1 2 3 4	Kingston Planning Board Public Site Walk Meeting - May 13, 2023 <u>at 186 Main Street, Housing Support, Inc.</u> Summary Minutes	
5 6	Ms. Merrill opened the meeting at 8:03 AM.	
7 8	There were not enough Planning Board members present for a quorum.	
9 10 11	ATTENDEES PLANNING MEMBERS PRESENT: Lynne Merrill, Chair; Chris Bashaw, BOS Representative; Peter Coffin, Member. Glenn Greenwood, Town Planner and Robin Carter, Land Use Admin. were	
12 13 14 15	also present. <b>Conservation Commission Member</b> : Evelyn Nathan, Chair <b>Abutters/members of the public:</b> Andrew Berridge, Robert and Virginia Morse, Scott and Madelynn Ouellette, Jeff and Julie Robie	
16 17	Housing Support, Inc. (186 Main Street): Paula Newcomb, Joe Watts, Brian Terry	
18 19 20 21 22 23	Site Walk Tour and Discussion The discussion during this site walk was primarily focused on the fact that the driveways are very close to the lot lines on both sides of the property; drainage and stormwater runoff concerns into neighbors' yards potentially impacting wells and basements; impervious vs pervious coverage; whether there is space for adequate parking; and how to continuously enforce restrictions on the number of occupants per unit.	
24 25 26	1. Paula Newcomb, Executive Director for Housing Support, Inc. gave a tour of the exterior of the property.	
27 28 29 30 31	<ol> <li>Ms. Newcomb indicated that the retaining walls in the front and the side have been done. She explained that they do have a landscape architect plan.</li> <li>Ms. Ouellette pointed out that the driveway on the left side of the property (from Main St facing the house) is very close to the neighbor's lot line. Mr. Ouellette and Mr. Robie also brought up the boundary line and how close the driveway is on the left side.</li> </ol>	
32 33 34	<ol> <li>Mr. Bashaw asked Ms. Newcomb if they plan on paving the driveways. Ms. Newcomb replied, yes. Ms. Newcomb stated that the existing gravel driveways are preexisting driveways.</li> </ol>	
35 36 37 38 39	<ol> <li>Mr. Robie mentioned that the existing driveway on the left side hasn't caused any puddling or runoff into their basement. If the driveway is paved, he is not sure of absorption and if this will impact water runoff into his yard/basement. Ms. Merrill commented that the Planning Board or others present are not qualified to make determination on stormwater runoff and this is done by qualified professionals.</li> </ol>	
40 41 42 43 44 45 46	<ul> <li>6. Ms. Newcomb guided the group along the left side of the house and went over some of the proposed changes they would like to make to the building.</li> <li>a. The left side entrance will be removed, the entrance will be from the back.</li> <li>b. In the rear of the building is where the lift would be installed, and the addition would possibly go up to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. The addition will not be visible from the street. Existing back stairs will be removed.</li> <li>c. The existing chimneys will not be disturbed.</li> </ul>	
47 48 49 50	<ul> <li>d. The barn in the back will be a workshop and recreational space.</li> <li>e. Ms. Newcomb showed where the original well was located in the backyard. The new well is in the front yard.</li> </ul>	

- f. Driveway will be extended to the back on the right side of the house for parking and access to the lift at the back of the building.
- 53 7. Mr. Bashaw brought up that the applicant mentioned during their recent Planning 54 Board hearing that they were initially going to have parking along the driveway, but 55 the abutters wanted the parking to be in the back. 56
  - 8. Ms. Ouellette mentioned that the abutters want the driveways to remain gravel.
- 9. Mr. Ouellette mentioned that the plan for the drainage from the driveways doesn't 57 show it going out to the back to a detention basin and is concerned where the runoff 58 59 from the driveways would drain too.
- 60 10. Ms. Ouellette explained that the property has been a 2-family for years. There are. other multi-family homes in the historic district, but they have plenty of space for 61 62 parking. This proposal for a 4 unit would have to address parking for 4, 1-bedroom units and it is a small lot. Ms. Ouellette said that the property is currently approved for 63 64 a 2-family with 3 bedrooms for each unit. She wants to make sure the bedroom count doesn't increase. If the property changes ownership, how will it be enforced to keep 65 66 the occupancy and parking as proposed for this project.
- 11. Ms. Newcomb commented that their financing is a 30-year lien on the property. It is a 67 68 specific lien for affordable housing, and they couldn't sell the property during this time even if the organization went bankrupt. 69
  - 12. Mr. Bashaw questioned the effect of the impervious surface calculation in adding the extra parking to the back. This would need to be verified.
    - 13. Ms. Newcomb stated that the State would prefer the driveways to be paved but could look into keeping them gravel and paving walkways for easier access and wheelchairs.
- 14. Ms. Nathan asked if the pervious vs impervious surface calculations were available. 74 75 Ms. Newcomb said their engineer did provide that information on their site plan. Ms. Merrill noted that the Town Engineer will be providing an updated engineering report 76 77 for the 5/16/2023 public hearing.
- 15. Ms. Newcomb mentioned again what she already mentioned at the hearing on 78 79 4/18/2023, that the driveways are being extended out back because the neighbors wanted them done that way. Ms. Newcomb explained that they would like to use their 80 driveways like all the other houses on the road use their driveways and be able to park 81 82 in/along them.
- 16. Ms. Morse referenced the Town ordinance and said that 8 parking spaces would be 83 needed for the 4 units and that the HDC also said that more parking is needed than 84 85 what is being proposed on the plan.
- 17. Mr. Morse said he doesn't see a big difference if the driveways are paved or gravel. 86 87 As abutters their concern is the snow and salt runoff impact on their well which is in 88 close proximity to the lot line.
- 18. Ms. Merrill stated that the water runoff must stay on the property. We need to know 89 the aquifer recharge. Ms. Merrill noted that the impervious coverage calculation is 90 29.8% per the site plan from Civil Design Consultants, Inc. dated/rev. 5/1/2023. 91
- 92 19. Ms. Ouellette pointed out that the front right of the property/driveway does flood sometimes. 93
- 20. Mr. Morse commented that the property lines should be respected. 94 95
- 96 Ms. Merrill ended the meeting at 8:45 AM.

51

52

70

71

72 73