

NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 24, 2024

The Needham Planning Board meeting, held in person in the Charles River Room at the Public Services Administration Building and virtually using Zoom, was called to order by Adam Block, Chairman, on Tuesday, April 24, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. with Messrs. Alpert and McCullen, Ms. Espada, Planner, Ms. Newman and Assistant Planner, Ms. Clee.

Mr. Block noted this is an open meeting that is being held in a hybrid manner per state guidelines. He reviewed the rules of conduct for all meetings. This meeting includes two public hearings and public comment will be allowed. If any votes are taken at the meeting the vote will be conducted by roll call.

Public Hearing:

Amendment to Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2001-02: Finitumus Associates Limited Partnership c/o Petrini Corporation, 187 Rosemary Street, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 464 Hillside Avenue, Needham, MA). Regarding request to convert approximately 815 square feet of general office space to medical office.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Ms. Espada, it was by a vote of the four members present unanimously:

VOTED: to waive the reading of the public hearing notice.

Mr. Block noted the following correspondence for the record: a letter from Attorney Evans Huber, dated 3/14/24; an email from Assistant Town Engineer Justin Savignano, dated 4/16/24; an email from Police Chief John Schlittler, dated 4/22/24; an email from Fire Chief Tom Conroy, dated 4/16/24; an email from Assistant Public Health Director Tara Gurge, dated 3/28/24; an email from Needham Building Commissioner Joseph Prondak, dated 3/28/24 and an email from Superintendent of Parks and Forestry Ed Olsen, dated 3/28/24.

Evans Huber, Attorney for the applicant, noted this is to amend the special permit. There is a mix of medical and regular office use and the parking requirements are different. The parking requirement for medical is one space for every 300 square feet and general office is one space for every 200 square feet. There is an anticipated tenant for medical office. He noted 815 square feet is permitted as general office. The parking requirement will increase by one parking space. There are currently 166 spaces and there is a waiver of 15 spaces. The demand is 181. The demand is increasing by one space so the applicant is requesting an increase in the waiver by one space.

Robert Michaud, Managing Principal of MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc., stated the parcel adjoins Hillside Avenue. There are driveways on Hillside Avenue and Rosemary Street. There are garage spaces and surface spaces for a total of 166 spaces. He showed the garage layout. The current occupancy of the building is 46,817 square feet with vacancies totaling 22,000 square feet. The suite is 1,829 square feet zoned medical and 815 square feet is zoned general and they are requesting that be rezoned to medical. An inventory parking for current uses was done. He showed the calculations. The existing tenant peak demand is 71 spaces. If they re-tenant regular office, it would be plus 59 and to re-tenant medical office would be plus 8 for a total of 148. This is the total empirical standard. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) basis is 141. The parking supports the full occupancy of the building. The conclusion is there is a surplus of 25 spaces using either method. Mr. Block stated he has gone through the materials. There is an oversupply of parking, and he has no issues.

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCullen, and seconded by Mr. Alpert, it was by a vote of the four members present unanimously:

VOTED: to close the hearing.

Ms. Newman stated she will have a decision for the 5/14/24 meeting.

Planning Board Recommendation:

Article 1: Citizen's Petition/Amend Zoning By-Law – Dimensional Regulations.

Zoning Article Assignments for the Annual Town Meeting and further Board discussion on Warrant Articles.

Mr. Block stated he would like to do the solar and affordable housing districts. The Board discussed having a split of presenters at Town Meeting and not having the Chairman present all. It was suggested Mr. Crocker present the solar. Mr. Block asked if that would be a conflict of interest. Mr. McCullen stated that he did not think that it was a conflict but that it could be a perceived conflict. The Board felt it should be disclosed at the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Block will speak with Mr. Crocker this week and let the Planning Director know who will present. Mr. Block stated he will take the Citizen's Petition. He noted Article 44 is FAR for Single Family homes. The Board received additional comments from residents. There is a question about house size. This is a priority of the Planning Board for action later this year. He will set up a committee later this year. He noted the Board should approve, oppose or recommend to Town Meeting to refer back to the Planning Board for further study. No one supports the Petition in the current form. Mr. Alpert is not sure a motion to refer should come from the Planning Board as a Board but rather a Town Meeting member. He feels a motion to refer is very limited in scope to FAR and runs on a different path than where the Board wants to go. The presentation of just the FAR issue does not solve the problem. Ms. Espada agreed. Mr. Alpert noted lot area coverage is more relevant to the issue. He is in favor of the Planning Board having a recommendation it be rejected.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Mr. McCullen, it was by a vote of the four members present unanimously:

VOTED: to recommend Town Meeting reject Article 44.

Mr. Block wants to remind Town Meeting they are on the calendar to create a committee for a robust public process, there will be studies (fiscal impact and hydrology) and it will come back to Town Meeting in a reasonable time. He is not sure about money for the studies. Ms. Newman noted she will have an appropriation in July for studies.

Summer Schedule

The Board will discuss this before Town Meeting and when Mr. Crocker is there. There have been a lot of inquiries regarding the Board's schedule.

Public Hearing:

7:30 p.m. – Amendment to Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 20094-01: Town of Needham, 1471 Highland Avenue, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 609 Webster Street, Needham, Massachusetts). Regarding request to renovate 4 existing tennis courts, add 4 new tennis courts, install stormwater management improvements, ADA accessible walkways and landscape improvements. Note: This hearing has been continued from the Planning Board meetings of March 19, 2024, and April 2, 2024.

Mr. Block stated this is a continued public hearing regarding tennis courts at the High School. He noted the following correspondence for the record: a letter from Director of Athletics Ryan Madden, dated 4/5/24; a letter dated 4/10/24 from Rosemary and Webster Street neighbors including Julie and Ross Dananberg, Nancy O'Leary, Linda and Christopher Kilburn-Peterson, Barbara FitzGerald and Harriet Dann; an email dated 4/3/24 from Ellen and Jim Dudley; an email dated 4/22/24 from Paul Siegenthaler; a letter dated 4/25/24 from Paul Siegenthaler and a letter dated 4/24/24 from Director of Park And Recreation Stacey Mulroy.

Jonathan Charwick, landscape architect at Activitas, Inc., stated the applicant came in previously with 8 courts. There were 5 concerns: pickleball, varsity tennis coaching here, sound and sight, maintenance and enforcement and placement of the courts. The proponent was asked to move the courts away from the abutters. They looked at shifting the 4 new courts and that gives them additional green space between the neighbors. The courts were 29 feet and are now 43 feet. Mr. Block asked if the courts could be moved 10 feet closer to the parking lot. Mr. Charwick stated they are staying away from the memorial area with the benches. The proposed fences are 12 feet high. There is a 3:1 slope and only about a 10 foot strip

of grass so it would feel very pinched. This proposal is as close as they feel comfortable with. They may consider raising the height of the fence to 14 or 16 feet if there is a ball issue. There will be a 12-foot fence on 3 sides adjacent to the neighbors and 4 feet on the walkway side.

Mr. Block asked what the material would be surrounding the tennis courts and was informed post tension concrete, concrete, loam and seed. He asked how much impervious surface is being added. Mr. Charwick noted the increase in impervious is being handled. Mr. Block asked if it is being pitched toward the parking lot. Mr. Charwick stated the existing courts pitch toward the parking lot currently. The grade of the new courts are pretty much the same and all are pitching toward the parking lot. Mr. Block asked if the left side elevations are higher than the right side courts. Mr. Charwick noted the courts are 2½ to 3 feet higher in elevation than the existing courts. Ms. Espada asked how the courts were accessed. Mr. Charwick stated there is an existing sidewalk that goes to the courts and a handicap access point along the parking.

Mr. Charwick stated Option 2 is removing the shade structure. That gives a little more space. The one option gives more green space between the courts and neighbors. They are also able to rotate the courts to keep in line. Option 3 is 29 feet from the existing property line. A lot more green space is gained between the courts and the back of the property. The size of the shade structure did not give the project the appropriate locations. Removing the shade structure gives better options. Mr. Block commented there are still a lot of feet between the courts and the parking lot. Mr. Charwick stated emergency vehicles can go through the walkway between the new courts if necessary. They could see if there is any more room to pinch but there are existing trees there. All the courts pitch toward the parking lots now and the shade structure has been moved all together. Ms. Espada asked if there was a way of creating a thicker walkway to allow handicap access for all to go through the same path if possible. Mr. Charwick feels they could move 5 or 10 feet over but this has a better walkway flow. He will look at it. Mr. Alpert stated Paul Siegenthaler suggested having 2 tennis courts and the bottom ones be singles rather than doubles. Has that been considered? Drew Lawrence, the boys tennis coach, stated his first thought is no. They looked at the whole facility in terms of matches. The default is always to double courts to get more bodies on the courts. Mr. Charwick stated the preferred design was presented. There were concerns and the applicant will provide a condition there will be no pickleball.

Mr. Block recommended any current reference to pickleball be immediately removed as of the date of this decision. Director of Park and Recreation Stacey Mulroy stated the Commission voted to remove the pickleball lines from the tennis courts. They are also in the process of updating their policies. Mr. Charwick reviewed the concerns including having the location of the courts as far away for abutters as possible. He will look at raising fence heights along the neighbors. Ms. Mulroy stated she met with different tennis court vendors and spoke of post tension concrete courts. These started in 1988, there is a 25-year warranty in place and there have been no issues. Post tension concrete is much more of a set it and forget it. The High School Athletics have recommended 8 courts as well as the Park and Recreation Department and Commission. There is a lot of opportunity for growth with Park and Recreation. They met with their neighbors a couple of weeks ago and sent a letter with the breakdown of numbers. Park and Recreation runs tennis lessons, and she showed the number of registrants and the number of people waitlisted. Leagues are run that they have not been able to participate in and cannot host due to the lack of courts. For the summer camp tennis academy there are a number of waitlisted. This will allow more residents to play and hire more counselors from the community.

Mr. Block opened the meeting to public comment and reviewed the process. He stated it is clear there will be no pickleball so there is no need to discuss that tonight. He wants to hear new comments. Julie Dananberg, of 36 Rosemary Street, stated there has been no talk about a sunset clause. She wants that as a condition. She would like to know where the teams and groups that use that green space would go. Ms. Mulroy noted she spoke with Director of Athletics Ryan Madden this week and he is confident he can find other spaces for them. That space is convenient, but the schools have access to all fields around town. Mr. Lawrence stated when groups have wanted to use that field other fields have been found for them. The space is relatively small and there are better fields for those uses. Ms. Mulroy noted the schools have the use of other fields and baseball fields.

Ms. Dananberg asked if it is possible to include more blockage than just fence like arborvitae. Assistant Athletic Director Richkaard Verrier noted this has been considered and it will be looked at, but they would not like the Planning Board to put a condition they plant arborvitae. The tennis courts have been moved away from the residents. He does not feel the additional would be added now but they will look into it for the future. Ms. Mulroy noted they would not want arborvitae to hinder the project and make the budget go so high they need to request more money. This will be looked at for the future.

Mr. Alpert stated there is a number to fund this project going to Town Meeting and landscaping is very expensive. He assumes the Town Meeting money does not include landscaping. Ms. Mulroy stated that is correct.

Ms. Dananberg stated going to Town Meeting with a dollar amount before the Planning Board approved it is out of order. She is having a hard time seeing how the water will not go on her property. Mr. Charwick stated there are currently 2 catch basins that catch all the water. There is a channel drain along the court that will go to the drainage system tied to the parking lot. The grade will not be touched for 25 feet near her property line. Mr. Block asked if the grade was being raised and got 2 answers. He asked if the elevation on the side near Rosemary Street is being raised. The grade is not being touched and it will be the same elevation. The other side is being re-graded to pitch toward the parking lot. Ms. Mulroy stated there is a Park Ranger and people using the courts need badges. There is currently one 40 hour a week Ranger and she is requesting more.

Paul Siegenthaler, of 1049 Webster Street, clarified his presentation. A determination for 8 courts was done in conjunction with the Athletic Department. He plays tennis and wants 8 courts. He did not realize there was a waiting list. Eight courts is the bare minimum. The High School renovation was done 13 years ago, and it was rushed. Four tennis courts were thrown in as an afterthought. If this had been properly done there would have been 8 courts. With 6 courts the sound of tennis balls would continue later. Mr. Alpert thanked Mr. Siegenthaler for the presentation he sent and his suggestions. Mark Gluesing, of 48 Mackintosh Avenue, advocated for 8 courts. There are not a lot of courts in town. Newman and the High School are closed to the public during the school day and teams use Newman and Mills Field during the day. He would love to play tennis during the day, but the only place is Mills Field, and it is shared with pickleball. If teams can go to the High School courts, it frees up the other courts for the townspeople. Tennis is one sport that runs both boys and girls teams together. That is a great thing for the kids to get together and support each other.

Julia Salamone, of 18 Rosemary Street, stated there are compelling reasons for 8 courts but the request at the last meeting was to see what 6 courts would look like. All were expecting to see that. She is a little disappointed something else was not presented. She heard the last time 5 courts were needed for tournaments and one was added for good measure. They do not have tennis facilities affecting the neighbors and their lives. She asked if any other locations were suggested for 8 tennis courts in town. Currently there are 4 at Mills Field and there is room to add more. That would not affect the abutters. Where else was considered? Mr. Block stated it is true the Planning Board asked to see a site plan for 6 courts. The Town, for recreation and academic programs, are advancing programs for 8 courts and that is not changing to 6 courts. Ms. Salamone stated it was not brought to the attention of neighbors that 6 courts was out of the question. She understands the desire for 8 but this is one particular space with many different interests. A lot of space is being devoted to one function. That is the only other non-vertical multi-purpose grass space.

Diane Fidurko, of 356 Hillcrest Road, stated she is the retired girl's tennis coach of 25 years. There is a need for 8 courts. There can be varsity and JV playing together. That used to be in different locations. It is good for building cohesiveness and also good to be at the High School. Cars were needed to drive kids to other locations. John O'Leary, of 46 Rosemary Street, is a 50-year resident and appreciates the chance to be heard. The public notice was the first the abutters heard about this and the first time seeing the plans was at the 4/2/24 meeting. Tonight, he is seeing for the first time where the courts will be located and now there are 2 plans. He asked how far from his house the courts are? Mr. Charwick stated it is 29 feet from the court to the property line. Mr. O'Leary commented that is very close. The first criteria is protection of abutting properties. The only sight and sound barrier is a chain link fence for him, his hammock and his chickens.

Mr. O'Leary stated this is a community athletic facility in the Single Residence B (SRB) neighborhood. He sees very little accommodation. It is unbalanced and there needs to be some balance with the neighborhood. This imposes on the quiet enjoyment of his property. He is disappointed he is seeing the plan for the first time tonight. He does not feel like this was the appropriate approach. There were no revisions to the plans and no signage. This is a dawn to dusk facility and there are no hour's limit. Dawn happens before sunrise. He appreciates the chance to be heard. He is fine with redoing the courts and adding a 5th or 6th court but this seems overbalanced. Summer and weekend use of the courts is dawn to dusk in an endless stream of people. He does not feel it is appropriate to rush this through and feels it could be pushed closer to the parking.

Ellen Dudley, of 567 Webster Street, asked how close the courts are to her property. Mr. Charwick stated the courts are currently within the 25-foot setback and that will remain the same. Ms. Dudley asked how that is ok. This was rushed

through the first time and has been an enormous inconvenience to people. She does not appreciate non-abutters not supporting this. Other sports play in different places and every sport has to drive. This should not disrupt personal space from dawn to dusk just for the High School. People play pickleball even without lines. She agrees this is being rushed through. They already made a mistake once. Mr. Verrier noted they can increase the height of the fence and asked if she would prefer 14 or 16 feet. Ms. Dudley stated she would like the fence further away from her property. It feels like a jail. The parking lot is being dug up so she suggests moving the courts into the parking lot and make the parking circle around the courts. For drainage, that is a walking puddle. She would guess it is maybe 5 feet off her property line.

Nancy O'Leary, of 40 Rosemary Street, agrees with Ms. Dudley. This cannot be approved without setbacks. It looks like this has not been moved from her property line. She came to see 6 courts. This is being done for a few teams that play in the Spring. The Board needs to look at setbacks. The additional wait list people could be accommodated with 6 courts and the Board needs to look at a 6-court option. That would be a happy medium. She stated she is a pickleball player and Park and Recreation was advertising pickleball and Play Time Scheduler, which is another group. Ms. Mulroy commented they have asked groups not to use Play Time Scheduler and not recognize it. That is not allowed by Park and Recreation. Ms. O'Leary stated the Planning Board cannot approve anything without design and setbacks.

Mr. Alpert asked the hours of the courts. There have been complaints that the courts are used from dawn to dusk. Mr. Siegenthaler suggested limiting the amount of time to start at 8:00 a.m. or later and kick people off earlier at perhaps 7:00 p.m. Could that be considered and practically enforced, or could there be locks on the gates? Ms. Mulroy stated they are looking for volunteer Park Rangers. With the changes last night all outdoor court policies are being looked at. Mr. Siegenthaler's recommendation seems reasonable. She does not feel people should be playing at 6:00 a.m. She looked at using scan cards but proponents who have used them found people leaving the gates open. All things are on the table and are being looked at but there will be updates to the policies. Mr. McCullen stated he would definitely say a higher fence should be considered up to 16 feet or a net at the top. There should be some sort of containment and some sort of privacy screen should be looked at. It is a cheaper solution in the beginning with additional funding in the future from Town Meeting.

Ms. Espada stated it is reasonable to change the hours. She prefers the perpendicular plan but still wonders if the courts could be moved over. She asked if parking could be reconfigured if they have the budget. Mr. Block noted the budget is not a Planning Board issue. Ms. Newman stated if it was a private developer cost would not be an issue for the Planning Board and it should be the same for the Town. Mr. Heep stated the parking configuration was considered when the High School was first designed. He would be reluctant to change the circulation of the parking. Ms. Espada asked what the setback on the north was. Mr. Heep stated it is pre-existing, non-conforming. This is not getting any closer to the property line. Ms. Newman would like to know if it is legally pre-existing, non-conforming. Mr. Heep noted it has been a permitted condition for at least 15 years. Mr. Alpert asked if the Planning Board knew the tennis court was over the setback line. Ms. Newman will look into it.

Ms. Espada would like to see if there is a way of moving the upper tennis courts closer to the parking. She agrees with a higher fence or some type of buffer. It could be temporary for now. She noted a 14-foot fence is not desirable. Mr. Block commented he is surprised the applicant does not have a properly measured site plan as would be expected from any other developer. He is hearing consensus from abutters and the Board to impose certain restrictions such as some sort of screening, controlling the hours and fencing be part of screening whether netting or additional fence. He feels site circulation would be a worse scenario if parking and courts were reversed with idling and such. He feels there is room to fix it up and it can be accommodated in a reasonable way to get closer to parking. Ms. Espada feels it would be too close to the original courts.

Mr. Charwick stated there needs to be adequate space for spectators. They do not want them going to the back of the courts near the abutters. Mr. Block stated one set of courts could be moved over. It seems like there is room, but it has not been measured. Mr. Alpert stated a lot of additional information has been asked for so the hearing should not be closed. Mr. Heep summarized the information needed as proposed hours of operation, screening plan and a site plan with measured setbacks and elevations. Mr. Block would like that information for all 3 options. Option 1 has 43 feet across the bottom in all new courts and Option 2 is 29 feet to the closest pinch point. Ms. Espada feels Option 2 is the best option. Mr. Alpert would like plans for Option 2. Mr. Block stated the hearing will be continued to another meeting. There will be another option for participation. He added people can provide written comments also. Ms. Newman noted this will be continued to the 5/14 meeting. There is a hearing for the hospital at 7:00 p.m.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Mr. McCullen, it was by a vote of the four members present unanimously:

VOTED: to continue the hearing to 5/14/24 at 7:45 p.m.

Correspondence

Mr. Alpert noted there was a letter from the Attorney General's Office. There was a new definition of family but they seem to already have a definition of family. The Attorney General had approved the first time around but the Board expanded on that. It was expanded and not restricted. Mr. Heep stated the Attorney General reviews all By-Law changes for consistency with state law. Their jurisdiction is limited to changes and not existing portions of the By-Law. Three words for the change to family were stricken. The definition of family would remain valid in the By-Law. The Board should work on cleaning up the language for the next Town Meeting. Mr. Block will add to the Planning calendar to work with Mr. Heep. Mr. Heep will prepare a proposed new definition of family.

Minutes

On page 2, 2nd paragraph in the solar zoning discussion, it should be "inconsistency" and not "consistency". On page 3, "it should be called out in the By-Law" should stay. The sentence noting "Mr. Heep stated if allowed for municipal it would need to be allowed for all uses" should say "would need to be allowed for all municipal uses." On page 4, Mr. Alpert's comment on the small-scale setback should say "Industrial does not have a 5-foot setback requirement for accessory use so the property line is the setback for the district."

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Ms. Espada, it was by a vote of three of the four members present (Mr. McCullen abstained):

VOTED: to approve the minutes of 1/16/24 with the redline changes and the changes modified tonight.

On the minutes of 2/6/24, page 1 under HONE, Ms. Frail noted it was easier to pass compliance. It was agreed to take out the sentence "She feels it would be a short time to pass compliance." Mr. Block stated, on page 3, it should be "it is not clear whether amendments can be made." On page 4, strike "Neehigh" and "put public hearing for (the Highland Avenue address.)."

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Ms. Espada, it was by a vote of three of the four members present (Mr. McCullen abstained):

VOTED: to approve the minutes of 2/6/24 as redlined in the packet and further revised at this meeting.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Espada, and seconded by Mr. Alpert, it was by a vote of three of the four members present (Mr. McCullen abstained):

VOTED: to approve the minutes of 2/27/24 as redlined in the packet.

Report from Planning Director and Board members.

Ms. Newman noted there is a HONE meeting tomorrow night and it will be the final meeting. The draft report is out, the draft zoning is done, and it went in the packet today. She feels comfortable with the draft. The draft zoning implements the base plan and all the map changes and legal descriptions associated with that, all zoning framework that actually implements the add on plan and all the map changes that are associated with that. The final report is done. The Committee will close out the work tomorrow night. She reminded the Board there is a meeting with the Select Board on 4/30/24 for presentation of the plan and to recommend zoning. The Finance Committee and Hone Committee will be there. All documents will be sent off right after that meeting. She noted the Warrant Meeting is on Monday, 4/29/24, and all have their assignments. Town Meeting starts 5/6/24 and the Board will meet at 7:00 p.m. prior to the meeting in case there is a need to vote on something.

Mr. Alpert noted the Board voted a recommendation for 2 Zoning Articles and was informed that was correct. He asked if the Board should make a recommendation for the Citizen's Petition for money for a planning person to review HONE. Ms.

Newman will wait on that. She is looking at using GPI to look at key intersections adjacent to the corridor. Ms. Clee noted the Board needs to sign the recommendation for the Citizen's Petition.

Correspondence

Mr. Block noted the following correspondence for the record: a notice from the Attorney General requesting modification of the definition of family and an email, dated 4/1/24, from Louis Wolfson regarding Brookline Oriental as it straddles 2 zones. With the HONE changes Industrial on Crescent will change to Residential. Ms. Newman will need to follow the boundary of the lot for the MBTA Communities. Mr. Block asked if HONE should consider that. Ms. Newman will speak with Mr. Wolfson to clarify. Mr. Block noted another email from Louis Wolfson, dated 4/2/24, regarding the Citizen's Petition and emails from George Lynch, dated 4/2/24; Matt Hughes, dated 4/10/24; Mark Bees, dated 4/4/24; Dana Alexander, dated 4/2/24; Jennifer Adler dated 4/2/24 and Katherine Adams, dated 4/2/24 all regarding the Citizen's Petition.

Mr. Alpert appreciated the email from Mr. Hughes. He did a great job presenting the issue. He noted the Board gets a lot of emails from people complaining a lot about trees being taken down. He joined the Board 9 years ago and the Board talked a lot about a Tree By-Law and were told by the Select Board it was their jurisdiction. Nine years later nothing has been done. There was a Tree By-Law Committee, then nothing. He would like to tell people he has been in favor, but they need to speak to the Select Board. People keep complaining to the Planning Board, but they need to speak with the Select Board. Ms. Espada noted the CAPC also discussed it. Mr. Block will put together a letter from the Planning Board Chair to the Select Board Chair requesting action. Ms. Newman commented the HONE Committee decided not to rezone any residential land which is why Brookline Oriental is not rezoned.

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCullen, and seconded by Ms. Espada, it was by a vote of the four members present unanimously:

VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Kalinowski, Notetaker

Natasha Espada, Vice-Chairman and Clerk