

TO: Genice Gary-Adams, Zoning Official/Director of Planning and Development

CC: Jamilet Baquerizo Vite, Planning Board Secretary
Ryan McNeil, Planning Board Engineer

FROM: Malvika Apte, PP, AICP, Planning Board Planner
Langley Oudemans, Associate Planner

RE: **SPRAB Meeting Summary**
PB Application 26-02
27 Fairway Drive

DATE: May 7, 2026

SPRAB Meeting Summary: PB 26-02

Meeting Date: April 14, 2026, at 8:30AM

The SPRAB Meeting for the proposed project at 27 Fairway Drive (Planning Board Application #26-02) was conducted on April 14, 2026. Below is a summary of the items discussed, including concerns presented by the review board and actions which should be taken by the Applicant.

Type of Application: Major Subdivision (3 lots)

Information Presented on the Site by Applicant's Team:

- Applicant is proposing to reflect the historic layout of the area, which included smaller lots sizes.
 - The 1932 maps that established the lots (Rolling Greens), show a similar layout to the proposal.
 - Lot 6.01 would be narrower than the original plat in order to maintain a larger setback for the existing single-family home. This lot would require variances for lot area and lot width.
 - Lot 6.02 would require variances for setbacks and lot area.
 - Lot 6.03 would require a variance for lot area.
- Intention of the subdivision is to have three lots with a single-family home on each property.
 - Future homes will be smaller and will not need variances for bulk standards.

- The pool and patio will be removed and replaced with a home.
- The existing home is unique.

Board Engineer:

- Applicant needs to submit a revised plat that meets the requirements for a major subdivision.
- Applicant shall outline on the revised plans if the development will be major or minor in order to assess compliance with stormwater management standards.
 - Should include new impervious coverage and the amount of site disturbance proposed.
 - Should include conceptual grading plans.
- For stormwater management, the revised proposal should propose alternatives to a drywell system first. Bioretention, rain garde, porous pavement, etc. should be considered first.

Board Planner:

- Response needed to March 3rd Completeness Letter
- The proposal is creating several noncompliant conditions. Justification will need to be prepared and presented to the Board.
- A concept/ floor plan is needed to assess compliance with other standards, including impervious coverage.
- Questions raised about the possibility of creating two lots instead of one.
- The zone permits certain standards, and the Applicant will need to provide a strong argument to the Board addressing concerns and alternatives.

Conclusion:

- Applicant must submit revised materials to meet the requirements of a major subdivision, including the items requested by the Board Engineer and Planner.
- Applicant must submit a list of the waivers being requested.
- The Review Board strongly recommended that an environmental impact statement be submitted.
- Currently, the application is deemed incomplete.