NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

December 6, 2016

The regular meeting of the Planning Board held in the Charles River Room, Public Services Administration Building, was called to order by Paul Alpert, Vice-Chairman, on Tuesday, December 6, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. with Messrs. Jacobs and Owens and Ms. McKnight, as well as Planning Director, Ms. Newman and Assistant Planner, Ms. Clee.

Vote to go into Executive Session to Discuss pending Litigation.

Mr. Alpert stated that the Board no longer needed to enter into Executive Session. He noted in the packet was a Stipulation of Dismissal with Prejudice regarding a civil lawsuit filed by SXC Needham Inn, LLC against the Planning Board and Claremont Needham Suites, LLC. Town Counsel David Tobin would like the Board to sign the Stipulation. He noted Claremont Needham Suites, LLC had requested a dismissal. Claremont's attorney contacted the Board and informed them they are in discussions with the attorneys for SXC Needham Inn, LLC which has agreed to drop the lawsuit with a Stipulation of Dismissal with Prejudice in the form presented tonight.

Mr. Jacobs noted there were 2 typos in the Stipulation. His name has an "s" on the end. This should be corrected in 2 places. Mr. Alpert stated he would ask them to correct the typos. Ms. McKnight stated she uses her middle initial "S". Mr. Alpert will ask them to put the S in as her middle name.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Jacobs, and seconded by Mr. Owens, it was by the four members present unanimously:

VOTED: to direct Town Counsel David Tobin to sign the Stipulation of Dismissal with Prejudice on the Planning Boards behalf.

Public Hearing:

7:05 p.m. – Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2016-03: Town of Needham, 500 Dedham Avenue, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located on Rosemary Street (adjacent to Rosemary Lake), Needham, MA). *Please note: this hearing has been continued from the November 15, 2016 meeting of the Planning Board.*

Mr. Alpert asked the applicant to bring the Board up to date on where the project is. Mike Retzky, of the Public Facilities Department, stated the Board members should have a new set of survey drawings for a draft consolidation plan in their packet. He noted it was discussed at the last meeting putting on the plan any and all access easements to the property. A registered land surveyor provided that information on each plan and has shown all accordingly. All are labeled with the deed reference.

Mr. Alpert suggested Mr. Retzky review all the easements for the Board members. Mr. Retzky noted on Sheet 3, Pennsylvania Avenue is a private way and there is a footpath easement for Armand Way. Ms. McKnight stated the footpath easement does not seem to lead all the way to Nehoiden Street. She believes it does go all the way to Nehoiden. Mr. Retzky will have the surveyor look into it. He noted the other easements shown are a 50 foot drain easement, a sewer easement and another existing easement that accesses at Nehoiden onto the property. There is a private easement between Lot 10 and Lot 8 off Rosemary Street. It is defined in the deed and is not public access.

Ms. McKnight stated the drain easement does not give a deed reference. She stated he should make a note if there is a deed reference and put it on the plan. Mr. Retzky stated this is just a draft. He will see if it can be done. The surveyor has spoken with the conveyancing attorney. Note 7 still remains on the plan. Language is being worked out to revise Note 7. He is not sure if the survey plan can be certified yet. The one parcel is still outstanding. Ms. Newman stated Note 7 will be revised when title is clarified.

Mr. Retzky noted on page 2 there are 3 easements. He noted one is at the end of Lake Drive;, there is a private way at the end of Garden Street and an existing drain easement on the plan. Ms. McKnight stated if there is a title reference for the drain easement it should be put on the plan. Mr. Retzky noted the surveyor has stamped and signed the plan, which will stay a draft until decisions rendered here are final.

Mr. Jacobs asked why the easements on pages 2 and 3 are not on page 1. Joel Bargmann, architect, noted Sheet 1 is really intended as a reference sheet for pages 2 and 3. Mr. Jacobs stated at the end of Lake Drive it says see Detail A. It shows the width of the right of way on Sheet 2 but not on Sheet 1. Why is it not consistent? Mr. Bargmann stated Sheet 1 is a key plan to show how Sheets 2 and 3 go together. Ms. McKnight noted there is no width for the easement on Garden Street. Mr. Retzky stated he made a note and will have that corrected. Mr. Bargmann stated it would be better to remove the references on Sheet 1 and not have it in 2 locations. It avoids duplication and avoids any mistakes later.

Ms. McKnight noted on Armand Way the notation near the end says 5.05 feet m and 5 feet p. She is not seeing a connection between m and p. Mr. Alpert noted the key says m is measured and p is on the plan. Ms. McKnight stated she was glad to see the entire parcel as it goes around the pond is the "site" with the abutters. Mr. Alpert noted a memo from the Design Review Board (DRB), dated 12/5/16, with comments. Ms. McKnight noted the memo says the lighting was approved with the light concepts. She asked if that was with 2 foot candles and was informed it was. Mr. Alpert noted a letter, dated 12/1/16, from Assistant Town Engineer Thomas Ryder with comments and suggestions.

Ms. McKnight asked if those comments would be incorporated into the decision or would they be conditions. Mr. Bargmann stated he understood the comments would be conditions and put in the construction drawings. Ms. McKnight stated she is pleased to see the DPW has no problem with a crosswalk being provided. She noted the DPW uses the word "may" and that is presumably because approval comes from the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Alpert asked if the Board had discussed the zoning waivers requested. Ms. Newman stated no, but it would be helpful. Mr. Jacobs asked if everything in Section 7.4.4 has been submitted by the applicant that the Board is supposed to have. Ms. Newman stated she is not sure about subsection b. She will have to check that to make sure it was on the plan. Mr. Retzky noted work is only taking place in the pool area. Mr. Jacobs noted after subsection p it says "upon request the Planning Board may, at its discretion, waive the submission from the applicant of any of the required information." He asked if the Board has received a request. Ms. Newman noted there has been no request. Mr. Retzky asked if it could be verbal. As there are minutes and a recording of the meeting this was fine. Mr. Retzky requested the Board waive what is shown of the 100 feet in subsection b.

Ms. Newman stated when she prepares the draft decision she will verify that there are still waivers required. Mr. Alpert stated it should be recited in the decision. Ms. Newman commented she would like feedback tonight but not a formal vote. The Board then reviewed the waivers requested in the 11/11/16 letter from Joel Bargmann. Mr. Alpert noted the upper parking lot setback is going from 6 feet to 10 feet. In Section 4.2.8.3, there will be mixed plantings. The applicant is proposing lower ornamental grass and a retaining wall up to 5 feet. It will be one to 2 feet lower at all points than the By-Law requires.

Mr. Alpert noted the parking requirements were discussed at length the last time. The applicant has 97 spaces. The requirement is only 72 spaces. During the 2 months the pool is open, the project will need 186 spaces per Section 5.1.1.2. There will be plenty of off-site parking in Memorial Field. Mr. Jacobs stated this is the only waiver request he has an issue with. He has questions but is willing to waive it. He thinks it will be ok. Mr. Alpert stated his only concern is that people may try to park on Hillside Avenue. Ms. McKnight noted parking is only allowed on one side of Hillside Avenue.

Mr. Alpert noted the parking lot illumination under Section 5.1.3(a). The Planning Board average candle is 1.0. This has a 2.64 candle. The consultant is suggesting the higher illumination for safety. This was discussed at the last meeting. Ms. McKnight noted the statement that the lights are controlled and will not be on all night. The Board may want something in the decision about the hours of the lights and such. The basic idea is the lights go off when the building is not being used. Ms. Newman stated that is how the Board usually does it. Mr. Bargmann stated that is true for the upper lot. Public safety seemed anxious for the lower lot to be lit so people would not gather and so public safety could see there. The upper lot could be when the building closes and the lower lot could be set for a different time that public safety requests. Ms. McKnight asked why this is different than other public areas. Why a 2.64 candle across Rosemary Lake? Mr. Jacobs noted the lower lot is a 1.96 candle. Ms. McKnight stated she did not realize that. A 1.96 candle is preferable to 2.64. Mr. Alpert stated the parking illumination lights will not shine on the public or private property. It will also include light shields.

Mr. Alpert noted the landscaping in the upper interior lot under Section 5.1.3(k). There will be no landscaping in the parking lot as the applicants want to maximize the number of parking spaces. Ms. McKnight agreed as there are a lot of trees at Rosemary Lake. Mr. Alpert noted Section 5.1.3(l), the project will be adding one new tree rather than the 9 or 10 required.

Mr. Alpert noted in the lower lot under Section 5.1.2 there are a total of 97 spaces. Illumination in Section 5.1.3(a) should be a one foot candle. The applicant is proposing a 1.96 candle with the higher illumination for safety reasons. In Section 5.1.3(k), landscape setbacks and number of trees, there will be 3 new trees rather than the 6 or 7 that are required. He noted the sense of the Board seems that all are reasonable and the Board will vote at the next meeting.

Mr. Owens noted that Ms. McKnight is in disagreement with the Police Department about the lighting. He stated the applicant is just trying to please the Police Department. Ms. McKnight stated, when wording this, it should be clear the applicant "may" increase the candle to 1.96, not "must." It should be the same with the upper lot. Mr. Alpert stated the Board is setting a maximum for the upper and lower lots.

Stephen McKnight, of 100 Rosemary Way, stated he was walking around Rosemary Lake around 8:00 p.m. Sunday night and could barely see Orion Rising. He walked around the base of the lake, looked across the lake and could see Orion Rising. He was able to see it but there are so few areas in Needham where you could see Orion Rising. It is a beautiful area at Rosemary Lake with the night darkness. He would not like to see it disturbed. He noted as for the kids, 20 feet away from the lot is a trail into the woods. He sees no reason to have the lots lit to greater than the 1.0 candle standard.

Mr. Alpert stated he would like feedback from the Police Department about lighting. Mr. Bargmann noted the police said there should be adequate illumination. The consultant came up with the candle numbers. Mr. Alpert stated he appreciates the concerns but it is a delicate balance between lighting and safety. Mr. Owens agreed. He feels the Police Department should be asked what they think.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Owens, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to continue the hearing to 12/20/16 at 8:00 p.m.

Request to Establish Performance and Drainage Bonds and Request to Release Lot: Oak Street Definitive Subdivision: Oak Street LLC, 235 Billerica Road, Chelmsford, MA 01824, Petitioner (Property located at 66 Oak Street and Cypress Street, Needham, MA).

Mr. Alpert noted the Board received a lot release request dated 12/23/16. The applicant is requesting Lot 2 be released. He noted a letter dated 12/1/16 from Assistant Town Engineer Thomas Ryder suggesting a $20,000 Performance Bond and an Off-Street Drainage Bond of $3,500 for a total of $23,500.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to approve the release of Lot 2 Cypress Street to be delivered upon receipt of a satisfactory bond of $23,500 with associated documents.

Appointment:

7:30 p.m. – Presentation regarding Hillside School at Central Avenue.

Hank Haff, representative for the applicant, noted the applicants had been before the Board on 3/29/16 with a schematic design. The town has since purchased 609 Central Avenue. Town Meeting approved 3 Articles and the town is moving forward on the project. The School Department and the Board of Selectmen have asked to accelerate construction to get it open by September 2019. He then discussed the revised schedule. He noted a letter from Michele Rogers, Project Manager, of Dore & Whittier Architects, Inc., that summarizes the project.

Don Walter, of Dore & Whittier Architect, Inc., noted the letter from Ms. Rogers and stated it is a detailed and comprehensive overview of the school. He noted this is a K-5 elementary school. There are 4 classrooms for each grade with 430 students in total. The building is 90,000 square feet and is being built into a residential area. The town is very cognizant of the residential neighborhood. The project has taken advantage of the topography. The property is high in the southern end and drops down toward the north. The building is a 1 ½ story building at the highest grade and 3 stories at the lowest grade. Due to the topography it feels like a 2 story building. He noted the building has been made horizontal so it settles down into the site.

He noted for materials the project will use stone base with wood impregnated siding with quite a bit of glazing. There is a lot of natural light which benefits the education of students. The school is set up to meet the educational needs of the children. Ms. Rogers noted her letter follows the outline of the zoning waiver requests. The school features dedicated drop off and pick up zones, a dedicated delivery area and access for emergency vehicles only that goes ¾ of the way around the building. There are landscape buffer zones and connections to natural resources which are the wetlands out back that they are using in educational programs. She reviewed the locus plan.

Ms. Rogers noted the new school is in the same school district so most students will stay at the same school. The town has acquired 609 Central Avenue. There are 8 parcels as well as the large farm land. The land is within 100 feet of several residential homes. She described the existing buildings and showed the area that was mown previously by the owner of the farm. She showed how the property would line up on the site. Ms. Rogers noted the former 609 Central Avenue will be used as a bus path.

Ms. Rogers noted the building will be set back 153 feet from Central Avenue at the closest, and the closest side setback is 35 feet. She showed the location of the 2 sheds for snow blowers, lawn mowers and other equipment. She noted there is one area that is only a 15 foot setback and there is a waiver request for that. There is a transition zone with trees and landscaping and also a fence that buffers the adjacent property. There is a 25 foot buffer.

Mr. Alpert noted truck deliveries and asked if the driveway off Central Avenue was for buses only or for deliveries also. Ms. Rogers stated the buses come in and exit on Sunset Road. Trucks go in, back up, pick up the delivery and go out Central Avenue. The intention is that trucks do not enter or exit through Sunset. The trucks will be delivering to the cafeteria and there will also be trash and recycling. Mr. Alpert asked for clarification as to whether buses are exiting through Sunset. He asked if there has been a public presentation. Ms. Rogers stated there has been. Originally the project had the buses entering and exiting through Sunset. Once the town purchased 609 Central the plans were revised. The buses are only existing onto Sunset twice a day, morning and afternoon. She noted the closest setback in the rear is 81 feet. Ms. McKnight commented she was glad there was a 25 foot setback where it abuts the house on Sunset.

Ms. Rogers stated cars enter and move all the way around and exit the same way. The other entrance is for emergency vehicles only. Fire trucks can reach the highest level in the back of the building. There is a specified van drop off. She noted the building elevations conform to the height By-Laws. Most children from the vans will enter through the front door. She described the drop off and how students will enter the building. Mr. Haff noted some students with special needs who go to Newman will be coming here. The school department will be putting together many K-5 special education programs in a single location for the entire district.

Ms. Rogers stated walking students will enter through the front door. She noted the town has not determined yet where the crosswalks will be. The applicant will be meeting with traffic engineers soon. Mr. Haff stated a school zone will be identified soon. Ms. Rogers noted there will be 2 playgrounds in the back of the building for age appropriate students. In the front there is a playground for kindergarten students planned and it will be enclosed. She stated they are looking at different elevations, removing roof screens and different materials at the front of the building such as wood material compared to brick material. Ms. McKnight asked if brick or wood material is more costly. Ms. Rogers stated wood material is more costly than the brick.

Ms. Rogers described the floor plans. The lower level has a gym, kindergarten classes, 1st grade and alternate kindergarten classes. There are lock-down doors for security reasons outside the academic area on each floor. There is an elevator. The main level has music rooms, overlook to the gymnasium which is 2 stories, a library which is 2 stories, 2nd and 3rd grade classes and special education classes. There is also a cafeteria, small performance platform and the Administrative area. The upper level has the library, some special education classrooms and the 4th and 5th grades.

Ms. Rogers described the property and the orientation of the houses. Mr. Haff noted that, other than 609 Central Avenue and 45 Sunset Road, all the other structures have been demolished. There is re-grading and replanting going on now. The Conservation Commission has approved. The applicant will come back and re-survey the land and have an 81X plan prepared. Ms. Rogers described where the retail store was, the parking and the steep grade. She described the new contours. She noted the new grading at 4% for the parking area and there is a new grade for the bus drive going through the property. There is a lower area then it steps back up again.

Ms. Rogers noted the parking is going to be between 101 and 107 spaces. She feels there will be 103 spaces. She stated 101 spaces is shown on the plans but all the spaces are at the larger size of 9 feet by 18½ feet . There are no compact spaces. There are 4 handicap spaces and a 5th handicap spaces is being proposed in the north end of the lot. Six vans can park along the front and there will be space for 7 buses maximum. There are 5 larger buses now. There will be a 30 foot wide exit and a 20 foot wide entrance/exit for the buses. The drive aisles are 24 feet all around.

Mr. Jacobs asked when picking up if all the vehicles can get off the street and was informed they can. Mr. Haff noted 2 buses tend to deliver after school only and when full day kindergarten begins there will not be mid-day buses. Steve Ventresca, Project Manager, Nitsch Engineering, Inc., gave a brief overview of where the utilities will come in off the site. The proposed gas line crosses the site to the mechanical area of the building. The water line will extend from the main in Central Avenue and include a fire protection line from that and will hook up to the water on Sunset Road for a continuous loop. The water line at a lower portion of the site will allow a hydrant at the back of the property. The sewer exits the cafeteria area to a grease trap to the sewer main in Central Avenue. There will be a gravity line from the middle of the school to a gravity line in Central Avenue.

Mr. Ventresca stated there will be electric and telephone utility poles at the lower end of the site. The drainage is a bit of a challenge. The system will capture all of the roof run-off and all of the parking lot water through catch basins or storm water buffer zones to areas with stone in the bottom for infiltration. They anticipate capturing and infiltrating the first inch of rain and water from the entire site. There will be porous pavement in the emergency driveway, play areas within the site and gravel wetlands in a couple of places. These will be adjusted as the project goes along and they see what the soils are.

Mr. Ventresca stated there is a flood plain line that coincides with the Town of Needham flood plain line following a LOMA approval by FEMA. Ms. Rogers noted the lowest floor plate level is at 90, well above the FEMA level of 85. There is work being done within the 25 foot buffer and they are working with the Conservation Commission. Ms. McKnight asked if they were thinking of grassy strips for soils. Mr. Ventresca noted the sandy soils have infiltration galleys that work hand in hand. The galleys are around and under the infiltration channels.

Ms. Rogers described the landscape and noted the project is providing for more landscape area in and around the parking area than is required. Bill Brown, of Brown Sardinia Landscape Architects, Inc., stated there are roughly 62,000 square feet of parking area. There is 10% of landscaping and 25% in the interior. The project may have 7,600 square feet of landscaping in the interior of the parking area. Ms. Rogers noted this is well above the needs. Mr. Brown noted trees are planted in the island and there will be shrubs. On Central Avenue there will be smaller trees with grasses and shrubs.

Ms. Rogers noted there are no waivers proposed for landscaping. There is no lighting plan tonight but it will meet all requirements. There will be a sensory garden geared toward children with sensory needs but available for all. There will be raised garden beds that incorporate handicap accessibility and will have raised planting beds for students. There will be stones, stone walls, bike racks and lighting incorporated into the landscaping. There will also be a lots of trees incorporated on the site. Mr. Brown commented the applicants worked with the science teachers.

Mr. Owens asked if there will be a list of waivers the applicant will be asking for. Ms. Rogers stated there will be a waiver request for non-compliance relative to the 25 foot buffer. Mr. Haff stated it is a work in progress but the service drive has no houses abutting the waiver area. Ms. Newman stated the project needs a waiver for this as well as Sunset Road, per page 130, Section 1.8.2. Mr. Haff noted there is no specific requirement for parking at elementary schools but there is a precedent. The precedent is to take the FTE (Full-Time Equivalency) of full time staff and multiply it by 1.5 to get a number of spaces. If that is done there will need to be 118 spaces and the project will need a waiver. He noted the project is more than doubling the parking that is now available at the Hillside School.

Ms. Rogers stated there are 101 spaces and could get to 103. There will be 20 overflow spaces when the buses are not there. The precedent would set the parking requirement at 118 and at 124 for special events. Mr. Jacobs asked if people could park along Central Avenue for special events. Mr. Haff stated there would not be parking on Central Avenue. Mr. Alpert asked where people would park for the overflow. Ms. Rogers noted Cynthia Road and Sunset Road. Mr. Alpert asked what the crossing would be like in the dark. Ms. Rogers stated they are planning on flashing lights for the crosswalk. Mr. Owens asked if there would be one at each end and was informed there would be. Mr. Alpert commented it is important at night to have the flashing lights.

Mr. Haff stated he would work with Ms. Newman on the text for the parking waiver. He noted the logical place for the shed is where it was recommended. Mr. Owens stated he feels there are reasonable grounds for asking for waivers. He asked if the building would last 50 years and was informed it would. Mr. Owens stated he hoped the town is building the biggest building on the site they can with the most flexibility. He noted no one knows what will happen in the future and he wants to make sure we are not being penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. Haff walked through the numbers. He noted the MSBA gave what he believes is a low population of students in the school at 430. He is working with designers and came to the conclusion they will need 4 classrooms for each grade. Needham allows 18 to 24 students in each class. The population today is 460 to 470 students and the new school will accommodate 544 students at maximum. That is a flexibility of over 100 students. He noted the MSBA has signed off on the program. He noted there are also some in-between spaces, extended learning spaces and some specialty spaces. There are also many special education spaces integrated into the floor plan.

Ms. McKnight noted the waiver for the shed and asked if the shed would be elevated above the 100 year flood plain. Ms. Rogers stated it is 5 feet above the flood plain. Ms. Newman noted it is not in the flood plain zone. The other shed cannot be where planned. Accessory structures cannot be in the front yard setback, only the side and rear setbacks. Ms. Rogers stated they will look at other options for the other shed.

Mr. Haff stated he is researching Wellesley's water land. The walking trails are fully within Wellesley. The project is looking at putting a field in back where it overlaps in Wellesley's water land. The best survey information came from a 1926 taking the Town of Wellesley did. There are no setback requirements for fields or walking trails. He stated he does not see a direct benefit to doing a Metes and Bounds survey of this 65 acres. He is suggesting the Board waive the requirement to do a detailed survey of that part of the site. It is clear Wellesley owns that land. Needham has a license agreement with Wellesley. Needham has the right to build a playing field, walking trails and a science pond on their property.

Mr. Alpert asked whether the water supply land is owned by Wellesley but within the Town of Needham. Mr. Haff clarified this is correct. The creek on the plan is now a lake. It would be difficult to survey. He would like to survey only the zone they will be using to put the trails. Mr. Jacobs asked the applicant to be specific about what they are asking. He asked if, under Section 7.4.4, they are asking for waivers of submission of a site plan that shows any of the Wellesley land? Mr. Haff stated he is asking for a waiver of submission of a full Metes and Bounds survey of the full 60+ acre parcel, which is all Wellesley owned land. Mr. Alpert stated they will need a survey plan that encompasses the land contemplated by the license agreement. The Board needs to know what land Needham is entitled to use. Anything else is extraneous to the Board's needs. Mr. Haff clarified that is what they are asking for. Mr. Alpert stated it makes sense to have a clearly defined license area. Mr. Haff stated Wellesley has been cooperative and noted the project will be replanting some areas that were previously disturbed. Mr. Jacobs commented it does make him nervous that it is only a 90 day license timetable with 90 days notice.

Mr. Haff commented on the timing and noted it will be on an accelerated schedule. The applicant is going to the Conservation Commission in advance of the formal permit to request a Request for Determination of Applicability to build nature trails. This is contingent upon the Community Preservation Act funding. There is no permit or Planning Board approval needed. The applicant will file with the Planning Board in late summer. They are still working on the timing. Mr. Jacobs complimented the applicant on the nice presentation. Mr. Alpert agreed.

Correspondence

Mr. Alpert noted a letter from the Attorney General regarding zoning articles that were passed at the May Town Meeting have been approved with comments that the retaining wall By-Law must be interpreted to be consistent with the state building code; 2 memos and one legal notice from the City of Newton with several zoning change they have made and the 2017 meeting schedule.

Discussion of Demolition Delay By-Law.

Mr. Alpert noted this was just giving notice of what was discussed at the Selectmen's meeting. The Selectmen could delay a demolition permit on historic buildings for 6 months and want to extend for one year. Ms. McKnight stated she would like to write to the Selectmen in response to the request for comments. She would like to speak in favor and would like the Board to support this. She feels 6 months is not a very long time and would like a year. Mr. Jacobs noted it is less about time. He does not like this By-Law as written. It seems to be totally without standards. He does not know what it means. Mr. Alpert noted the definition of historically significant. Ms. Newman stated the presumption is the houses are already on a historic list. Ms. McKnight noted it says under definitions. She added it is worthy of delay. Mr. Jacobs asked what the standards are. Are there any rules and regulations? He commented he would not speak for or against but would comment there needs to be standards.

Ms. McKnight noted it has to be listed on the Needham Historic Register and waiting on the list of the National and/or State Register. Mr. Jacobs noted the By-Law does not say what needs to be considered. Ms. McKnight stated she will comment as an individual. Mr. Owens feels he needs to give it more thought before commenting. Mr. Jacobs will privately make his comments.

Discussion of Large House Review Study Committee work.

Ms. Newman gave an update. The Large House Committee has finished its work. She is scheduling a presentation in January. She wants to have the cable TV there. There are some minor changes and she will update accordingly. She noted all members were given a copy of the complete packet.

Presentation of Fiscal Year 2018 Planning and Community Development Budget.

Ms. Newman noted everyone has a copy of the budget. It is going to the Finance Committee on 12/14/16. She would like a Board member to go with her to the finance meeting. Mr. Jacobs will let her know in the morning if he will be able to go. Mr. Owens may be able to go.

Minutes

The members gave Ms. Clee comments on the 9/27/16 minutes.

Board of Appeals – December 15, 2016.

Tricia Balatico and Dan Burch – 140 Laurel Drive.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Owens, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: "No comment."

Neehigh, LLC – 26 Cross Street and 40 Arbor Street.

Neehigh, LLC – 629-661 Highland Avenue.

Ms. Newman noted this is a parking lot near Highland Avenue. The only issue is the lot has an existing office building. If it is open to the public the parking lot would need a handicap space. She needs to clarify the use of the office. Mr. Owens stated it needs to be looked at carefully. It is easily overlooked. It looks like Putnam Road goes through to Arbor Street and it does not. It also looks like Cross Street goes through to Guild Road and it does not. He drove down there today and the roads do not exist. They are paper streets. He found the plans to be misleading. Mr. Jacobs suggested a site visit before a decision is made because access is not as shown on the plan. Ms. Newman will call it out to the Board of Appeals that they should be satisfied there is reasonable access and suggest a site visit.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Owens, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to comment the Board of Appeals should be satisfied there is reasonable and adequate access, to suggest a site visit and a handicap parking space.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Kalinowski, Notetaker

____
Paul Alpert, Vice-Chairman and Clerk