

NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

January 21, 2025

The Needham Planning Board meeting, held in the Charles River Room of the Public Services Administration Building, and virtually using Zoom, was called to order by Natasha Espada, Chairman, on Tuesday, January 21, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. with Messrs. Crocker, Block, McCullen and Alpert, Planner, Ms. Newman and Assistant Planner, Ms. Clee.

Ms. Espada noted this is an open meeting that is being held in a remote manner per state guidelines. She reviewed the rules of conduct for all meetings. This meeting includes one public hearing and public comment will be allowed. If any votes are taken at the meeting the vote will be conducted by roll call.

Public Hearing:

7:00 p.m. – Amendment to Major Project Special Permit No. 1997-08: EP 63 Kendrick Realty, LLC, c/o Edgewater Properties, LLC, 14 Mica Lane, Suite 202, Wellesley, MA 02481, Petitioner (Property located at 63 Kendrick Street, f/k/a 155 Fourth Avenue, Needham, Massachusetts). Regarding request to make certain revisions to the site and building.

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

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

Ms. Espada noted the following correspondence for the record: an email from Police Chief John Schlittler, dated 1/17/25, with no issues; an email from Fire Chief Tom Conroy, dated 1/17/25, noting approval and an email from Assistant Public Health Director Tara Gurge, dated 1/17/25, with comments. She noted the Building Commissioner reviewed, agrees with Attorney George Giunta Jr and has no additional comments. Engineering had a comment that the applicant has agreed to prepare an Operation and Maintenance Plan for Storm Water. Attorney George Giunta Jr., representative for the applicant, noted this is an amendment to the special permit. This building is at the corner of Kendrick Street and Fourth Avenue. It is Parcel 6 and is in the New England Business Center. The property is 261,361 square feet with 372.99 feet of frontage on Kendrick Street and 739 feet of frontage on Fourth Avenue. The property is fully developed. The existing commercial building was rehabbed in 1997.

George Giunta Jr., representative for the applicant, noted the existing building is 105,900 square feet. It is mostly one story with a 2-story section in the back opposite Kendrick Street. The setback is 19.6 feet from the left side line, so it is non-conforming. There was no sideline setback in 1997 in the New England Business Center. This was fully lawful and conforming. He noted there is no work being done on that side of the building. A special permit to alter a non-conforming structure is needed. There are 2 existing parking areas – one large to the rear off Fourth Avenue and a small one in front accessed from Kendrick Street. The shell is being left intact. Two additions will be added. A small one to the front and a small one to the rear. This will provide a new entry or vestibule area for better access. The address was Fourth Avenue but the property has both legal addresses with Kendrick more prominent. It will now be designated as 63 Kendrick Street. He noted the front refers to Kendrick Street. The existing loading area in the right rear is being reconfigured to allow better loading. There will be a trash compactor and trash removal.

Mr. Giunta Jr. noted there is currently an existing open courtyard in the middle of the building. That will be enclosed and made a part of the interior space of the building. A new loading dock is being added to the left rear corner on the opposite side from Fourth Avenue. The 2-story section and another portion will be renovated to be open to the ceiling. The exterior will be upgraded and renovated all around. Landscaping and parking will be upgraded and the front will be altered a little with a patio area going in. He called out a couple of non-conformities such as the side setback and the front parking lot located less than 50 feet from the exterior line of Fourth Avenue and Kendrick Street. The location of parking is not changing and the special permit could reduce down a bit. The parking now is to the side or rear. Front parking will no

longer be allowed. The landscape open space new requirement on site is 25%. They currently have 19.8% open space and this has been increased to 19.9%. A special permit will be needed. He noted there was no limit in 1997.

Bill Madden, landscape architect with Edgewater Properties, LLC, noted there are 3 elements – renovation of existing landscape, which is in decline, Kendrick entry side and the rear entrance. David Silverman, landscape architect with Edgewater Properties, LLC, noted there are 2 entrances off Kendrick Street that will be removed and one entry will be made with a landscape area. There will be a new loading dock on the north side with the overall net square footage reduced. Mr. Madden noted there will be a formal entry and a series of walls to create a garden for guests composed of 4 benches. There will be handicap parking stalls in front to get into these spaces, a sloped walkway to get up to the entrance of the building and a series of risers for the grade change from the small plaza. The applicant wanted a gesture to the street. The material pallet for the landscape board is formed concrete walls, concrete pavers, hex shaped and a dark gray concrete building. The intention of the garden is for people/tenants to come out and rest and feel separate from vehicular traffic. Trees are being planted that can handle salt and snow.

Mr. Silverman noted the building was last renovated in the mid 90s. It is mostly stucco with a lot of joints and patterns and little pieces of granite inserted. The stucco around the building is being kept. The joints will be cleaned up but it will be kept modern and simple. From the left corner until the 3 hits there is a metal panel that was added to the right. On the right there will be a different color gray for the stucco to break up the long façade. All glass will be replaced. The parking is planted with Bradford pear trees that are in severe decline. They will plant species of red maple to keep the canopy tight. It has been reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB). Ms. Espada asked what the DRBs biggest concerns were and was informed the amount of lawn in front. Mr. Silverman stated between the windows metal panels are being added to break it up a bit. The bump up of parapets are being moved to simplify. Mr. Madden stated there is an interest in naturalizing the site. The comment from the DRB was a good one. For a visual impact, there will be a series of mulch beds and a lot of maintenance for the conceptual look they like. All parcels are lined by verdant green lawns and there will be a significant amount of new plantings. Mr. Guinta Jr. stated the DRB approved the design as is and made suggestions.

Mr. McCullen had no comments or questions. Mr. Block noted there are 2 trees in front off Kendrick Street right near the building. He could not understand having 2 trees span out. The applicant has shown a lot of intention and he likes the approach. He feels it is an overall improvement to the property and the neighborhood. He asked if the uses are light manufacturing and asked for an example. Mitchell Kassler, Manager of Edgewater Properties, LLC, noted clean technology, robotics, clean energy. Mr. Block asked how much of the space will be devoted to light manufacturing and was informed about one third. Mr. Block stated there is considerable concern in the Heights with the rise in rodent activity. He assumes the applicant will maintain a robust pest control process. Mr. Kassler stated they have a pest contract in place and will continue. He has not noticed any activity in the 5 months of ownership.

Mr. Crocker stated he likes the project but he likes the math to work. The project is eliminating a large open space inside the building and the applicant is saying there is no change in green space. Ms. Espada noted 30 less parking spaces become green space. Mr. Alpert stated the interior space is not green space but open space. Mr. Kassler clarified the courtyard is mostly stamped concrete which is impervious. Mr. Madden noted all sidewalks are gone and being planted green. The other small wedge is being planted along with bits and pieces everywhere. Mr. Alpert stated it was a good presentation and very thorough. Ms. Espada agreed. She especially likes in front of the building where people are able to get in in an easy way. There were no public comments.

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

VOTED: to close the hearing.

Ms. Espada noted there will be a draft decision in 2 weeks.

Transfer of Permit: Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2008-01: Frozen Custard New England, LLC d/b/a Abbotts Frozen Custard, 2 Thoroughbred Lane, Sherborn, Massachusetts 01770, to Frozen Custard Greater Boston One LLC, Petitioner (Property located at 934 Great Plain Avenue, Needham, Massachusetts).

Bill Zeoli, of 382 South Street and Owner, bought the business from the previous owner and wants to continue as is under the conditions of the special permit. There will be no changes or renovations. This is just a paper change of ownership. Ms. Newman has no concerns. The applicant has agreed to abide by the previous decision. She has prepared the paperwork. Mr. Block noted the staff is always great with kids and pets. He wished him the best of success.

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

VOTED: to consent to the requested transfer of the permit with regard to Abbotts Frozen Custard.

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

VOTED: to approve the decision as drafted.

Discussion and Vote to submit an action plan for interim compliance to the Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities, which shall consist of the Base Compliance Plan.

Discussion and Vote to submit to the Select Board the set of zoning amendments known as the Base Compliance Plan to initiate the process of amending the zoning by-laws in accordance with M.G.L. c. 40A §5.

Ms. Espada noted a letter from the state. She reviewed the process and the Board's purview. The Planning Board put together 2 plans to move forward to Town Meeting. The Base Compliance Plan was accepted. The Neighborhood Plan was accepted with 57% of the vote. There was a referendum and it received enough votes to go to a Town vote. 58% voted to repeal what Town Meeting approved. The Town Manager reached out to the Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities (EOHLC) to see what the town needed to do. She received an email from Chris Kluchman, Director of Livable Communities Division, dated 1/21/25, noting the EOHLCs emergency regulations that allow additional time for communities to come into compliance. By 2/13/25 the town needs to submit a new action plan and a district compliance application needs to be submitted by 7/14/25. The Board needs to show the steps to be taken to be in compliance by 7/14/25. The town will be in interim compliance if approved by the EOHLC.

Ms. Espada noted the Select Board voted to recommend to go forward with the Base Compliance Plan. She asked if the Board agrees with this and noted there would need to be a vote. When Town Meeting occurs is in the purview of the Select Board and Town Moderator. Ms. Newman's understanding is this will advance at the May Town Meeting. Ms. Espada noted the following correspondence for the record: emails from Laura Dorfman, Joe Matthews, Robert Smart, Joe Leghorn, Mona Steinberg, Margaret Abruzese, Andrea Danneberg, Andrea Okerholm Huttlin, Paul Bennett, Zachary Wallack, Ed Wallack, Jim Van Dyk, Marcus Loveland, Mike Kelly, Donna Meyer, James and Jean Higgins, Catherine Spaulding, Gabi Gutierrez, Riley Hastings, Nathan Levin, Jackie Kiley, Steven Maxwell, Kenneth Buckley, Gary Petrie, David Greenes, Paula Dickerman, Cathy Mertz, Amy Merce, Nicholas Kourtis, Vincent Mastro, Janet Mastro, Victoria Mastro, Lucas Mastro, Janice and Robert Klein, Tracy Rubin, Asher Schachter, Julie Traub and Arthur Cantor, Simon Traub, Noreen McQuade, James Blackwell, Kimberly McCollum, Jane Volden, Oscar Mertz, Ralph Winters, Katie and Jay Doonan, Bruce Wolfeld, Charles Hogan, Richard Epstein, Catherine Hogan, Donna Crescenzi, Dustin and Tiffany Pevear, Eran Hollander, Bill and Kathleen Leahy, Sean Robbins and Ariel deBairos, Cindy Wolfe, Catherine Carroll, Christofer Palasinski, Gary Ajamian, Lynne Collins Stratford, Olga (Volha) Batura, Pavel Bandarchuk, Aryn Patentas, Eileen Orscheln and Louis Wolfson.

Mr. Alpert stated he is in full agreement with moving forward with the Base Plan as drafted and passed by Town Meeting. To change the Plan would probably require a reconvening of the HONE Committee with additional meetings and hearings. The Base Plan was already approved by the EOHLC and if the Board wants to make changes they can do it later. He is in full agreement with submitting the Base Plan by 2/13/25. He feels the Base Plan will pass. The Town is going forward to try to get funds but will not get any if the town is not in compliance. Mr. Crocker is in total agreement with moving the Base Plan forward. He is happy to look at this in the future but not now. He feels it is in Needham's best interest to vote on the Base Plan before the May Town Meeting. He would like to put this to rest. It has had a negative effect on the Town and should not have been. He feels it is critical to move forward with the Base Plan. Mr. Alpert does not feel it needs to go forward before the May Town Meeting. He feels if they are going to expand it to have more apartment housing like this they should do it by special permit.

Mr. Block stated the Town spent a lot of time developing thoughtful zoning reform designed to meet the goal of the Commonwealth to create more housing. He is not convinced the special permit has been the mitigating factor against housing development. He hopes the Town would be open to looking to achieve some more housing but in a way that provides the Town with greater control in the process with more robust oversight. They talked about 888 Great Plain Avenue and he feels dimensional regulations and FAR are appropriate for the area but should be for a larger stretch of Great Plain Avenue. He would like to see the Board work toward that in a way that gives greater control in the process. He would have preferred to be in the process rather than the Select Board just telling the Planning Board what is being done. It makes sense this time to go ahead with the Base Compliance Plan in May so the Town is not out of compliance.

Mr. McCullen supports the Base Compliance Plan. He takes umbrage from a process purist perspective that zoning should be coming from the Planning Board and the Board was not able to make this decision. He feels it is the right decision. He does support the Base Compliance Plan but does not think the process was right. Mr. Alpert agrees it should have been a Planning Board decision instead of the Select Board deciding to act first. It was up to the Planning Board to act first. Mr. McCullen stated it was great the state extended the date for compliance. He agrees with Mr. Block that the board needs to look toward smart planning and zoning that would allow for zoning and commercial first floor development and some sort of overlay that would help toward diversification. Ms. Espada agrees with all and agrees with the process. It was not what she thought should occur but they ended up in the same place. The whole negative effect on the Town bothers her. They had 2 good plans they believed in. They had 58% for one plan and 57% for the other plan. This was a democratic process in the end and she does not understand the negativity. She hopes there can be some consensus going forward. She thanked all in the town for being so passionate and for all the work done in the past year.

A motion was made to support the submission of an Action Plan for interim compliance to the EOHLC which shall consist of advancing the Base Housing Plan to Town Meeting in May of 2025. Mr. Alpert suggested an amendment to say “in May 2025 or such an earlier time as the Warrant Commission may subscribe.” The amendment was accepted.

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

VOTED: to support the submission of an Action Plan for interim compliance to the EOHLC which shall consist of advancing the Base Housing Plan to Town Meeting in May of 2025 or such an earlier time as the Warrant Commission may subscribe.

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

VOTED: to move the Planning Board submit to the Select Board the set of proposed zoning amendments known as the Base Compliance Plan to initiate the process of amending the zoning by-law in accordance with M.G.L. c. 40A §5.

Ms. Newman stated this will go to the Select Board at the next meeting for referral back to the Planning Board for purposes of holding a hearing. There will be legal notices on 1/30/25 and 2/6/25 and the hearing will be held on 2/13/25 at the Broadmeadow School. There will be 2 Zoning Articles. After the hearing the Planning Board will make a recommendation on the Articles.

Attorney Christopher Heep – discussion of state draft regulations on Accessory Dwelling Units.

Town Counsel Christopher Heep noted there have been changes to the law, G.L. c. 40A §3A, at the state level. There are new protections and this includes the Dover Amendment. ADUs have been added to the uses. A new paragraph was added to Section 3 that states cities and towns cannot prohibit ADUs, unreasonably restrict ADUs or require a special permit for an ADU in the Single Family Zoning District. Changes to Section 3 go into effect 2/2/25. The current state of the law is that the EOHLC has to come up with regulations to implement for this. Final regulations will be issued before 2/2/25 but have not come out yet. He is working with the draft regulations with the expectation the final will come out soon. He noted the regulations contain a list of prohibited types of requirements: 1) Neither the primary structure or the ADU are required to be owner occupied. 2) the Board cannot require the ADU be attached and must allow attached or detached. 3) ADUs can have more than one additional parking space if located more than ½ mile from a transit station. The town can require one

additional parking space if greater than ½ mile from transit. If less than ½ mile, they cannot require any more than the principal dwelling. 4) they cannot make the ADU subject to use and occupancy restrictions that goes to income.

Mr. Alpert noted restrictions in town prohibit overnight parking. If the Single Residence B (SRB) District lot has a short driveway and no garage within ½ mile of a train station where is he supposed to park. Mr. Heep stated the town could apply an overnight parking ban but he does not believe there are any parking requirements in SRB Zoning. The By-law could be drafted saying 2 spaces are required for every lot in town or a minimum of one parking space for the principal and one for the accessory for all lots located outside the ½ mile of transit. Both would be appropriate. Under the current zoning that lot with a short driveway could put in an ADU by right without any parking. The change in the law only affects the zoning by-law. He noted 5) there can be no use and occupancy restrictions like affordable rates or age restrictions. Mr. Block asked if the use of the ADU could be restricted to residential use only and not business uses. Mr. Heep stated it could be done in single family dwellings. He does not see why not in the ADU. The only restriction could be the 900 square feet. He noted 6) they cannot have a limit on the number of ADUs constructed in Districts.

Mr. Heep noted presumptively unreasonable regulations include 1) dimensional standards more restrictive than the single family house, 2) cannot apply design standards not applied to single family dwellings or that would render it infeasible to build the ADU, 3) local requirement regarding utilities, 4) more stringent environmental standards than single family dwellings, 5) impact analysis and studies not applied to single family dwellings, 6) any site plan review requirement more stringent than what is applied to single family dwellings and 7) any local prohibition or regulation of modular that is more stringent than the local building code. Any short term rentals need to be consistent with Ch. 64 (g) and there should be no regulation that does not serve a legitimate municipal interest. There should be no regulation that serves a legitimate interest but does not rationally relate to that interest. These are things that cannot be done in the zoning by-law.

Mr. Heep stated the by-law currently requires ADUs to be attached, the owner must reside in one unit and the ADU must be occupied by a family member or caregiver. It also requires both units to have parking. He feels the final regulations will be close to the draft regulations as of 2/2 and the statutory law will be in effect even if the final regulations are not out. The Board needs to revise the regulation Needham has on the books relative to ADUs. They cannot require, through a site plan review, something that is not required on a principal dwelling. Mr. Alpert noted the section that says as soon as these regulations are in effect everything in your zoning that does not comply is automatically thrown out. He asked if the Board would have to amend anything because the Building Commissioner has to allow an ADU application that conforms to the regulations even if they do not conform with the town's requirements. He feels they can take their time. Mr. Heep agreed. He wants to revise the zoning to be consistent with the state regulations. Mr. Block asked why not just repeal the zoning by-law. They are not regulating anything that is required beyond the state. Mr. Heep would like to look this through before offering an opinion on that. He noted repealing a zoning by-law is procedurally no easier than amending a by-Law. It would make sense to repeal and replace at the same time.

Mr. Block feels they could deal with this with a couple of footnotes. One could say "shall conform to these state regulations that may be further amended by the state." The only thing regulated at that point is there would not be more than one on a lot. Ms. Espada suggested Mr. Heep take all the information and give the Planning Board a recommendation. Mr. Heep noted the final regulations will be released within the next 2 weeks. When they are final he can work in earnest on how to draft zoning consistent with the state. Mr. Crocker asked if it has to abide by the lot coverage currently on the books and was informed it does. A discussion ensued. Mr. Heep noted it will be tight for the May Special Town Meeting but it can be done. It will be easy to draft once the final regulations come out. Mr. Alpert wants to say "subject to the same dimensional requirement as the principle building." Ms. Espada asked, if non-conforming, do they need to be kept non-conforming or go by the new regulations. Mr. Heep was not sure. Ms. Newman noted she planned on ADUs and the Base Plan at Town Meeting.

Discussion and Vote to appoint Bill Paulsen to the Large House Review Committee Pursuant to M.G.L. c268A, §19(b).

Mr. Block noted Bill Paulsen has a conflict. He earns a living selling homes that may be new construction or may be sold to a builder for new construction. Therefore, by earning a commission he has a financial interest in any residential lots for sale in town. He is affirmatively disclosing that. Ms. Newman finds nothing substantial to affect the integrity of the service he would provide on the committee. Mr. Crocker stated it is clear he is unbiased. Mr. McCullen stated the Board said they

did not want Mr. Block for the same reasons. They did say they wanted a Real Estate Agent. He did work in Needham and it is a little familiar. He feels it is hypocritical. He is ok as long as Mr. Paulson is not going to be conflicted. Mr. Heep spoke of the rule and the exception to it. A member of the committee cannot be faulted if representing the professional as a whole. He discussed this with him and felt the exemption covered him. Some percentage of his work covers new construction in Needham. The Ethics Commission felt the exemption applies but suggested the Board make a finding under c268A, §19(b) that the appointing Board believes the financial gain is not so substantial as to interfere with his work with the Town. The Board should make the finding and the issue would go away.

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

VOTED: to appoint Bill Paulsen to the Large House Committee as the Planning Board has reviewed the particular matter and the financial interest identified above by a municipal employee, and has determined by vote taken at its January 21, 2025 meeting that the financial interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the municipality may expect from the employee.

Board of Appeals – January 29, 2025

Ms. Newman noted there are no issues with any of the cases.

51 Fremont Street – Rental City, Inc.

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

VOTED: “No comment.”

378 Manning Street – Nick Koslov and Megan Waldvogel

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

VOTED: “No comment.”

281 Warren Street – Stephanie Cox and Joshua A. Shaller

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

VOTED: “No comment.”

0 Colgate Road – Patricia M. Connolly, appellant

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

VOTED: “No comment.”

Minutes

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

VOTED: to move passage of the 11/19/24 minutes.

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

VOTED: to move passage of the 11/25/24 minutes.

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

VOTED: to move acceptance of the 12/3/24 minutes.

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

VOTED: to move acceptance of the 12/17/24 minutes.

Report from Planning Director and Board members

Ms. Newman noted she, Mr. Crocker and Ms. Espada went to the Finance Committee to present the budget. It was a normal level funded budget with 2 add ons. She has asked for a Planner and additional administrative support. Most of the conversation was around why a new Planner was needed, and what the Planner would do. She is preparing some additional information. Ms. Espada agrees there is a need for more detailed information for the Finance Committee. Ms. Newman stated the Town Manager agrees with the need for another Planner. She is doing the Action Plan this week and will work on gathering the information next week. She will submit it in writing to the Finance Committee and they will make a decision.

Mr. Crocker noted the Large House Review Committee meeting and stated there were 3 action items. They are looking at comparable towns, FAR and tear downs. Ms. Newman noted she is looking at Newton, Wellesley, Lexington, Winchester and Sudbury. She is trying to identify towns with comparable regulations, how they are defining the terms, FARs, what lot sizes, dimensional sizes and dimensional standards and if they have any review process ancillary to the as of right process. She is looking at tear downs over the last 3 years. Also, non-conforming lots to see what houses have been built on those lots and how they are fitting. She is modeling the new non-conforming house and wants to find what is a good fit on a lot. Mr. Block would like to get a copy of all the information from the Committee.

Ms. Newman noted the next meeting is 2/3/25. They will present the information on what the other town's are doing and present information on non-conforming lots. There will be monthly meetings. A report will be given to Town Meeting in May but they are looking at an October Town Meeting. Mr. Crocker would like some kind of meeting before summer. Mr. Alpert noted he is on the search committee for the Town Manager position. A professional has been hired for the search committee. Resumes will be collected until 2/8/25 and they anticipate 20-25 resumes. There will be 10-15 for the search committee to review, then a meeting to discuss the resumes and whittle it down to those to interview. He would like 3 to present to the Select Board, then it is out of the Committee's hands. The professional would like a recommendation to the Select Board by mid-March. Mr. Crocker heard Bulfinch has some interest in developing the Muzi site with housing and retail with possible 55+ housing. Ms. Newman stated she is meeting with Bulfinch tomorrow.

Mr. McCullen noted the Mobility and Coordination Committee had a joint transportation summit in January as per the Charter. There are updates for the Highland Avenue TIP Project and signals. They are looking at it from a funding issue. The Mark Tree Road neighborhood had a meeting with the DPW to discuss reconstruction and whether there should be a sidewalk on one side or both. They may have coalesced with one sidewalk. They also talked about changing the by-laws for subdivisions. The Board always requires sidewalks and then waives them. Envision Needham is going ahead with walk throughs in February. There are 15 points and they will have walking tours.

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

VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Kalinowski, Notetaker

Artie Crocker, Vice-Chairman and Clerk