

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Avon held a GoToMeeting on Tuesday, November 16, 2021. Present were Thomas Armstrong, Chair, Brian Ladouceur, Jr., Vice Chair, Lisa Levin, Peter Mahoney, Dean Hamilton, Joseph Gentile, Mary Harrop, and Alternates Elaine Primeau (did not sit) and Drew Bloom (did not sit). Alternate Raz Alexe was absent. Also present was Hiram Peck, Director of Planning and Community Development.

Mr. Armstrong called the meeting to order at 7pm.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

App. #4963 - Stephen Carroll, owner/applicant, request for Special Exception under Section IV.A.4.q. of Avon Zoning Regulations to permit attached accessory apartment, 12 Glen Hollow Drive, Parcel 2410012, in an R30 Zone

Stephen Carroll was present.

Mr. Carroll explained that the hallway that will connect the apartment to the house will be heated and is intended to be a walkway; he noted that his mother will be living in the apartment. He confirmed that the proposed apartment is 778 SF.

In response to Ms. Levin, Mr. Peck noted his understanding and agreement about clarification being needed relative to the language in the accessory apartment regulation.

The hearing was opened for public comment – there were no comments.

Mr. Armstrong said that App #4963 meets the requirements of Section VIII.

There were no comments from the Commission.

The public hearing for App. #4963 was closed.

App. #4957 - Proposed amendment to Avon Zoning Regulations for creation of Housing Opportunity Zone (HOZ): Beacon Communities Development, LLC, applicant

App. #4958 - Twenty Security Drive, LLC, owner, Beacon Communities Development, LLC, applicant, request for Zone Change from IP to HOZ, 11.21 acres, 20 Security Drive, Parcel 3900020

App. #4959 - Twenty Security Drive, LLC, owner, Beacon Communities Development, LLC, applicant, request for 2-lot Resubdivision, 20 Security Drive, Parcel 3900020, in an IP (HOZ) Zone

Also heard at this time but not part of the public hearing.

App. #4960 - Twenty Security Drive, LLC, owner, Beacon Communities Development, LLC, applicant, request for Site Plan Approval for 176 residential units, 20 Security Drive, Parcel 3900020, in an IP (HOZ) Zone

The public hearing for Apps. #4957, 58 and 59 was continued from October 26.

Present were Tim Hollister and Andrea Gomes, Hinckley Allen & Snyder; Dara Kovel, Gina Martinez, and Nicole Ferreira, Beacon Communities; Michael Binette and Andrew Stebbins, The Architectural Team; Tom Daly, and Emily Foster, SLR Consulting; Monique Hall and Michael Kluchman, BSC Group; Chuck Coursey, Coursey & Co.

Attorney Hollister reported that two submissions have been provided since the last meeting; one submission dated November 9 and one dated November 15. The intent was to cover all the questions and comments received at the October 26 meeting. Tom Daly and Mike Binette met with the Fire Department and it was confirmed that the driveway into the site for emergency vehicle access is adequate as supplemented by the fire protection measures being proposed. The CT Water Company provided a letter (with recommended conditions of approval) noting that there are no concerns about the site plan relative to the small area at the north end of the site that is within an aquifer protection area. He stated, for the record, that the applicant accepts the recommendations of the CT Water Company. Minor modifications have been made to the HOZ regulation. Suggested conditions of approval are provided to assist Town Staff, which is merely a running tally of the application process and public hearing. Preserving as many trees (of a certain height/size) as possible, to be consistent with the proposed development plan, is one of the suggestions. He explained that a provision would be included in the tenant leases putting people on notice that there are nonresidential uses in the area including manufacturing.

Mr. Armstrong said that he asked for lighting or additional security for the path leading down to Darling Drive and it was indicated that it is not needed.

Mr. Hollister said that he doesn't think it was said it is not needed but there was a request to look at the fixture used in the Town Center plan but we didn't think that was appropriate because it's not residential lighting. The site plan has both ambient and security lighting all along the driveway.

Mr. Armstrong said that he's focused more on the pathway that connects the apartments to Darling Drive; he noted his concern for safety. He noted his understanding that the lighting doesn't meet the LEEDs requirement.

Monique Hall explained that the pedestrian connection is along the sidewalk and along the roadway and is the primary route of travel. The trail connection is more of a natural connection through the woods and we typically do not supply lighting through woods because it is considered to be more of a natural trail and would require extensive conduit. It's not a private sidewalk or a paved area but is rather a natural path. She noted her understanding for safety concerns after dark noting that signage could be considered but confirmed that typically lighting is not installed.

Mr. Armstrong asked about another pathway from the apartments down to Route 44 (rear of 43 and 45 West Main Street) and the bus stop.

Mr. Hollister confirmed that this was discussed at length and explained that any pathway on the north/north east side or corner of the site would require fairly extensive tree cutting, paving, and

earth removal. A pedestrian easement would also be needed as this is private property; he noted that this is not something that has been pursued to date. He said that if someone wants to walk to the bus stop in the vicinity of O'Neill's Car showroom they can walk safely on the sidewalks down to Security Drive and up Darling Drive and go through the pedestrian tunnel under Route 44 and then use the sidewalk on Route 44. People could also use the trail described by Ms. Hall. He noted that Mr. Armstrong's suggestion could be revisited at some future point because it is a shorter distance but reiterated that it would require cooperation of the private property owners at 43/44/45 West Main Street.

Mr. Armstrong said that there is already a path from the "Coffee Trade" to the subject site; maybe the owners could be asked if they have a problem with it. He said it would help the application and help the future tenants and the businesses located there.

Mr. Hollister noted his understanding saying that he is appreciative of the suggestion adding that there is nothing on the plan to prevent looking into this in the future.

In response to Mr. Ladouceur, Mr. Hollister explained that if making the aforementioned path a condition of approval it would need to be worded/styled as a "best efforts" because it requires permission of private property owners. We would not want our application to go down because an abutter refused to grant an easement especially when there is an alternative. He suggested that it may be appropriate to add wording (as a condition if an approval is granted) such that the applicant shall use its best efforts to work with the Town, Town Staff, and abutting property owners to look into the additional aforementioned access. He indicated that this suggestion was just made this morning so we have not looked into it yet but confirmed that if the application is continued to the next meeting we will look into this item before the next meeting.

Ms. Hall explained that for the existing trail connection that is being made there is some amount of regrading and potentially trees that will need to come down. The most viable path will need to be found. Understanding that we want to maintain buffers around the community to the extent possible any existing trails are fine but we would want to be careful about trying to add too many trails connections to too many destinations having to clear cut trees and having to make paths through natural buffers.

Messrs. Armstrong and Ladouceur noted their understanding.

Mr. Ladouceur said that if there is an existing path that would benefit surrounding businesses you could weigh that against the buffer. He said that if he got off a bus at that location he sure as heck is not going to take the world's most convoluted route which is almost a 270 degree trip. People are going to go the path of least resistance – they are going to go for this path which will be unlit, right now, from 4:30pm on peak commute times.

Dara Kovel said that at this time they don't really understand the condition of the path and don't have full information but added that they are happy to look into it.

Mr. Ladouceur asked that it be looked into before the next meeting.

Ms. Kovel noted that she and Nicole Ferreira will be in Avon this Thursday and will look at the

existing conditions of this path and explore options but referenced Mr. Hollister's earlier comments such that the applicant does not have control over private property. Mr. Gentile said that he knows for a fact that tenants/workers at 20 Security Drive in the past have used this path to get to the Coffee Trade; the path will be used whether it is a formal path or not.

Ms. Kovel noted her understanding adding that they will introduce themselves to the abutting owners who will want to have a say in this matter.

Mrs. Harrop asked why the existing parking garage is not being used.

Ms. Kovel explained that after conversation with the property owner it was determined that the parking garage is too far away from where the buildings are located to be attractive to the residents. She added that she understands that the owner is open to conversations about the use of the garage if there is interest by the residents. We are happy to look at it if there is interest.

Ms. Levin asked how the assisted housing provision will be enforced since the property will not be deed restricted. How does the Town guarantee the "A" affordability of the units if the property is sold.

Mr. Hollister explained that under 8-30g there are two categories. Set-aside housing which is privately financed with at least 30% of units set aside for 40 years for moderate/low income; this is enforced by conditions of approval and/or deed restrictions. Assisted housing means there is some form of government financing; in this instance, Beacon would seek tax credits from the Federal government which are administered through the State government. There are zoning restrictions that apply to both set-aside housing and assisted housing so there would be no difference in the Town's enforcement powers between set-aside housing and assisted housing. There is a formal declaration of restrictions connected to assisted housing; these restrictions are financial but also reach to the administration of the affordability rules and the income limitations and they mesh completely with the zoning approval. CHFA in order to grant tax credits wants to make sure that the zoning is in place and enforceable long term. He explained that if a property is sold the declaration of covenants and restrictions that would go with any type of low-income housing tax credit or any type of Federal or State financing is recorded on the Land Records and has the same force of law as a deed restriction; it runs with the land.

Ms. Kovel noted her agreement with Mr. Hollister adding that for this property the minimum applied for, traditionally, under the tax credit program is a 30-year restriction and in order to make the application more competitive you can opt for another 20 years. She indicated that when financing for this property is applied for a 50-year restriction period is the intention and all future owners would have to adhere to the same requirements.

Mr. Armstrong addressed the HOZ regulation noting that there would be an 80% affordability in the units. He said he made two suggestions for revision: 1) the floor should not be less than 70 and 2) the average shall not be less than 40 years. He said that these changes were not included in the rewrite of the regulation and asked for the rationale.

Mr. Hollister confirmed that he looked at those suggestions carefully but said that they give them

no wiggle room if, for some unforeseeable reason, the parameters of the financing program were to change. Beacon is going to apply under the points system and we were concerned to have a floor of 70% when we are proposing 80%; an ironclad requirement could void the zoning approval if the financing program changed.

Ms. Kovel explained that the challenge is that the State has limited resources as to how much it puts into affordable housing. She said we will try to do as much as we can on the affordability side but must balance that with what fits inside the box of what the State can finance and give to any one property. We need flexibility to be able to secure sufficient financing to create affordability at 80%, which we will pursue but request some flexibility on the overall mix; we will still be achieving a very substantial amount of affordable production.

Mr. Armstrong asked what will prevent you from going down to 30% and 40 years when you've pitched 80% to us. Many towns do not like affordable housing.

Ms. Kovel indicated that they are very grateful for the opportunity to propose affordable housing in Avon noting their commitment/goal is to build a wonderful community with as much affordability as possible. She said that while they would be happy to create some floor they also want to make sure they can produce the development as represented. It's all about how much State resources can be tapped into.

Mr. Hollister explained that the higher the percentage of affordability the more points awarded toward tax credits. It's a self-enforcing mechanism.

Mr. Armstrong said that he has added up the percentage and you help our percentage of affordability with the higher percentage you have but noted his concern that no occupancy is planned until 2026.

Ms. Kovel said that she would love to convince the State to put in more resources and do it sooner; we are very eager to deliver this housing to Avon.

Ms. Levin asked what would happen if the financing doesn't come through and an approval is granted. She said that she recommends making it a condition of approval so that the HOZ regulation is not approved if the financing isn't approved.

Mr. Hollister confirmed that he answered this question in the November 9 submission. This is a problem in any development but pointed out that the HOZ regulation in this instance is site specific. If financing falls through the property goes back to the seller and the resubdivision would have to be undone. He said this is really the land seller's issue; the risk to the Town is minimal. The likelihood of the deal falling through is small and all the pieces are falling into place to create a wonderful development. He indicated that they would not be in favor of a condition involving financing (e.g. if the financing is not approved in two years the zoning approvals go away) and may not even be legal.

Mr. Armstrong said that he would have no problem reviewing reasonable proposed conditions should an approval be considered/granted. He wants to avoid having to try and undo something in the future.

Mr. Hollister noted his understanding.

In response to Ms. Levin, Mr. Hollister noted his understanding adding that he would provide information relative to the differences between the proposed HOZ regulation and the AHOZ as well as the underlying zone (IP).

Mr. Ladouceur asked that the applicant report back to Mr. Peck regarding discussions with the adjoining property owners relative the path discussed earlier. This information could be forwarded to the Commission.

Mr. Hollister noted his understanding.

In response to Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Binette confirmed that storage bins for tenants will be provided and noted that they will work on getting some type of poly glass housing for the bus stop.

Mr. Armstrong also recommended that an evacuation plan with a rally point (head counts) be created.

Ms. Kovel said that an evacuation plan is common for this type of property and will be done.

The hearing was opened for public comment.

Greg McGee, President, Petroleum Meter and Pump (PMP - 25 Security Drive) said their main concern is that they are a manufacturing use (trucks, noise, odors) and would want the future tenants to be aware of this ahead of time (put info in leases) to reduce possible complaints. He said they have been at this location since 1977 and would like to stay. He noted concerns for safety relative to the sidewalk and proposed crosswalk at Security Drive, which is where large trucks exit the driveway for his site. Currently there is a vacant property that serves as a buffer between PMP and where the buildings will be but noted concerns should that property be developed in the future because this is an industrial park that will now have residential uses. He said that while no expansion is planned at this time it may be needed in the future.

Steve Mitchell, Waterville Road, said that his experience is that the developers have a concern for helping Bike Walk Avon, which is about making a sustainable community with biking and walking. He is a car dealer who employs several hundred people who live in areas that are more affordable, adding that this type of development is needed in Avon.

In response to Mr. Mahoney, Mr. McGee confirmed that while he has not gotten any noise complaints from Peachtree Village he knows it could happen because we are making a portion of an industrial park into residential. He said that he just wants to make sure the future tenants will be fully informed.

Ms. Kovel noted her understanding adding that Mr. Hollister has confirmed that a disclosure can be made part of the lease informing people of the active industrial use next door. She explained that the proposed apartments cannot be converted into condos; the units will be rental for the affordability term and probably beyond.

Robin Baran, Woodford Hills, asked about the future intended use of the parking garage on the site.

Mr. Greenberg, owner of 20 Security Drive, stated that the parking garage was not discussed because it is not part of the applicant's plan. He indicated that the garage is currently being used by Acura of Avon and by the Police Department. He explained that while he has no idea about the future use of the garage it will likely depend on the economy.

There being no further comments, the public hearing for Apps. #4957, #4958, and #4959 was closed.

App. #4964 - Proposed amendment to Avon Zoning Regulations pertaining to accessory apartments; Town of Avon, applicant

Mr. Armstrong said that Public Act 21-29 will affect Avon's accessory apartment regulations and therefore he has proposed some changes to address his concerns. There is an "opt out" provision but doesn't start until January 1, 2022. He reviewed his proposed changes. He suggested keeping the requirement for the property owner to occupy either the main dwelling or the ADU; he also suggested keeping the maximum allowed to two bedrooms. He suggests prohibiting subdivision or condo conversion of an ADU. If an ADU exists you can have a minor home occupation but cannot have a major home occupation. He noted that while the State Statute doesn't really fit Avon, the Town's proposal (for ADUs) has been very progressive; the Commission has approved every application for an ADU.

Ms. Levin asked if there is a document (red line version) that compares the existing regulations with the proposed language changes. Mr. Armstrong said no but noted he gave you the bullets.

Mr. Ladouceur said that he reviewed the proposed changes noting that he is in favor; they look good and hit all the points that we need to protect Avon from the overreach of the legislature to open everything up for things that we don't necessarily need. We need to make sure that someone cannot bring a manufactured/mobile home to their property, hook up to electricity, and call it an accessory apartment.

Mr. Armstrong said that his major concern with PA 21-29 is that unless the Town opts out between Jan 1, 2022, and Jan 1, 2023, it's forever governed by the State of CT Legislature. He noted his opinion that the proposed changes are better than the current regulations and better for the Town than having to bare the terms and conditions of PA 21-29.

Mr. Ladouceur said that the proposed changes, which he is in favor of, also allow us to maintain local control.

Ms. Levin said that she doesn't feel prepared to vote on this application without having information containing the existing language in our regulations as compared to the proposed changes. She asked why the urgency.

Mr. Armstrong said that it is his understanding that we cannot make a change to our regulations after Jan 1, 2022, unless those changes are consistent with PA 21-29. The opt out provision requires 2/3 votes (5 out of 7 PZC and 4 out of 5 for TC). The changes proposed are done to hopefully make the language more acceptable to more people to exercise the “opt out” provision.

Mr. Ladouceur said that the legislature has made it somewhat ambiguous such that some could interpret it that if you don't opt out before Dec 31, 2021, that it could be read that way as well; we are taking the safest approach here. He said that he doesn't see the need for a comparison to the PA Statute because it doesn't do anything for deciding whether to revise our regulations. We are making a change to our regulations that we feel the Town deserves and needs. If after approved we want to make something more restrictive or more in line with the State Act, there's no issue with that but the problem is you can't go in the other direction.

Mr. Mahoney said that he totally disagrees adding that it would be very useful to compare what we are doing to that of the State as well as our own regulations.

Ms. Levin said that she does not feel comfortable voting on this item without a red-line comparison document to understand what she is voting on. She asked that this matter be taken up at the December meeting.

There were no further comments on App. #4964 from the Commission.

Mr. Mahoney motioned to continue the public hearing for App. #4964 to the December meeting. The motion seconded by Mrs. Harrop received approval from Messrs. Mahoney, Ladouceur, Gentile, Hamilton, and Mesdames Harrop and Levin. Mr. Armstrong abstained.

The public hearing portion of the meeting was closed.

## **PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**

Mr. Ladouceur motioned to waive Administrative Procedure #6 and consider the public hearing item. Mr. Mahoney seconded the motion that received unanimous approval.

App. #4963 - Stephen Carroll, owner/applicant, request for Special Exception under Section IV.A.4.q. of Avon Zoning Regulations to permit attached accessory apartment, 12 Glen Hollow Drive, Parcel 2410012, in an R30 Zone

Mrs. Harrop motioned to approve App. #4963 subject to the following:

1. Applicant shall submit construction plans and apply for a permit with the Building Department prior to beginning any site activities. Applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all requirements and codes of the Departments of Building, Fire, and Health (Farmington Valley Health District).
2. Construction shall begin within one year of this approval unless an extension has been granted for good cause by the Director of Planning.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Levin and received unanimous approval.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### Stratford Crossing – Status Update

Mr. Peck reported that the construction trailer was removed today. There is paving that needs to be done but paving season is over for this year (ends Oct 30). There are curbing and drainage issues that still need to be resolved but cannot be addressed until paving starts up again. There are some drainage and pavement grading issues that are unacceptable to the Town Engineering Department but the developer is working on a solution with Town Engineering to correct these items. The wiring for the private road lighting is being worked on but we do not have a completion date. The developer has indicated that Eversource has the request order to energize the lighting on the public roads. The developer knows that the Town is waiting for this to be done; the Town is pushing the developer to complete this item. There is still significant landscaping that still needs to be done, as shown on the approved plans. The developer says that some of the residents do not want trees planted and some have taken down existing trees. A comparison between the approved landscape plan and what exists on the lots needs to be done; this will require a lot of Staff time to review and any landscaping changes would likely take place next spring and not now. Mr. Peck explained that he has asked the developer that the landscape architect that produced the plan provide certification that the plans were executed in accordance with the approved plans; he noted that he hopes the developer agrees to do this. The HOA documents are being reviewed for needed repairs/revisions (noting that the Commission has not been involved with this matter). There has been a drainage complaint from a resident on Quinn's Court relative to the detention basin there; the developer says the detention basin was constructed in accordance with the approved plan. Town Engineering is investigating and has asked for an asbuilt of the basin to make a determination. Trail maintenance needs to be done by both the HOA and the Town and hopefully this will be done well before spring. The public roads have not yet been transferred to the Town (developer still owns the public roads) and the Town is currently doing winter maintenance on these roads.

In response to Mr. Ladouceur, Mr. Peck explained that it has been a longstanding policy of the Town to maintain (winter) public roads that have not yet been transferred to the Town. He noted that he doesn't know if this is a written policy or not but will find out. He said that the Assessor indicates that the value of the residents is in the homes and not in the roads. He noted his agreement that the Town probably needs to review this policy moving forward. He noted that this situation has occurred in many other situations/subdivisions in Avon and also in other towns. He noted his opinion such that if the developer is still paying taxes on the roads there should be a significant effort to get the roads transferred as soon as possible but that is not the case here. It's a complicated issue; the policy should also be discussed with the Department of Public Works, Town Manager and Town Council.

Mr. Ladouceur said that if turns out the policy is not a requirement can the Town require the developer to maintain the roads in winter and/or reimburse the Town. If it doesn't happen this season it should happen in all future seasons until the roads have been transferred to the Town.

## **STAFF UPDATES**

### Avon Village Center Status (signage question)

Mr. Peck said that he provided to the Commission a memo and some comments and suggestions

and noted that Attorney Meyers is here to provide information.

Robert Meyers said that both the Town and the developer want the constructed buildings to be filled with tenants. Many people have shown interest in occupying the buildings but have also expressed concern that no one will know they are there because they don't have signage. It is very difficult to lease buildings R5 and R8 as there is zero visibility from Route 44; there is some visibility for buildings R1 and R2 (located on left on Climax Road). The developer has indicated that there will be no plans for new buildings until there is substantial leasing of the existing buildings and revenue coming in. He said that providing signage seems to be the only way to get the buildings filled and move on. The proposal is to put on the corner of Climax and Route 44 a structure (tower) matching the one in the boulder garden to tie the project ends together. The signage proposed for the structure (at Climax/Route 44) would be at the bottom; signage would be discreet with uniform size, color, and styling. The cost for the existing structure is \$150K. He noted that if signage is permitted in the area requested it would not prevent the construction of building R3. He explained that he is looking for guidance from the Commission either they prefer a tower structure or some type of wall, adding that it would have to be seen from both directions.

Mr. Gentile said that prior to a couple of years ago most businesses along Route 44 had no signage at all and it wasn't until the directory sign regulations came into effect that small mom and pops retails were able to get small little signage on the road. Every sign on Route 44 represents a business with an address on Route 44. He is not in favor of any signage visible from Route 44 that is for a business that does not have an address and direct access off Route 44.

Mr. Peck noted his understanding but asked Mr. Gentile to review the section of the existing zoning regulations that addresses/provides for this signage issue. He suggested that he could work with developer to provide some appropriate sketches for review by the Commission. He explained that his goal is to make the signage as small as possible but the developer would like it larger possibly using a tower structure; this is totally up to the Commission. He confirmed that building R3 could still be built if a tower were added in this area.

Mr. Meyers pointed out that a large sign exists facing Route 44 for a business called "River Ridge", which cannot be reached from Route 44. You have to drive up Climax Road and turn left onto Bickford Drive. This came before the Commission many years ago and the same discussion was had and the Commission voted to approve the sign.

In response to Mrs. Harrop, Mr. Peck explained that the proposed signage would be located behind and higher up than the existing curved signage that exists on the brownstone wall (Route 44). If the signage were to be located on a tower structure, the signage would be located near the bottom of the tower and the tower would be positioned such that the signage on the tower could be visible above the brownstone wall.

Mr. Ladouceur said that the River Ridge building can be seen from Route 44. The developer is always asking for something else and we give it to them and then they ask for more. He said he doesn't want a tower with signs on it only for them to come back and ask for bigger signs or something else. If lease committals were acquired contingent upon signage at Route 44/Climax that would surely sweeten the pot.

Mr. Meyers explained that the intention is for the developer to alert potential tenants that they can have sign exposure for a specified time limit for people to learn where they are located. Once this is done that same sign area would be used to lure another tenant.

In response to Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Meyers explained that ten (10) individual sign blanks are proposed that the developer would have to apportion among tenants and prospective tenants.

Mr. Mahoney said he would be happy to look at some ideas.

Mr. Peck said that he thinks the Commission would be happy about one or two of the potential tenants he has heard about; these are tenants that have refused to commit without signage. In response to Ms. Levin, Mr. Meyers said that he doesn't think there should be a time frame attached to any approval for signage because it's not just for the initial tenants. Leases may go on for years but the developer will need flexibility with the signs for future tenants as well. He explained that the proposed signs are all white letters on black, no logos (ten signs facing west and ten signs facing east – two columns of five on each side).

Ms. Levin said she is open to all designs but needs to see some renderings and options adding that she is fully committed to making the Town Center a success.

Mr. Peck explained that the size (square footage) of each sign is not yet known – this is part of what has to be worked out.

Mr. Armstrong said that he thinks this signage would ultimately be temporary and evolve into directional signage for businesses.

#### Legislative Updates

Discussion for these updates with the Town Attorney will be tentatively planned for a January special meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10pm.

Linda Sadlon  
Avon Planning and Community Development