

POPE LAND DESIGN COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING

DECEMBER 7, 2023 – 10:00AM (VIA ZOOM)

1. Call to Order. Present: Ray McGuire, Vivian Garfein, Abeth Slotnick and Curtis Rand. Absent: Lisa McAuliffe and Tim Sinclair.
2. **Approval of Agenda. So Moved** by V. Garfein, seconded by A. Slotnick and unanimously **Approved.**
3. **Approval of Minutes of November 2, 2023.** A. Slotnick asked for a correction to Item 7 to read: “...so phasing might not be required.” A **Motion to Approve the Minutes, as amended**, was made by V. Garfein, seconded by A. Slotnick and unanimously **Approved.**
4. Discussion: Review of Latest Revision (11/9/2023) Concept Design 6
It was pointed out by A. Slotnick that the revision looked OK, but a subsequent site plan for the recreation section is different now. R. McGuire asked C. Rand if the recreation plan was final. C. Rand commented that L. McAuliffe had asked that they wait until the January meeting to discuss that; there is information from the PZC Colliers study, including the recreation plan, which Phil Barlow hasn’t seen yet. V. Garfein mentioned the recent information regarding the capacity of the sewer system and suggested that this Committee should pause and let this proposal rest a bit. R. McGuire asked C. Rand about that; C. Rand offered that there could be capacity for this proposal, but then nothing else. He talked about a way to increase capacity, such as by re-lining the old lines to help reduce groundwater infiltration; that will be a Town issue for a few years. C. Rand mentioned that he had spoken with Phil Barlow, regarding the end of the conceptual planning and funding stages. C. Rand asked this Committee to think about whether they want to continue working further towards the final designs, architectural designs and the deeper applications to the Land Use Commissions. He indicated that obtaining the grant funding would eventually be up the Housing groups; it could be possible that the Town might need to lease the land for housing to the Housing groups. R. McGuire mentioned Phil Barlow’s comments at the last meeting, that this Committee’s work would be finished after the presentation to the IWWC. A. Slotnick pointed out that the Housing groups would need to have site control, an agreement with the Town to lease the land, otherwise they can’t apply for grants; she feels that this Committee should have the responsibility to get the project to that point. C. Rand indicated that it would take quite a bit of time to get that to a Town meeting. R. McGuire asked how people would feel, if they were asked to lease land for housing, before there are finished designs. C. Rand suggested that the Affordable Housing Commission would be asking and making the recommendation about how to proceed, not the PLDC; he noted that the recreation part of the land would remain under Town control and large expenditures would also have to go

to Town meeting. C. Rand noted that the Town would approve expenditures on a funding basis; some things might go in the capital portion of the annual budget to be discussed next year. V. Garfein mentioned that the town would need to vote on the whole project, not housing and recreations separately. C. Rand indicated there would need to be a very clear resolution for a vote, such as asking for the approval of Concept Design 6. V. Garfein expressed that the initial approval would be just for the 2 land uses, housing and recreation, on the site. C. Rand suggested the process would be what was done for Holley Place, which was the option to lease the land for housing, which was approved at a Town meeting. That option gave the Housing Committee site control and they were able to apply for pre-development funding and planning. A. Slotnick would like to have Town approval for the whole plan, not just the lease option. R. McGuire asked if approving the capital requirements of the proposed recreation would, in effect, approve the whole concept; C. Rand could not answer that question. V. Garfein suggested having one over-arching vote for approval on both the housing and recreation sections, as a concept. R. McGuire asked how much more detail would be required on the design concept, before a decision could be made on going forward: A. Slotnick suggested that the vote would only be on the concept of having the 2 areas, not on details of what would eventually be built there or approving exact designs. C. Rand suggested that more guidance is needed from the Historic District (HDC), Planning & Zoning (PZC) and Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commissions (IWWC) before proceeding; they would be giving approval of the concept only, not specific details. C. Rand added that there will need to be documents from those Commissions, based on what they have been shown. R. McGuire asked how much Phil Barlow has been paid; C. Rand answered about \$50k. C. Rand indicated that the proposed Recreation portion of the concept design needs to be reviewed at the January meeting, before going to the IWWC. R. McGuire asked if the bridge is a PZC issue; C. Rand noted that it is a large project; there would need to be information about traffic flow. Some of the bridge funding would come from the DOT, but it takes a lot of time; a pedestrian bridge would be much less of a matter. A. Slotnick suggested that a traffic study is needed. C. Rand suggested that would be one of the problems with having a vote on the concept design; information on traffic is needed.

5. Discussion: Plan presentation to the IWWC – Update

R. McGuire suggested that the January meeting would have the discussion about the recreation plan and then how to move forward; plan a presentation to the IWWC; then decide if the PLDC would make a recommendation to the BOS. Funding may be discussed in January. R. McGuire asked about the water/sewer capacity: C. Rand indicated that the total of the proposed AH units would use up the current capacity.

6. Discussion: Next Steps / Schedule of Meeting Dates 2024

A Motion to Continue Meeting on the 1st Thursday of the Month at 10:00am was made by A. Slotnick, seconded by V. Garfein and unanimously **Approved**.

7. Public Comment – None

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