



Mansfield Tomorrow

OUR PLAN ► OUR FUTURE

ZONING FOCUS GROUP MEETING

Special Meeting

Wednesday, March 16, 2016 | 8:30 A.M.

Conference Room B
Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building
4 South Eagleville Road

DRAFT Minutes

- I. **Call to order**- The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. The following were present: Booth, Pelletier (Zoning Focus Group members), Painter, Kaufman, and Mullen.
- II. **Minutes of March 7, 2015 meeting**- They were reviewed by the group and approved by consensus.
- III. **Review of Draft Modifications to Existing Regulations**

Alison Hilding's comments submitted on 3/16/2016 (attached) were handed out to the members and reviewed.

 - A. Alcohol--Painter distributed draft regulations that are based on direction received from the Commission.
Booth suggested that neighbors would want at least 100 ft setback from residents. Mullen questions the legality of this since people with smaller lots would have less area to work in.
- IV. Public Comment-None
- V. Next Steps/Meeting Date-Next meeting has not been scheduled, but will be once substantial progress has been made on multifamily development.
- VI. **Adjourn**- Meeting adjourned at 8:57 pm.

Jennifer S. Kaufman

From: Alison Hilding <aahilding@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2016 8:30 AM
To: Jennifer S. Kaufman
Subject: storm water regs

Jennifer,

I am planning to come this morning but just in case my driver does not show up I would like the following comments included in the record in response to the staff's remarks that were made at the last meeting regarding my 3/7/16 email on the storm water regs, and more specifically the proposed concept of "a menu of choices" without specificity in performance standards with regard to the geography in which these take place, ie steep slopes, flat land, rocky soil, high water table, or shallow to bedrock:

Too many choices may appear good but without specific guidance on what these really mean, the choices are meaningless. Having choice is good but having choices that are undefined is not good. What are the precise meanings of each stormwater choice? How should each choice be applied and under what circumstances? Where on the property should each choice be applied and under what circumstances? Without specificity, these choices assume an understanding about the principles of stormwater mgt that does not exist within the general public or construction worker. To make this section work, the town planner needs to provide more details of when and where these choices make sense. For example, sheet flow of stormwater is a great idea to avoid erosion but will not work on steep slopes. Similarly, detention and retention ponds will be extremely challenging to implement on flat land with a high groundwater table.

Perhaps a storm water booklet that gives guidance on how to implement these options would be beneficial if they are all personal selections as of right under the zoning permit process. Guidance in matters such as what percent of the disturbed property needs to adhere to these options, can they have, for example, five different options, and under what conditions specific options can be employed should be clarified. Furthermore, are there scenarios where one or more options would not work on a site? For example are there certain soil conditions, slopes, surface bedrock where some of these options would not be appropriate. Likewise, how much of the disturbed area would require a storm water solution? Similarly a detention basin might be an appropriate action in an area of relatively flat land and a high ground water table. If the options are a matter of right, how do we know that implementation of the selected option will be effective?

Thank you.

Alison