Cook, Jonathan Pratt, Jane Remsen, Rick Noonan, Henry McCarl, Shawn Henry, Beverly Bookin

Staff: Gregg Cademartori- Planning Director, Jacquelyn Rose- Recording Secretary

I. BUSINESS

- Approval of Outstanding Minutes – 1/10/2017, 12/7/2017, 12/21/2017, 2/1/2018 and 2/15/2018

Mr. Henry explains that there was a deficit in the presentation because it failed to address affordable housing, and Councilor Lundberg stated that the Board was not able to ask questions on affordable housing.

Motion to approve the Minutes for January 10, 2017 was made by Mr. McCarl, seconded by Mr. Cook and unanimously approved.

Ms. Remsen clarifies that the Public Hearing motion be corrected from being closed to continued to the next regular meeting. Mr. Henry explains that on Page 4 Energy Department' be corrected to Engineering Department.

Motion to approve the Minutes for December 7, 2017 was made by Ms. Remsen, seconded by Mr. Cook and unanimously approved.

Ms. Remsen clarifies to remove Mary Black from the Members Present. Mr. Henry makes the correction of changing 'and' to 'but' in the last paragraph of the last page.

Motion to approve the Minutes for December 21, 2017 was made by Mr. McCarl, seconded by Mr. Cook and unanimously approved.

Ms. Remsen clarifies that Vickie Bourneuf is spelt Vicki. Mr. Henry clarifies on top of Page 4 should be corrected to 'does meet the requirement' and 'does not meet the design'.

Motion to approve the Minutes for February 1, 2018 was made by Mr. Pratt, seconded by Ms. Remsen and unanimously approved.

Mr. Noonan made an addition on Page 5. Mr. Henry makes the correction that CDM Smith would have received a response, not provided a response.

Motion to approve the Minutes for February 15, 2018 was made by Ms. Bookin, seconded by Mr. McCarl, and unanimously approved.

- Public Comment- None.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Planning Board to consider a Site Plan Review submitted by Innovation House, LLC for 3,252 square foot addition at 18 Norman Avenue (Assessors Map 170, Lot 43).

John Judd, engineer with Gateway Consultants, explains that this lot was formally the White House Lodge which has been purchased by Innovation House, a high-tech organization that rooms employees from overseas during the Summer months for sabbatical. Mr. Judd continues that they meet all requirements, it has an approved septic system that needs to be installed for 27 beds, and provides parking for 27 spaces. They are requesting an 3,200 square foot addition off the back of the building, and it meets all Zoning requirements for setbacks, and there is no lighting, landscape or parking being added other than reconfiguring what is on the site. It is in a Building Village Zone. They have met with the City Engineer and others.

Mr. Noonan asks Mr. Judd if the septic system they will be building will not be a backup. Mr. Judd replies it has been approved by the Health Department, and that it will not be a backup. Mr. Judd continues that they have 100% expansion as required. Mr. Judd explains to the Board that the leach field has been approved and will accommodate all bedrooms. Mr. Noonan asks if it will be all gravity, and Mr. Judd answers yes.

Ms. Remsen asks if they will be digging up the front yard to add the second septic system in order to waive the landscaping requirement. Mr. Judd answers that the lawn area will be replaced. Ms. Remsen asks why would the Board not waive a requirement to show buildings and roads within 1000 feet from the property line. Mr. Judd answers that it is a fairly dense area of Magnolia. Ms. Remsen asks if there have been any comments from abutters due to how close some houses are to this property. Mr. Judd replies that while the houses are close, it meets all Zoning requirements and abutters understand the use of this property. Ms. Remsen asks to clarify the business moving into this property is an incubator for startups. Mr. Judd answers that it is an existing corporation that uses this property as something of a retreat house. Mr. Pratt adds that it is a collaborative and not so much of a startup, but the use will continue as is.

Mr. Cademartori explains that the addition will be behind the right side of the building, the septic field will be in the grassed area in front of the building, and the access to the expanded parking is off of Dalton Avenue. Mr. Judd clarifies that there will be no expanded parking and that it is all existing. Mr. Cademartori continues that there will initial concerns with counting spaces based on what can be provided, and the applicants suggested they won't necessarily need all 27 parking spaces.

Ms. Remsen clarifies that a lot number shown on the map is incorrect. Mr. Judd makes the correction.

Motion to approve a Site Plan Review submitted by Innovation House, LLC for 3,252 square foot addition at 18 Norman Avenue (Assessors Map 170, Lot 43) was made by Mr. Pratt, seconded by Mr. Cook and unanimously approved.

III. CONTINUED PRELIMINARY CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

In accordance with MGL Chapter 41 Section 81-S, the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land in Gloucester, and Section 5.9 of the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board shall review a Preliminary Cluster Development submission for land located at 186 Concord Street (Assessors Map 248 Lots 14) submitted by Carrigan Development LLC.

Deborah Ellison, Ellison Law Office and representative for Carrigan Development LLC, explains that the Board was provided a revised plan at the Site Visit last week and they will be submitting a hard copy of that plan. On the site visit they went along the trail that goes along the edge of the property. The houses will be equally divided between the first and second parts of the development. The road is looped instead of having a turnaround. They met with the City Engineer whom suggested other design ideas for the site.

Ms. Ellison continues that they need to reduce the size of the pavement, and decide on a T, Y, or loop design. They are also thinking of having dedicated parking areas, they will have parallel parking around the shoulder. They have met with the Fire Chief and as long as the loop allows trucks to traverse road he will be satisfied, and the City Engineer can confirm that they will be able to pass regardless of how the loop is designed. The client is intending to install sprinklers on all of the houses.

Ms. Ellison continues that at the last Planning Board Meeting the Board looked at the Conventional Subdivision Plan. This plan would have seven lots with 14 units, with each lot being a duplex. The Cluster plan will have 12 single family homes. Ms. Ellison clarifies that the Conventional Plan would have the homes more spread out, creating more of a disturbance zone. The Conventional Plan will not preserve any land, whereas the Cluster Plan will preserve 70% of land.

Mr. Noonan asks for clarification on the acreage of the parcel and how it relates to the ratio of preserved land. Ms. Ellison answers it is in the R40 district, and 21 acres. Ms. Ellison continues that the preserved land in the Cluster Plan will either be owned by the City or a Land Trust.

Ms. Remsen asks for clarification on the boundary of the parcel. Ms. Ellison shows the Board the boundaries on the map and explains that they will be adding connections to existing trails so that residents can use the trails. Ms. Ellison shows the Board a map of existing trails and also proposed new trails, and explains that there are benefits to new trails and any changes can be made. Ms. Ellison also shows the Board a map of the proximity of neighbors.

Ms. Ellison explains that this area is an R40 district. R40 requires 1 acre and R80 requires less than two acres. The purpose of the Cluster in an R40 or R80 is to encourage property owners not to chop their land into 1 or 2 acre lots, but to leave less land disturbed. The Ordinance only requires preserving 30% of land, and the Cluster Plan will be preserving 70%, and is six times the size required. Ms. Ellison explains that her client previously approached Essex County Greenbelt about purchasing land, and they were not

interested at the time. The Greenbelt has recently contacted Mr. Carrigan. Ms. Ellison asks the Board for approval of the Preliminary Cluster Plan and asks Mr. Cappuccitti to address the Board.

Anthony Cappuccitti, representative for Hayes Engineering, clarifies to abutters that are focused on flooding downstream from Concord Street that this project is located within 100 feet to a wetlands is subject to Flood Protection Act. Mr. Cappuccitti continues that there are 10 Stormwater Management Standards. The second standard states that you cannot increase peak discharge rates from pre-development position to post-development position. Initial calculation shows they will not increase on site flooding, but they will increase stormwater quality by removing 80% of TSS. They will infiltrate a portion of the runoff, which is typically from the roof of the homes, that provides an annual recharge to the wetlands area. Mr. Cappuccitti continues that other concerns involve the septic system. The septic system is designed to meet Gloucester standards and is located in access to 150 feet from a private drinking water well. The tank will pump 150 gallons per minute. Mr. Noonan asks how deep the water wells are. Mr. Cappuccitti answers that most of them are 500 feet or less.

Ms. Remsen asks for clarification on who would own the conservation land. Ms. Ellison answers that it would be up the Board, but the Ordinance allows the City of Gloucester to own that land and have it go to the Conservation Commission, a homeowners association, or it also allows a private non-profit Land Trust to own it, but a Land Trust would have to be interested in owning it.

Ms. Bookin asks if the local and state regulations with regards to three options- a conservation easement held by a Homeowners Association, the City's Conservation, or a private non-profit- automatically require that the land is conveyed over as a Conservation District have some sort of public access. Ms. Ellison replies that it is not an automatic provision, and that there are many Conservation restrictions that do not allow public access, but they are offering public access. Ms. Bookin asks if there is any restriction or requirement that automatically creates a 'no touch zone' so that there are no changes to topography, no removal of natural vegetation, and no disruption of natural stormwater drainage. Ms. Ellison replies that there are certain areas that are protected and that those areas would not be used. Mr. Cappuccitti answers that they gave 70% of preserved land in order to allow them to grade the lots if the definitive comes out differently. The intent is the preliminary construction would be at the open space limits. Ms. Bookin expresses that since it is not automatic, the Board may be able to consider that there are explicit conditions in order to stake the area so the construction team would know that it is a no touch zone. Mr. Cappuccitti replies that they would typically show an erosion control line that is staked and flagged.

Ms. Remsen explains that she would like to see a Conservation Easement in perpetuity and asks Mr. Cademartori if they could potentially make this plan any more clustered than the Cluster Plan already shows. Mr. Cademartori replies that the distance between the buildings is akin to a R10 setback, and are about 20 feet apart. The entrance of the Cluster seems straightforward. Some issues brought up by the Engineering Department were that as things migrated into the loop configuration, whether or not having it on the inside really would tighten up future disturbance. One issue is that there are utilities running through the backyards and side yards of the homes. A suggestion is if there is a way to eliminate some exterior roadway by coming through the middle and having units on either side could be a way to contract and develop further. Mr. Cademartori continues that it could be helpful to understand what the development footprint is for the Cluster Plan if the Board wants to reduce further with the intent of

maximizing open space so there is some comparative of what the net disturbance would be. Ms. Ellison explains that the net disturbance they are proposing is 30% and it could be smaller than that. Mr. Cademartori continues that there are wetlands on the property as well that will not be disturbed in any scenario, so it would be helpful to understand a comparison and to maximize open space.

Mr. Cappecitti explains that after meeting with Mr. Cademartori they preliminarily were able to relocate utilities by about 500 feet and pull the cluster back. What the Board is asking for is feasible and they are already headed in that direction to shrink the footprint. Mr. Noonan explains that one of his concerns was that the utility access points were in the back yards, so it is positive they are looking at that.

Ms. Ellison explains that Mr. Carrigan's preference is for the Greenbelt to own the land and asks to start discussions on that.

Mr. Henry clarifies that wetlands within the property are not deducted, but are unbuildable.

Ms. Bookin explains that the issue is moved because it is R40 and on the flat map you could get presumably as many as 20 units on the development. Ms. Bookin continues that between the wetlands and topography there are certain limits of carrying capacity and by virtue of designing this for 12 units and then demonstrating that you can meet all technical requirements for water, sewer, runoff, life safety and fire access you demonstrate that 12 units is the carrying capacity. Ms. Ellison replies that the Conventional Plan holds 14 units, but rules can change so without knowing what future Boards will do, protecting in perpetuity the conservation restriction being held by a conservation agency is more certainty.

Mr. Cademartori explains that in Section 5.9.5 of the Design Criteria, it is important to look at the vast distinction between the Conventional Plan and the Cluster Plan. The best guidance to give to an applicant is whether or not you think it is a superior approach. Mr. Cademartori continues that the Conventional Plan requires special permitting for Pork Chop Lots, which require twice the lot area for the district, but also need access from the roadway.

Ms. Remsen asks if this Cluster is being considered as two Clusters, and if there needs to be distance between them to be categorized as two Clusters. Mr. Cademartori answers that it needs to exceed 50 feet between them. Mr. Cappuccitti explains that the feedback they received from their first plan was that it looked like a regular Subdivision and the intent they had was to enhance the trail system with additional parking. Mr. Cademartori clarifies that the first Plan had a cul-de-sac with a common driveway to three units in the back of the property. The two clusters were 3 in the back and the majority up front, and one of the significant features on the site is the large outcropping at the edge of the location. There are other design processes that do not jump out but a thought is to get the outcropping on the inside. Mr. Cademartori continues that the second Cluster needs the most work in terms of ways to minimize footprint.

Ms. Bookin explains in regards to road configuration, she believes it preferable to have the loop. It would be safer, and easier for fire trucks to go around as opposed to turnaround. It would be ideal to tighten the loop up, but still wide enough for a fire truck, if it is 500 feet and the road is about 20 feet wide then that

is 10,000 square feet of impervious surface that would be eliminated. Mr. Cappuccitti responds that they are presenting a concept of a loop, and believe it to be the best solution. Ms. Ellison adds that they believe though a loop may be smaller, it is the better option.

Mr. Noonan explains to the Board that they have two options, either to condition the approval based on production of the services previously spoken about, clarifying utility so nothing is being run through the backyards, or to take no action and let the process continue. Mr. Noonan continues that it is clear this plan is evolving in the correct direction, and the Board can choose to approve the Preliminary Plan, with the aforementioned conditions to offer further guidance and to continue.

Ms. Remsen asks if it is typical for Preliminary Site Plan to be undeveloped. Mr. Cademartori answers that it is typical for a Preliminary Cluster Development Plan. Mr. Cademartori clarifies that there is no binding commitment on the Board in terms of disposition of the definitive. The applicant has gone through the process and has received feedback and had the opportunity to come back with a revised plan that addresses concerns. The applicant has also have the option to pursue alternatives.

Mr. Henry addresses that the process is working for the preliminary design phase and it has improved over first draft. Approving at this stage provides encouragement to continue along the same lines of improvement. Mr. Henry continues that he is in favor of motioning to vote in favor of moving forward. Mr. Noonan asks if Mr. Henry would offer any conditions. Mr. Henry replies that he would offer the condition previously mentioned in regards to the impermeable reduction.

Mr. Cademartori clarifies that the different concerns heard this evening as well as if the board wants to provide a preference in terms of having a Land Trust being the entity that owns and maintains the open space. The Conservation Commission are predominantly a permitting board at this point and do not have the manpower to function as a Conservation Commission was originally set out to manage public open space, so it is encouraged that the applicant to continue to explore the conveyance of the open space. Mr. Cademartori continues that another point that was raised at the last meeting is parking in relation to the open space, and whether there should be parking closer to the access point by the street, or make it so the Greenbelt will have to figure out how valuable it is to encourage people to park at the back of the development. This is something that should be fleshed out in terms of access to open space.

Ms. Remsen clarifies that this would be an issue that the Greenbelt would have to figure out. Mr. Cademartori replies that they have created an opportunity in the proposal to create parking which is a management issue and more so if it involves another party who will own the open space. It is something to consider in terms of the best way to provide access as they would be travelling through this development to park in the area.

Ms. Remsen asks for clarification on the current motion. Mr. Noonan answers that it is shrinking the impact area, clarification on utilities so not having easements across backyards to get to septic, conveyance to land trust. Ms. Bookin adds she would like to see public access to the conservation area and articulation assurances to ensure neighbors that the area which is staked for conservation will be a no touch zone during construction so that its natural characteristics will not be altered. Mr. Noonan replies

that that section will come out in the Definitive Plan. Ms. Bookin continues that since this lot will contain trails, it would be an advantage to have a group who can appropriately maintain them.

An audience member asks if there will be a time to ask questions. Mr. Noonan answers that this is a Preliminary Cluster Development plan and the process has afforded the applicants receive guidance from Staff and the Board. By moving in the correct direction, the applicant will move into a Definitive Cluster Development application process. Mr. Noonan continues that the Board have seen one evolution, are in the second evolution, and are now talking about the third evolution, and directionally the applicant will be in the right direction. Mr. Noonan invites anyone to come forward.

Dennis McGurk, resident of 283 Concord Street, explains that he wants to put a framework reference for a review of this project. Mr. McGurk reads portions of the City of Gloucester's Community Development Plan 2001. Mr. Noonan reminds Mr. McGurk that since he has already submitted this in writing, it is already public record. Mr. McGurk continues that the importance is that the market is changing the area in West Gloucester. Gloucester is a target for this demand, developers are interested in these parcels and now because of that these undeveloped lots are gone. The residents in this neighborhood have said for the past two years is that these developers will come in, upset the neighborhood, and change the way of living.

Nick Holland, resident of 11 Jebeka Lane, explains that he is not against the development of this property, but does not believe that a Cluster Development is appropriate for this part of West Gloucester, and he does not believe that this particular Cluster Development is worthy of a Special Permit. Mr. Holland explains there are two large areas of low and medium density residential zoning, one is in Dogtown and the other is in Gloucester Woods. Mr. Holland reads the zoning description of this part of West Gloucester. Mr. Holland believes that having a Cluster Development in this area would undo several decades of intelligent zoning decisions. The Special Permit stated intent is to protect open space and preserve the character of the surrounding neighborhood, but to grant one it has to be in harmony with surrounding neighborhoods, and Mr. Holland believes it is not.

Ms. Remsen asks Mr. Holland if he would rather see a Conventional Subdivision Plan as opposed to a Cluster Plan. Mr. Holland answers that he would, based on the abutting developments made in the past years, the site conditions are such that they will end up with a handful of homes.

Grant Clark, resident of 279 Concord Street, explains that there is a disconnect between how the neighbors see this development and how the applicant does. Mr. Clark continues that when they look at the property and think about how many conforming structures could be built there, it is hard for the neighbors to see the principle that the developer is seeking credit for unbuildable land. It would be difficult to put four conforming structures near the ledge due to steep slope, wetlands, and a non continuous parcel. The residents want to make sure that the calculations are being done properly. Mr. Clark continues that everyone bought and built here did so in compliance on a history of zoning enforcement and they feel that is a covenant that is on the verge of being broken. Mr. Clark asks the Board to consider the permanent and final act of what they are doing here. The neighborhood has calculated that there will be a 53% increase of homes on Bray Street and a 20% increase of total homes in the neighborhood. Granting a special permit would change West Gloucester fundamentally.

Peter Grodotia, resident of 259 Concord Street, explains that it is important to look at the City map that shows watershed in this area. Mr. Grodotia is concerned about water runoff, well contamination, the zoning changes, and the impact of wildlife. Mr. Grodotia shows the Board how there is a 200 foot buffer zone from the wetlands, and explains that he does not see how they will be able to fit the development. Mr. Grodotia explains the direction of water runoff during rainfall and how it goes through properties and reaches the wetland, and results in flooding. Mr. Grodotia explains he is very concerned about this area and this development will make the flooding worse.

Ron Hadley, resident 257 Concord Street, explains that there is a stream that passes one area that has potential habitat for rare species, that goes through his property and into the Great Marsh ACEC, and with the additional houses, parking, and roads, it is going to permeate the land and result in astronomical water runoff. Mr. Hadley's lot sees water runoff from other homes that were allowed to build. When residents move in, they are going to fertilize their lawn which is going to permeate. Their sewer and septic system by the time it leaches certain chemicals will be in the waterway going into the ACEC.

Tucker Smith, resident of 299 Concord Street, asks for clarification because it was mentioned there were both a 100 foot buffer zone and a 200 foot buffer zone from the wetlands. Mr. Cademartori answers that if there is a perennial stream then it would be a 200 foot buffer zone, and all wetlands have a 100 foot setback, so it could be both.

Ms. Ellison clarifies that this lot is 21 acres and they are planning on 12 units, which will equal to two acres per unit. There is no requirement for a Cluster to have a proof plan, but there is a requirement that this Cluster be a better development than a Conventional. They have had an engineer look at the lot and the Conventional would be able to accommodate 14 units, and the ledge does not make it unbuildable and that can be removed. Ms. Ellison continues that the property will not be able to add to any water runoff, and shows the Board the Assessor's Map. Ms. Ellison explains that the Open Space Plan was developed so that the City can decide what its regulations are going to be, and the purpose is to not have these larger lots be chopped into one or two acre lots and in this lot they are preserving 70% of the open space.

Ms. Bookin asks that this site, under local stormwater requirements, cannot generate any more runoff off the site than is current, which is to say that any new stormwater generated must be collected and treated on site. Mr. Cappuccitti replies that is correct, and explains that you cannot exceed the peak flow rate exiting the site so they provide infiltration, forms of treatment to slow the water down so it does not exceed the existing condition rate of runoff. There is a decrease in runoff from the site because of design. Ms Bookin asks that the stormwater generated by the impervious surfaces on this cluster will be collected in retention ponds on site and held and how are they treated. Mr. Cappuccitti replies that it is a treatment chain with multiple methods of treatment. Ms. Bookin asks Mr. Cappuccitti to demonstrate that the retention ponds are apt to take on roofs, roadway, and other impervious surface runoff, hold it, treat it, and slowly release it. Mr. Cappuccitti replies that there is a stormwater checklist that gets prepared by the 10 Massachusetts Stormwater Standards, and is submitted to the Conservation Commission. Ms. Bookin the issues of downstream sounds like they are using the best practices.

Ms. Ellison explains that there seems to be a misconception that you cannot build in the buffer zone, which you technically can.

Alice Eastman, resident of 7 Whale Rocks Road, asks the Board to ensure that the wetlands delineation that is being used to calculate the available area for the Cluster is being adhered to because there is a protected buffer zone.

Mr. Noonan explains that the Board can take action on approving the list of conditions or not take action. Ms. Remsen addresses that she has a concern that a Cluster Development is not most sensitive way to build a property here. Mr. Henry explains that there is no requirement in regard to seeking a Cluster Development Special Permit that the applicant prove that it is better than a standard Plan. If you look through the 2001 Plan, Cluster Development is a good thing for the city to adopt. The consensus then was looking at alternative methods of developing properties so that we don't build ourselves into a city of 1 acre lots that are entirely unaffordable. The intent behind a Cluster is to allow more affordable developments to build, and these 12 units are de facto affordable, as opposed to if the development had to be financed for mega homes that would not provide for the city. Mr. Pratt agrees with Mr. Henry.

Mr. Cademartori clarifies that there have been two previously approved Cluster Developments in the City. Based on what's in City GIS, the proposed developed area is approximately 6.5 acres, which is fairly consistent with what has been presented. The density that is allowed far exceeds what is being proposed.

Ms. Remsen advocates to not take action but to move forward with guidance. Mr. Noonan explains that there has been a lot of information given, and there is no problem with not taking action yet and letting the Preliminary process continue. Ms. Ellison explains that the Applicant would prefer the Board to take action in order to get more direction. Ms. Bookin expresses the Board should take action since they have provided the Applicant ideas to think about, and the Applicant is making a good effort in addressing all concerns brought up by the Board. Mr. Cook agrees with Ms. Bookin.

Motion to approve, with all mentioned conditions, the Preliminary Cluster Development submission for land located at 186 Concord Street (Assessors Map 248 Lots 14) submitted by Carrigan Development LLC was made by Mr. Henry, seconded by Ms. Bookin and unanimously approved.

THE BOARD TO TAKE A 3 MINUTE BREAK

IV. PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPLICATION

In accordance with MGL Chapter 41 Section 81-S, the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land in Gloucester, the Planning Board shall review a Form B Preliminary Plan submission for land located at 12R Wolf Hill Way (Assessors Map 88 Lots 22,23,24,25) submitted by Wolf Hill Trust, William Friend.

Michael Fahey, representative for William Friend, explains to the Board that this is a preliminary plan. The Friend family has owned this land since 1900, and there have been a number of inquiries made on the land over the years. Mr. Fahey expresses that while the Board may propose a site visit, there are a

number of roads that were constructed around 1900, and they attempted to incorporate the roads into this design as a major feature. The property consists of four Lots. The first Lot is an existing lot. The bottom section of the property is laid out. There is a house on an existing Lot that may come down in order to build another house. The access to that Lot is from Wolf Hill Lane. They want to combine an emergency exit over the existing road in the event of an emergency. There is a large granite pier in one section of the Lot, and an aluminum ramp at another. A goal is that the house will have exclusive access to the pier, which would be a Non Buildable Lot. The aluminum ramp would run into an upper lot. In addition, they are looking at creating a 10 foot path so that two lots will have a pathway to the river. One lot will become a Pork Chop Lot and the driveway to the house will be created into an emergency exit access. Wolf Hill Way services the lots and has City water and sewer, and electric. This plan meets all requirements. Mr. Fahey continues that they met with city officials who proposed making off site improvements, and the emergency exit access satisfies the Fire Chief. The definite plan will have a list of possible uses with the area.

Ms. Remsen asks Mr. Fahey to outline the proposed Pork Chop Lot. Mr. Fahey outlines it and clarifies that it will have 40 feet width, 25 feet of pavement, will run down to the river, and is more than required. Ms. Remsen asks for clarification if Lots 1,2,3 are existing because they are not on MapGeo. Mr. Fahey clarifies that they are not proposing to do anything on Lot 3 and that the lots are shown on the ancient plans and have not changed. They have made some changes to the width of the lots. Ms. Remsen asks if that qualifies these Lots as an ANR. Mr. Cademartori explains that because of the level of construction and because the right of way has been expanded, it falls under a Subdivision. Mr. Cademartori continues that this property is a hybrid because there is an existing lot, lot lines have been readjusted, construction of a road annexing to the existing right of way.

Ms. Remsen asks if Parcel B is going to remain its own lot, or if the lot line would be removed and join Parcel 24. Mr. Fahey replies that it is a non buildable lot and would remain the same.

Ms. Bookin asks how many Lots there are currently, and how many the Applicant is asking for. Mr. Fahey replies that right now there are four lots, and there are some lots that do not exist anymore. Ms. Bookin explains that there needs to be exhibits that are helpful in defining the lots, what is there now, and what is proposed.

Ms. Remsen asks for clarification that the Applicant is creating Parcel A by joining two lots and creating Parcel B by taking part of Parcel 23 and creating Lots 1,2,3 by adding two lot lines. Mr. Fahey replies that that is correct.

Mr. Cademartori explains that there is an existing right of way which makes one of the lots appear that it has frontage on one right of way, and other lots with frontage on a different right of way. The paved portion of Wolf Hill Way comes straight and leads to properties. There is a separate right of way that could be driveable on an all terrain vehicle. This is a combination of the reconfiguration of lots but also the construction of the right of way that makes this a Subdivision. Mr. Cademartori continues that the support for the Pork Chop Lot is that there is enough land area proposed such that you can extend the right of way further and creating the required frontage, and there will be an emergency access and a

driveway. They need to clarify that the drainage will be handled, and what can be done leading to the Subdivision in terms of access.

Ms. Bookin asks if the non buildable lot meets the 20,000 square feet minimum site size. Mr. Cademartori answers no. Ms. Bookin asks that since it is a nonconforming lot, would the Board must grant a waiver on size because it is substandard. Mr. Cademartori answered that if it is a Non Buildable Lot, it will be labeled as such on the plan.

John Judd, engineer with Gateway Consultants, clarifies that Parcel A is an 100 foot lot, and not the starting point of the Pork Chop Lot. Mr. Judd also clarifies that they have been meeting with the City Engineer.

Ms. Remsen asks where the frontage for Lots 1,2,3 are being provided. Mr. Cademartori clarifies where each lot is getting their frontage. The existing lot is provided frontage by Wolf Hill Lane.

Mr. Cook proposes a site visit. The Board decides on a site visit on Wednesday, March 7, 2018 at 3:00 pm.

Motion for the Board to have a Site Visit at 12R Wolf Hill Way on Wednesday, March 7, 2018 at 3:00 pm was made by Mr. Cook, seconded by Mr. Pratt and unanimously approved.

V. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

In accordance with the provisions of MGL Chapter 40A Section 5, and the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance Section 1.11, the Gloucester Planning Board to consider the following petition to amend the Zoning Ordinances:

Provide for amendments to 2.3.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3, and any other necessary section of the GZO, as well as any necessary footnotes in the sections of the GZO, to enable the building of and/or use of multi-unit, mixed use properties in the CB district by right, in the event the property owner provides at least one affordable residential unit on site.

Mr. Noonan opens a Public Hearing.

Mr. Cademartori explains that they intended to meet a week and a half ago, and again this past Wednesday, but it was beyond the 48 hour time period to hold the meeting. There is a disconnect between the purpose of intent that accompanied the proposed amendments and what is actually written in the proposed amendments. A Main Street property owner suggested the housing allowance did not seem to be balanced by the requirement for affordability. This proposal was the allowance of upper story development of units up to six units, if a ratio was provided as affordable. This would not address other potential relief that might be needed related to parking, and if it would make more sense to look at the overall dimensions for the CB District to promote upper story housing options. Mr. Cademartori explains that one option is to negatively recommend the current proposal because if the Board goes after

dimensional standards for downtown, they would be touching other sections of the ordinance. There is a suggestion to continue on the track of looking at dimensional and density requirements in downtown.

Mr. Noonan explains that the affordability aspect changes the intent to achieve what they are looking for in this proposal.

Mr. Noonan closes the Public Hearing.

Motion to recommend to the City Council the adoption of the proposed amendments was made by Ms. Bookin, seconded by Mr. McCarl and unanimously opposed.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- CPA Update

Mr. McCarl informs the Board that they are in the process of taking applications.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. McCarl, seconded by Mr. Pratt and unanimously approved.

VIII. NEXT MEETING

Next regular meeting of the Planning Board March 15, 2018

Planning Board Members: If you are unable to attend the next meeting please contact the Planning Office at (978)325-5235.