Approved 2/12/2026

CAPE COD COMMISSION

26 Shank Painter Rd (CCC File No. 25017) Development of Regional Impact Review Subcommittee Meeting

Minutes | Tuesday, January 27, 2026 at 1 p.m.

Virtual, Via Zoom

Summary of Actions Taken:

- The subcommittee heard presentations from the Applicant, Commission Staff, and public comment and discussed the project.
- The subcommittee voted to direct staff to draft a decision approving the Project, with conditions, as discussed for further review by the subcommittee.
- The subcommittee voted to continue the hearing until Thursday, February 12 at 3PM. This hearing will be held virtually via Zoom.

The Chair, Peter Okun, opened the Subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Okun said that the meeting is being recorded for the purpose of taking minutes. He asked that anyone else recording announce themselves. No one responded.

Mr. Okun announced that the Cape Cod Commission is holding this Development of Regional Impact Subcommittee Hearing on the 26 Shank Painter Rd Housing project (Commission File Number 25017), which proposes a new four-story building containing 40 home ownership units.

He noted that anyone wishing to testify will be welcome to do so during the public comment portion of the meeting.

Alex Peterson took the roll:

- Peter Okun, *Chair*, Present
- Douglas Fromm, Present
- Kevin Grunwald, Present
- David Mead-Fox, Present
- Michele Vion, Present

Applicant Presentation:

The Chair recognized Eliza Cox of LaTanzi, Spaulding and Landreth, representing the Applicant, Ecotekture Salient Partners, LLC. Ms. Cox provided a brief overview of the proposed development and expressed her intent to address concerns raised by the subcommittee at the December 10, 2025.

Eliza Cox noted that she submitted a letter dated January 9, 2026 that responded to the areas about which the subcommittee asked for additional information or clarification that are as follows:

Installation of Solar Panels at time of Construction
Ms. Cox noted that the project is being designed to support the installation of rooftop solar panels. With over 75% of the proposed units proposed to be income-restricted, the margins on this project are very thin, and so the additional costs of installing solar with the initial construction are still being re-evaluated.

Ms. Cox relayed the findings of her research into CCC approvals of four (4) recent residential housing projects highlighting the percentage of income restricted units associated with each project ranging from 13% to 28%. She reviewed the conditions for meeting EN1 in each of the project decisions and believes Objective EN1 can be met by an applicant's commitment to either install solar on the roof, or enter into a green power purchase agreement.

Ms. Cox suggested that a condition similar one in the Quarterra development agreement that would enable the applicant to elect either rooftop solar or enter into a green power purchase agreement prior to issuance of a certificate of compliance, so that we can continue to evaluate the feasibility of installing solar on the project.

Coastal Resiliency
The next area that the subcommittee asked us to look at related to coastal resiliency and the location of building mechanicals.

This site is in a non-coastal A zone. The state building code requires that for multifamily residential, developments that utilities and equipment be elevated 2 feet above the base flood elevation (BFE). The BFE is 9 feet. The Project proposes a first floor finish elevation of 11, and therefore it does fully comply with both the state building code as well as fully complying with the Cape Cod Commission requirements.

Raising the interior, utility and equipment room above that elevation would add additional cost to this project. In addition, it would also make it difficult to provide accessible routes from both Shank Painter Road and Brown Street to the main entrance. Similarly, putting the electric room only on a higher floor is non-standard and would also add excessive cost.

Parking Spaces
The vision for this site was to prioritize housing over parking on the site, because there is public parking within easy and safe pedestrian walking distance from the site.

There are three parking spaces proposed on-site, two are proposed to be handicap accessible, one is not designated as an accessible space. As conceived, the one non-accessible space is intended for short-term usage -- for pickup, drop-off, deliveries, moving in and out of the building. A condominium homeowners association will create rules and regulations regarding use of the parking spaces.

If all three parking spaces were being used, there is still space for a car to pull in from Brown Street into the site, out of the public way for short-term drop-offs and deliveries.

This project is within the Shank Painter Overlay District which contemplates reduced on-site parking spaces, and there is an explicit special permit provision in the zoning by-law that allows for the Zoning Board of Appeals by special permit to reduce the amount of required on-site parking. We will be filing for a special permit following the Cape Cod Commission review.

The parking layout will be evaluated locally and is really a local planning consideration. Where there is, off-site parking, within easy walking distance, and that also allows for safe pedestrian connections to the site that the proposed on-site parking does not create any regional issues that are within the Cape Cod Commission's purview.

Subcommittee Discussion:

Peter Okun (Chair) inquired whether all 40-units within the condominium would have separate electric service and bills? Christine Barker responded that it was likely they would have their own agreements.

The Chair asked who will the green power agreement relate to or will it be included in the condominium documents? Will all 40 units have to have green power agreements?

Alex Peterson, Commission staff, noted that it was possible for the building's common areas to have the Homeowners Association enter into the green power purchase agreement to cover that portion of their energy consumption.

Eliza Cox offered that the Applicant would comply with any Commission requirements to meet the Energy objective.

The Chair asked about how such a condition would be enforced when residents are allowed to choose their own supplier when they're setting up their electric service. He noted that there would also have to be some kind of mechanism to enforce that.

Alex Peterson responded that he was not sure that the Commission has seen this exact scenario, where it's been a housing project that's a condominium electing to enter a green power purchase agreement. At minimum it would be the common areas that would be subject to it. As to how it relates to individual units, he was not sure what that would look like. He offered that staff could look at other examples, if they can find one, to provide that information and draft a condition for your review.

The Chair asked about the existing parking lot directly across the street, which he suggested would be the primary preferred location for most of the residents of the project. How would that affect the competition for those spaces? Will we be crowding out residents elsewhere in the neighborhood that currently use that parking lot and forcing those residents to have to walk further.

The Chair recalled that at the last hearing the town manager mentioned that there is an area across from Stop and Shop that is town-owned land that might be converted to parking. He asked if the town committed to building a parking lot there and would it be residents only parking?

Thaddeus Soule, Town of Provincetown, responded that the town has gone through a feasibility study to add 180 parking spaces to the Route 6 right-of-way as well as extending the Cape Cod Rail Trail portion through Provincetown. There is a long-term vision to add additional public parking, as well as additional sidewalks, bikeways, and other forms of pedestrian connectivity. And that is for this entire corridor.

The Chair requested that Thaddeus Soule provide an overview of the process of going through the ZBA for parking.

Thaddeus Soule explained that the ZBA weighs parameters like the proximity to other areas of public parking and whether there will be dedicated parking spots or parking passes for residents of a condominium unit. Those agreements can be made through the special permit process with the ZBA. That seems to be very effective for condominium units, where there will be a governing board that would then distribute passes to ensure that if there isn't an appropriate amount of on-site parking provided, that they can at least assure that there will be a pass provided for those residents. The hope, ultimately, is to reduce the number of vehicles and have people elect to use bicycle and pedestrian means. He noted that this process was used to address parking at 44 Captain Bertie's Way.

Mr. Soule further noted that isn't possible for all residents regarding accessibility and being able to go to places of work, so the ZBA must have a balanced approach and weighs those factors along with the geographic location, input from abutters as to whether or not this will have any negative impact on on-street parking, or the possibility to expand public parking.

Michele Vion observed that there is only one non-accessible spot and it's a parking spot. She asked whether there were any considerations given to other designs for access in case of emergencies or if there's multiple deliveries?

Eliza Cox responded that the regional review is addressed first, and then the local permitting that's required under the Cape Cod Commission Act is undertaken. As part of local permitting, there is a site plan review process where the fire department and other emergency responders provide comments to the planning board regarding the layout of the plan. She acknowledged that local review will take place after the Cape Cod Commission review.

Ms. Vion responded that she understood the local review but felt they would be remiss if they did not consider this issue during the Commission's review.

Project architect Jeffry Burchard responded that we don't expect negative feedback from the local jurisdiction or the fire department on the layouts. The distances to entrances and the coverage and the truck locations are all designed to satisfy their requirements.

Architect Burchard noted that they did look at various configurations for the parking, and the unit counts that would result. None of them would satisfy the target unit count of 40.

He further explained that In Provincetown, because the streets are small and narrow, there often is not space for emergency vehicles to pull over. Shank Painter is a wider street, so if an emergency vehicle had to park on Shank Painter Street in front and couldn't use the Brown Street entrance or parking lot for whatever reason, or if they needed to use both entrances, they'd still be able to do so in this location. The delivery vehicles will be directed to the Brown Street Parking lot area. Because there are only 3 spots there is not a lot of other passenger vehicle traffic happening in that parking lot, and so there will not be a lot of inhibition on delivery vehicle access.

Kevin Grunwald asked whether there was any history of flooding in the police building. Architect Burchard could not confirm the presence of any flooding but did note that the police station has a basement that is well below the grade of the first floor elevation of the proposed project. The Chair offered that when the town was working to on a location for the new police station many people toured the old police station and it was noted that the basement often flooded.

Kevin Grunwald observed there will be one parking space that will be available to residents. There are 40 units. The two accessible spaces will be used. There will be one space for the rest of the residents. He understands that parking is a local planning consideration but believes that traffic is a consideration for the Commission. He asked how they would address people needing to make multiple trips to unload their vehicles. He also raised questions about the potential for cars to back up onto the street while waiting to drop off / pick up people, unload groceries, etc. He asked for a description of where the parking spaces are and how they would be accessed.

Eliza Cox reviewed the site plan and pointed out the location of the 3 parking spots and the adjoining large bicycle parking area.

Mr. Grunwald ask whether the parking lot entrance was on Brown Street and how that related to the location of the Methodist Church. Ms. Cox responded that the church was to the right – on the south side of the project site. There is another housing development on the other side of Brown Street.

Mr. Grunwald asked the applicant to use the drawing to explain where people can pull over for deliveries or to pick somebody up. Ms. Cox responded that cars could pull up right in front of the dumpster if they needed to stop temporarily to drop off something, and all three parking spaces were being utilized.

Architect Burchard noted that at that point it is the typical width of a double-loaded aisle, which allows cars to pass, or for cars to pull in and out while a car is passing on the other side. It's tight, like all parking situations in Provincetown but it provides that little bit of buffer space. He further observed that the primary purpose behind Shank Painter Zoning overlay is to make a mixed-use, walkable community that focuses on not just more or less parking on this site, but less parking on all

the sites, and to increase the kind of density of retail, mixed-use housing that happens along Shank Painter, and to make that a better connection to Commercial Street.

Christine Barker added that in town during the summer, we are trying to discourage people from driving because it's too congested. In the summer, when parking is more competitive, that's really when people aren't using their cars so much anyway. In the winter, there's a lot less pressure on parking spots, so there's a lot more available in either the public lots or on the street.

David Mead-Fox asked about what LEED level the Applicant was planning and why. Eliza Cox responded that LEED Silver is what the Applicant was planning for. Architect Burchard confirmed that and noted that Provincetown is an opt-in community, so they have to meet the stretch code which already exceeds requirements of LEED.

Mr. Mead-Fox said he agreed that the green power purchase agreement ought to be as ironclad as possible, and that every unit should participate. He asked the Applicant what Green Power Purchase Agreement they were considering, noting that there are varying types -- some that are partial, some that required 100%. He expressed a preference for 100% green power. Christine Barker responded that they have not decided about that yet.

Mr. Mead-Fox encouraged the Applicant to, at a minimum, do the 100% Green Power Purchase Agreement, and indicated that the preferable approach would be solar panels on the roof. He noted that he understood the tight cost margins but hoped that the Applicant would consider the long-term benefits of not just the installation cost but also calculated benefits over 20 to 30 years in terms of energy costs. Ms. Barker responded that the condominium association will also be able to take this on themselves. She pointed out that under this administration, there's no incentives currently available for solar and that she anticipates that the cost of solar panels will go down in price in the next 5 years or so and that is why they are making the building solar-ready.

Mr. Mead-Fox suggested a mixed model wherein the developer would set aside funds for partial payment on the panels and another portion of costs would be the responsibility of the condominium owners.

Mr. Mead-Fox asked to hear more about the reason why some building features cannot be elevated. He noted that the 2070 projection is of concern, because many times with flooding and climate change more broadly, the impact can be more immediate than expected. He observed that they wouldn't want to build a building at 11 foot elevation and later wish that it was at 13 feet.

Architect Burchard responded that the they are following the current building code. They must provide an accessible entrance into the building. The level changes to get from curb to that front door in the middle of the building requires the full length of that sidewalk and the pathway from Shank Painter Road to that center entry at an appropriate ADA slope. There is also an appropriate ADA slope from Brown Street and from the parking area, so that it's all accessible. To raise the building level would require more room -- more length of ramp -- which would have to come from

the building footprint or the bicycle parking or the accessible parking staffs, for example. There is not enough room on the site to begin to make that happen.

Architect Burchard further noted it would elevate the entrance from Shank Painter to a point where it would become unnaturally high relative to its neighbors and inconsistent with the pedestrian corridor sense and the zoning of the Shank Painter Overlay District. He noted that the cost would be extraordinary.

Mr. Mead-Fox suggested that a mixed model may be possible where the entrance remains at 11, but the utilities are elevated higher than 11. He asked for any thoughts on just the utilities being higher.

Architect Burchard responded that utility rooms must be accessible, and in an elevator-served condo building of this size, every unit must be accessible. They cannot have split levels without introducing additional elevator stops to make up for the split level differences.

Mr. Mead-Fox requested clarification as to whether a utility room needs to be accessible to somebody in a wheelchair. Architect Burchard did not have specific information on that point but noted that the utility companies expect it to be an accessible room and that it is accessible from the main elevation of the main level.

Douglas Fromm thanked Eliza Cox for responding in writing to address issues that were raised at their prior meeting. He expressed his particular interest in the percentage of income restricted units included in the chart and noted that the 75% income restricted units offered by this project exceeds the others. He called this an absolutely commendable project and said that he can fully understand why the town would say they would go with housing over parking.

Mr. Fromm requested clarification as to whether the parking scenario is exactly still the same as it was in the first presentation. Could they verify that nothing has changed about the parking. He also sought verification that parking is a town issue and a zoning issue. Eliza Cox confirmed those statements.

Staff Presentation:

The Chair recognized Alex Peterson, Legal and Regulatory Specialist, for the Cape Cod Commission staff's presentation. Mr. Peterson provided an update on the status of the review and possible next steps to be taken by the subcommittee. He noted that the subcommittee held a hearing on December 10th, 2025 and are within the 90-day required public hearing period for the project. The project will need to be before the full commission, no later than March 10th of 2026. The closest available full commission regularly scheduled meeting would be March 5th of 2026. To complete subcommittee review, next steps include review of draft decision and potentially making a recommendation to the full commission. At least one more meeting to look at that decision will be needed prior to continuing that hearing to the full commission meeting.

Mr. Peterson reviewed the criteria for approval of the project by the full Commission. He reviewed the issue areas of the RPP and the relevant goals and objectives. He recommended that based on

the information in the staff report and the additional information provided by the applicant that the project satisfies the RPP criteria.

Further, he noted that the town provided comments both at the previous hearing and in writing stating that the project satisfies the applicable municipal development bylaws and is consistent with the town's Commission-certified Local Comprehensive plan. The subcommittee will need to factor into that decision a finding that the probable benefits outweigh the probable detriments.

The Chair requested clarification on where parking fits into any of these goals and objectives like community design or transportation.

Alex Peterson responded that parking is largely outside the Commission's purview. To the extent that the transportation objective deals with it, there is a requirement that the access point meet visibility standards and that it meets that with respect to that driveway onto Brown Street. Otherwise, parking requirements, regarding the number of parking spots per unit is not included within any of the Commission's technical bulletin requirements for any of our objectives, except to the extent it is mentioned in community design.

In that case, there are recommendations that projects should aim to provide fewer spaces than what would otherwise be required for zoning, to enable more dense, compact, walkable development. The number of spaces and the use of those spaces is an issue to be handled, at the town local permitting level, and is not necessary for the subcommittee to discuss or condition in any more detail.

Public Comment:

Federal, Local, and State Officials

The Chair asked for comments from any other federal, local, or state officials.

There were none.

Public

The Chair opened the hearing for comments from members of the general public.

The Chair recognized Stephen Kazanjian, 30 Shank Painter Road. Mr. Kazanjian raised concerns about the limited parking and was concerned that Brown Street would become parked up. He did not think that the parking scheme was realistic for year round residents who might need to get to work or to other places that are not within walking distance.

Mr. Kazanjian also raised concerns about the building design and believes that it looks more like a medical office building than a residential structure and does not fit in with the historic character of Provincetown. He would like the developers to rethink the facade relative to the character of the surrounding buildings, as well as something that looks a little bit more residential in its nature.

Mr. Kazanjian noted that the lowest income restriction the project is going to is 80% of AMI and asked whether anybody had done a market study to see if that is going to be able to be affordable to teachers, firefighters, policemen, or to people that work in the retail stores in Provincetown. Mr. Kazanjian asked the Applicant to consider more setbacks on his side of the building, just so that you're not blocking the light from the units that are on the south side of our building.

Christine Barker highlighted the work of the town and acknowledged that there's been a lot of effort to determine need, and this project is meant to address the needs of the missing middle characterized by AMIs that go from 80% to over 200%. Ms. Barker noted that the project architects also designed the Provincetown Art Association and Museum (PAAM) and that they are a well-known, highly regarded firm that has clients across the country and globally.

Architect Burchard noted on Brown Street, the street is striped by the town, and the traffic enforcement in Provincetown is very strong. Additional parking on that street other than in the marked spaces will not be allowed. Regarding the setback between the buildings, he pointed out that they set back the proposed building more than is required by the zoning by-law or by the overlay district, and the proposed building is set further away from the property line than 30 Shank Painter is from the property line to provide as much space as we could between the two buildings to allow it to be more like a garden pathway between the two buildings.

Further Subcommittee Discussion:

The Chair asked for additional comments, questions, and requests from members of the subcommittee.
Douglas Fromm noted that there was an expressed preference that would be given to workers in Provincetown and town employees that counters the argument that it could consist of people who will have cars and drive elsewhere on the Cape for their employment. Christine Barker confirmed that it is town policy to give preference to people who live and work in town.

The Chair said that he would like to propose as a condition that there be in the green power purchase agreement and in the condominium documents that all the units would be required to have 100% green power. He further suggested including in that condition that in the case that the condominium association decides to put solar panels on the building, they may potentially be relieved from some of that requirement.

Kevin Grunwald commented that while he like the idea, the Commission may not have the authority to require that.

Alex Peterson noted that the staff could look at prior decisions in which we have set up a condition where, at a later stage of compliance, an applicant indicates which option they have selected, and then provides documentation of that power purchase agreement. He thinks that requiring 100% renewable power for each unit would exceed what has been required of other housing projects. It would exceed what can be required under the technical bulletins and imposing a higher requirement on a project than we have similarly situated ones. Our staff recommendation would be

to go with the language of conditions that we've imposed in the past that are within our bounds. He offered to prepare a draft decision with language for such a condition.

The Chair thinks that the obligation should be on the individual condominium owners. If only the condo association is required to enter into a green power agreement it will be just for the common areas, which is a small percentage of what the building will be using. There would be no real incentive for them to put solar on in the future. He is amenable to suggesting something less than 100% renewable energy or green power agreements.

Michele Vion suggested that data about the actual affordability parameters and meeting the needs of the missing middle would be important to have compiled and presented to the full Commission. She also said it would be helpful to include data on the projected price for the condominiums, along with the average salaries of police, fire, and other municipal employees.

David Mead-Fox asked what stretch code is in effect in Provincetown. He also asked whether there was no better way to protect the utility room itself against potential flooding. Finally, he asked if a condition of approval could be to meet the criteria for LEED Silver or ideally Gold.

Architect Burchard responded that the Provincetown energy code is a 2000 energy code, not the specialized opt-in. As far as the protection of the utility room, it could be constructed as a wet-proofed room. It's not a code requirement, because that would supersede the basic understanding of elevating the rooms out of the floodplain.

Mr. Mead-Fox noted that if you had a room that was protected sufficiently, and you had a flood of 12 or 13 feet, presumably the utility area would be secure and not damaged. Architect Burchard generally agreed but noted that the building owners make their own calculations about risks and the cost associated with it. Mr. Mead-Fox acknowledged the issue of cost but asked the Applicant to consider the idea.

Eliza Cox responded regarding LEED Silver certification and noted that the Applicant is not proposing to go through the certification process, but that the project is being designed to be able to achieve LEED Silver. She observed that the Commission has traditionally handled through a finding that the applicant has submitted materials and testimony that the building is being designed to achieve LEED Silver criteria but not pursuing the LEED certification status.

Alex Peterson confirmed Ms. Cox's statement.

Eliza Cox raised a concern related to the chair's proposed condition regarding the green energy purchase agreement and suggested that it was important that the Commission treat projects equally. She noted that the type of condition that he's suggested has not been present in other decisions. She asked to defer the discussion until the next meeting when they review a draft decision.

Kevin Grunwald highlighted one of the benefits is that the project not only increases the availability of affordable housing, but also increases the diversity of the housing. This project develops 75% of 40 units as affordable home ownership opportunities. Most of the projects that are coming to us are rental projects, and I think that that meets a significant need.

The Chair suggested that point should be included in the benefits and detriments.

Eliza Cox offered that on slide 25 of our prior presentation, they put together a list of some bullet points of benefits.

The Chair asked about the meaning of "workforce" in the context of the Applicant's slide. Ms. Cox responded that it is defined in the Cape Cod Commission regulations. It's a level of affordability--typically, between 100 and 180% AMI are considered workforce housing, and then above that, the restrictions up to 245% AMI for attainable, and then under 80% AMI would be the affordable.

Michele Vion noted that is important to highlight that this is a joint effort that was initiated by the town. The town put out an RFP and it's being championed by the town. The shared public-private goal is very compelling to her.

The Chair considered the question of adding parking to the list as a detriment, despite having established that parking is really a local issue as opposed to a commission issue. It can be included to document that there's a lack of parking for this project.

Mr. Mead-Fox noted that if the subcommittee identifies a detriment, it does not mean that it is saying this has to be addressed and does not mean that the subcommittee is not still, potentially supporting this to the full board. The Chair confirmed Mr. Mead-Fox's statement.

The Chair queried the subcommittee as to whether the list of benefits was complete. He then invited the group to consider the possible detriments.

David Mead-Fox offered a list of detriments: 1) the lack of commitment to installing solar on the building at the time of construction; 2) concerns about the flooding issue; 3) parking; 4) LEED Silver (rather than Gold or Platinum).

Kevin Grunwald questioned having limited parking as a detriment because it seems like we've established that that's outside of our purview except as to how it relates to community design, and I don't think that is a community design issue. Mr. Grunwald asked for more time to review these prior to sending them on to the full Commission.

Douglas Fromm noted that with flood risk, they want to make sure that they are not saying that's an immediate risk.

The Chair acknowledged requests for more time and asked Alex Peterson to prepare a draft decision for their review and noted that they will have to schedule another meeting to continue the

discussion. The Chair informally polled the subcommittee members regarding their being prepared to discuss a draft decision at their next meeting. The members agreed that they were ready to do so.

Alex Peterson reviewed the status of the review and noted that they have reviewed the content of the staff report and found there to be consistency with all the applicable objectives. They also reviewed correspondence from the town indicating that the proposal was consistent with local bylaws. Finally, they noted consistency with the town's LCP and that the benefits outweigh the detriments. These findings serve to demonstrate that it meets consistency with the Cape Cod Commission Act.

Mr. Peterson recommended that if the subcommittee is comfortable with the findings, then it would be appropriate to move to direct staff to draft the decision, at which point they can get into the details of exactly how to phrase the benefits and detriments.

Kevin Grunwald made a motion to direct staff to draft a decision for their review and vote on at our next subcommittee meeting.

Michele Vion seconded the motion.

The Chair asked to confirm that staff was going to research that potential condition regarding renewable energy. Mr. Peterson confirmed that.

Jessica Wielgus, Cape Cod Commission Counsel, asked if they wanted to specify whether the draft decision was an approval. The Chair suggested that it was an approval and Michele Vion concurred.

Mr. Grunwald noted that his preference was to leave "approval" out of the motion at this point, and just leave the discussion of approval for their next meeting

After some discussion, Mr. Grunwald agreed to add "approval" to the motion. "Move to direct staff to draft a decision approving the Project, with conditions, as discussed for further review by the subcommittee."

Alex Peterson took the roll call vote:

- Peter Okun, Chair: Yes.
- Douglas Fromm: Yes.
- Kevin Grunwald: Yes.
- David Mead-Fox: Yes.
- Michele Vion: Yes.

The motion carried.

The Chair asked Ms. Wielgus if the Commission is bound by precedent of these approvals, or is there some flexibility to take a new tact? He noted that he was speaking of setting potential conditions related to green energy purchase agreements.

Jessica Wielgus noted that there has always been a choice of either fulfilling the requirement with a purchase power agreement or the solar. She suggested that it would be appropriate to do that in this case as well. Ms. Wielgus continued to discuss the breadth of the Commission's authority, suggesting that getting a little too specific in that condition may be touching on exceeding their authority.

The Chair asked the condo as a whole can be required to participate, or can we only require the association to participate?

Ms. Wielgus responded that for the Commission's purposes, we want that condition to be fulfilled, but we may not want to dictate to the applicant how they do that. We can certainly take this question back and draft something that is appropriate for understanding your concerns.

The Chair asked for a motion to continue this hearing to February 12th, at 3 PM virtually.

Douglas Fromm made the motion.
Michele Vion seconded.

Alex Peterson took the roll call vote:

- Peter Okun, Chair: Yes.
- Douglas Fromm: Yes.
- Kevin Grunwald: Yes.
- David Mead-Fox: Yes
- Michele Vion: Yes.

The motion carried and the hearing was continued.

Materials Used:

- Applicant Presentation dated 1/27/2026
- Staff Presentation dated 1/27/2026