

POPE LAND DESIGN COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING

MAY 12, 2022 – 10:00AM (VIA ZOOM)

- 1        1. Call to Order. Present: Lisa McAuliffe, Tim Sinclair, Ray McGuire, Abeth Slotnick, Vivian Garfein  
2            and Georgia Petry, Secretary. Attending: Chris Williams, Selectman. To Design/FHI: Phil  
3            Barlow, Rory Jacobson and Rocco Petitto.  
4
- 5        2. **Approval of Agenda. So Moved** by A. Slotnick, seconded by L. McAuliffe and unanimously  
6            **Approved.**  
7
- 8        3. **Approval of the Minutes of March 24, 2022.** L. McAuliffe expressed that there was an incorrect  
9            statement in the minutes from To Design, Item 2.c. “Paddle tennis and Pickleball can use the  
10           same courts”; she indicated that this is not the case and to eliminate that issue. A. Slotnick  
11           noted on the FHI minutes under 3.1., she did not remember expressing that the housing might  
12           be too dense; she thought that the housing footprints shown might change because the mix of  
13           units is not known yet. Any reference (in minutes) to that issue should be eliminated. In the  
14           Minutes of March 24, 2022, under Item 4, she corrected “Area Median Income” (AMI). A  
15           **Motion to Approve the Minutes of March 24, 2022, as amended**, was made by A. Slotnick,  
16           seconded by V. Garfein and unanimously **Approved.**  
17
- 18       4. To Design/FHI Presentation  
19            • Site Visit Discussion.  
20            R. McGuire indicated that the site visit was extremely helpful and informative; Phil  
21            Barlow agreed. Mr. Barlow talked about the outcome of that visit: Scheme 5 was  
22            moving in the right direction, but to re-orient the green towards the road; not  
23            wanting to cross the road for recreation elements; eliminate any road adjacent to  
24            the trail. Those ideas resulted in Concept/Scheme 6, which had been distributed.  
25            • Review all Schemes and Concept 6.  
26            Mr. Barlow mentioned that the Committee may have a preferred Concept, but  
27            needs to select 2 of the other schemes which have already been presented, in order  
28            to have 3 alternatives to eventually present to the public. There can be minor  
29            adjustments to the concepts selected. A. Slotnick suggested that they decide which  
30            issues are important to bring up for discussion and see which of the other schemes  
31            represent some of those ideas. R. McGuire mentioned that one issue had been  
32            about the possibility of combing some of the athletic venues for multiple uses; he  
33            was not certain any of the schemes capture that part of the discussion. L. McAuliffe  
34            recalled that the 90’ base-path baseball field could be eliminated; one U-12 field  
35            could be used for soccer, lacrosse and other sports; one U-10 field would be for

36 soccer; the two U-8 fields could go onto either of the 2 larger fields. A. Slotnick  
37 suggested re-visiting Scheme 3 and eliminating the baseball field on it. She  
38 expressed that all the schemes should show 64 units of housing, so there is no  
39 confusion. There was a lengthy discussion about how that number of units was  
40 determined. That was the number of units requested from the Salisbury Housing  
41 Committee (SHC) and Salisbury Housing Trust (SHT); it was also a number used in  
42 the 2018 Affordable Housing Plan ([https://www.salisburyct.us/boards-commissions-  
43 committees/affordable-housing/](https://www.salisburyct.us/boards-commissions-committees/affordable-housing/)) L. McAuliffe pointed out that concessions had  
44 been made by Recreation already and asked if there was flexibility on the number of  
45 housing units, such as showing a plan with 50 units. V. Garfein mentioned that  
46 these units are part of attaining a larger goal of AH units in Salisbury. She added  
47 that the plan would likely be developed in phases and things could change over  
48 time. L. McAuliffe asked if the site is capable of holding that much housing and  
49 recreation. R. McGuire commented that the focus has been on the number of units,  
50 not numbers of people. Mr. Barlow and Mr. Petitto responded that the number of  
51 bedrooms per unit must be addressed at some point; the “footprints” will use  
52 different amounts of space. Mr. Petitto offered that there would likely be a mix of  
53 different types of units. The possibility of showing one plan with a large apartment  
54 building was discussed, as it preserves more land. Mr. Barlow pointed out that the  
55 desired density determines what can be built; there is adequate acreage for the 64  
56 housing units. He noted that Concepts 1, 2 and 3 met those goals; Concepts 4 & 5  
57 have more open space, limiting the dense use of the site.

58 There was a long discussion about the pros and cons of Concept 4, with housing  
59 along Salmon Kill Road. L. McAuliffe did not like traffic having to go through housing  
60 to get to recreation areas. T. Sinclair thought that traffic could enter on a road near  
61 the pump station. The hedgerow would be eliminated in this plan and have less  
62 open green space. T. Sinclair pointed out that the basketball courts need to be side-  
63 by-side; L. McAuliffe noted that the playground would be in foul ball territory.  
64 Concept 1 was dismissed. Concept 2 could be modified by eliminating the baseball  
65 field and retaining the open green space, but housing along the rail trail might be  
66 objectionable. Concept 3 was not acceptable to L. McAuliffe and T. Sinclair.  
67 Concept 4 could be modified to move the driveway access. Concept 5 puts the  
68 housing behind the hedgerow, towards the back of the property, but shows a road  
69 along the rail trail. Concept 6 was discussed at length. L. McAuliffe does not like the  
70 gated access area and locked gate – that is a big complication, as access to the  
71 storage area is needed, not a gated driveway. She noted that the Pickleball courts  
72 and playground area are in foul ball territory and can’t be there. T. Sinclair  
73 suggested giving up the green community space in order to have denser housing. V.  
74 Garfein prefers Concept 6 with the open greenspace concept and walkability into  
75 town via the rail trail. L. McAuliffe mentioned that Community Field cannot have  
76 any paving because the water company’s infrastructure is underneath the entire  
77 area. Mr. Barlow suggested that the Pickleball courts could be moved slightly on the

78 plan and the number reduced from 12 to 8 courts. He will work on adding some  
79 additional parking spaces near the large soccer field, as well. L. McAuliffe  
80 mentioned that she had shared this Concept 6 with others on the Recreation  
81 Commission and the feedback was that it was a very urban design and putting in  
82 such a long road was a problem. A. Slotnick wondered if parallel parking was a good  
83 idea; Mr. Petitto gave examples of different parking solutions in other areas. That  
84 opened a conversation about who would maintain the driveways. Landscape  
85 buffers could be considered, if the hedgerow is cut back. A. Slotnick asked if Phasing  
86 should be shown now; R. McGuire responded yes, and suggested showing 3-Stage  
87 Phasing plans over a 20 year period. There was general agreement on that.  
88 The Committee decided to move forward with Concepts 2, 4 and 6, with the  
89 modifications discussed. For next steps, V. Garfein wants to see the 3 modified  
90 concepts at the next meeting; she also wants the Board of Selectmen to look at  
91 them, followed by other Commissions. L. McAuliffe suggested including Concept 1,  
92 just for show and to let the other Concepts be left available.

- 93 • Rory Jacobson, FHI, briefly discussed Public Outreach efforts that will be made. She  
94 indicated that they will be set to have 3 small focus groups with stakeholders. There  
95 will eventually be a public workshop type of event. She is aware of being sensitive  
96 about the needs of the neighbors, as well. The meetings will continue to be virtual  
97 and the timing still needs to be determined. The modified Concepts will be  
98 reviewed first and a list of potential attendees for the 3 focus groups will be drafted.  
99 She will get information from the Town website.

#### 100 101 5. Public Comment

102 R. McGuire asked for comments from George Massey. Mr. Massey would like to see the original  
103 “horseshoe” plan restored, Concept 5. He thinks the rail trail road is necessary and with an  
104 added buffer, can be safe. He is not concerned with the views from the trail, as they are varied  
105 along the way. He mentioned that there would be a lot of parking spaces provided.

106 L. McAuliffe commented that there was not a lot of consensus, except that there should not be  
107 a road along the rail trail; traffic and pedestrians don’t mix. She wants the community to feel  
108 welcome in the housing and recreation areas, not create another barrier; V. Garfein and A.  
109 Slotnick agreed.

#### 110 111 6. Next Steps

112 Curtis Rand suggested moving ahead, not worry about details now, and to continue to work on  
113 the big concepts. R. McGuire agreed that getting consensus on the 3 modified concepts is just a  
114 start. Mr. Rand suggested the following next steps: send a report with the concepts to the  
115 Selectmen for their meeting in June or July; the BOS could then forward them on to the  
116 neighbors; then discussions could be arranged with the other Commissions. V. Garfein would  
117 like to move forward with the 3 modified Concepts for discussion at the next meeting on  
118 6/2/2022. Mr. Rand suggested that George Massey comments and other public comments  
119 should be directed to the BOS. Phil Barlow asked Mr. Rand about getting the latest survey; Mr.

120 Rand will track it down. Mr. Barlow indicated that he needs to talk to the Planning office, at  
121 some point, about roads and other issues; Mr. Rand agreed. Mr. Barlow pointed out that they  
122 have the original survey in the Pope Report, but that as it was a preliminary survey, the final  
123 survey could have some surprises such as the exact location of the pump station.

124

125 7. **Adjournment. So Moved** by V. Garfein, seconded by A. Slotnick and unanimously **Approved**.

126 The meeting adjourned at 11:39am.

127