

HARMONY HOMES DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Minutes of June 11, 2020 meeting

Attending the meeting:

Michael Behrendt, committee member

Barbara Dill, committee member

Kitty Marple, committee member

Todd Selig, committee member

Sarah Wrightsman, alternate for Barbara Dill, Planning Board representative on committee

John Randolph, applicant

Maggie Randolph, applicant and architect

The meeting came to order at 11:05 p.m. Michael updated the committee on the project and the Planning Board discussion last night. He said there may be some minor adjustments in the plan as now submitted. The Planning Board may make changes and the applicant may want to add lighting later, for example. The board may address issues not related to design such as the driveway access, snow storage, and handling of solid waste. Barbara said the Planning Board last night did not raise any design issues.

The committee talked about whether there should be any condition that the residents be employees of Harmony Homes. This is the applicant's intent. Sarah said she did not think it appropriate, and it might not be legal, to require this. It would bind future owners and situations could arise where the owner would need to rent units to non-employees. Todd said it is highly unlikely that the owner would use the housing for non-employees. It is possible an owner would want to use it for future residents of Harmony Homes pending availability in the main facility. But he can't imagine that a future owner would rent the units to students, for example, or want there to be a party atmosphere here. It was the sense of the committee that there should not be any language in an approval regarding this issue. John said this building could also give them more flexibility during the pandemic, such as having employees work there some days.

Michael said the plan will go forward largely as it is including the architecture. It would be highly unlikely that there would be substantial changes from here but there will almost certainly be some changes either by the Planning Board, as precedent conditions, during the building code process, or as specified by the state. There are three ways the committee could deal with changes to the plans:

- 1) bring them back to the committee
- 2) include in the committee's endorsement that there is no need to bring changes back assuming they are consistent with the current design and are approved by the Town or the State
- 3) provide a final endorsement now but Michael would just update the committee about any changes and members could individually email back nonbinding suggestions.

It was the sense of the committee to follow the third option. *Todd moved that the committee give its endorsement of the project as now submitted, that Michael inform the committee of any changes to the design going forward, and that individual members of the committee can send back nonbinding comments about those changes at their option.* The motion was seconded and carried 4-0.

Members of the committee commented on the high quality of the project. The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Michael Behrendt, Town Planner