

Barons South Committee  
February 4, 2014

Present:

Steve Daniels  
Martha Hauhuth  
Ken Bernhard  
Yvonne Senturia  
Sharon Rosen  
Jo Fuchs Luscombe  
Rob Haroun  
Matt Mandell  
Avi Kaner and Jim Marpe

Absent:

Rev Ed Horne  
John Thompson

Meeting called to order at 8:40 by Martha Hauhuth.

AK reported that since the last meeting had not been properly noticed, he would summarize: He explained the memorandum of understanding, and reiterated the unresolved major financial component, hopefully to be resolved within next few days. He reviewed the artist's rendering and the topography of the property; the synergy with the senior center; some parcels to be preserved as open space in perpetuity (developer maintain with walking paths, etc); public/private partnership with a 98 year land lease for 10 acres of property, only 8 of which will be developed;

Finances: Paul Fria in attendance.

Issues raised at last meeting:

1. Assisted living services: Jewish Senior Services will be located on site to provide ad hoc services. Yes, you will be allowed to bring in your own provider, as long as they register with JSS (no certification, just registration).
2. Swimming pool: concerns regarding lap swimming were communicated to the developer's swimming pool consultant. The plan is for a warm water pool 20 feet by 40 feet. Lap swimming will be permitted during normal pool operating hours when no classes are being held. Have observed that some residents do swim laps in warm water pool. State law says can't create a lane divider. Frequency of classes depends on demand. Schedule would be posted. Provide something supplemental to what is available already in the community, with the warm water therapy pool.  
SD: other facilities in town for swimming. Look at what is being utilized in town today, and how are they being utilized  
Carolyn: making pool longer would mean further excavation/additional costs

KB: make overall needs assessment. First priority resolving PILOT.

?: people living in the complex likely to want mid-day classes. Younger non-resident seniors wanting to lap swim less likely to want mid-day swim while still employed.

MM: bring the greater senior community into the facilities

3. Amenities – synergy with the senior center

Sue P: the fitness equipment in the senior center is 10 years old, and soon would need replacement. No duplication with fitness center in amenities building. Would retire senior center fitness equipment and continue with stretching and other exercise classes that do not require equipment. Fees for classes in senior center currently \$4/hour.

KB: set up subcommittee to look at overview of amenities. Would Sue P agree to be in charge? Yes. Work with MM and developer etc.

4. Affordable Housing Units - Larry Bradley, staff to Planning and Zoning Commission reported. (a) sizes of affordable units: Westport statutes say must be  $\geq 75\%$  of comparable market rate units. Developer proposes 85%, so no problem.

(b) comparability: LB says statute says “amenities shall be comparable”.

Discussion: We had agreed washer/dryer in each unit. Developer says finishes largely similar and will have similar appliances. No stigma with affordable as proposed.

(c) unit types: Experience suggests affordable *senior* housing almost never provided as 2 bedrooms. *Seniors* only 1-2 people in household, and extra bedroom adds  $> \$1500$ /month to rent. Also would increase the size of the building if wanted any 2 bedroom units. LB says no current regulations on unit type comparability specifically for *senior* housing.

(d) LB reviewed possible text amendment changes. the letter of authorization comes from the First Selectman, but that does not say who drafts the letter. Developer offered to draft the text amendment proposal which committee and First Selectman would review. Offer accepted by committee.

AK: outdoor exercise equipment incorporated into the concept.

AK: walking paths open to town residents

Carolyn: specific parking spaces for town residents will be in next design iteration

RH: discussed topographical sketch, and suggested that areas of parcels 2 and 3 with steep slopes set aside as conservation easement, which also provides buffer for residential housing abutting

LB: If have 10 acres dedicated to the facility, don't have to adjust the density calculation.

Conservation easement in an L shape would insulate residential houses and make that part of the 10 acre lease (only 8 acres developed). Planning & Zoning will require traffic study. LB says also goes to state traffic commission because of the two state roads.

SD: playground would increase traffic. Make sure that doesn't take away from the entire goal.

AK: Big open item is ongoing lease payments negotiations.

Next meeting (tentative) set for Wednesday February 26<sup>th</sup> 8:30 – 10:00.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55am.