

NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

December 15, 2020

The Needham Planning Board Virtual Meeting using Zoom was remotely called to order by Jeanne McKnight, Chairman, on Tuesday, December 15, 2020, at 7:15 p.m. with Messrs. Jacobs, Alpert, Owens and Block, as well as Planning Director, Ms. Newman and Assistant Planner, Ms. Clee.

Ms. McKnight took a roll call attendance of people expected to be on the agenda. She noted this is an open meeting that is being held remotely because of Governor Baker's executive order on March 12, 2020 due to the COVID Virus. All attendees are present by video conference. She reviewed the rules of conduct for zoom meetings. She noted this meeting does include public hearings and will allow for public comment. If any votes are taken at the meeting the vote will be conducted by roll call.

De Minimus Change: Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 95-2: Zucchini Gold, LLC d/b/a The Rice Barn, 172 N. Main Street #9, Mansfield, MA 02048, Petitioner (Property located at 1037 Great Plain Avenue, Needham, MA).

Charles Intha, owner, stated his cash flow has been adversely impacted by the pandemic so he has looked at ways to generate more cash flow. He has decided to open in the morning. The business is close to the train station. He is not sure it would work but would like to try. In the morning he will have food like a coffee shop but will cook differently from the other coffee shops around. Ms. McKnight asked his current opening time. Mr. Intha stated he can open at 11:00 a.m. but opens at 11:30 a.m. Ms. McKnight noted this is a deminimus change and Mr. Intha is requesting a waiver of the \$250 application fee. There were no comments from members.

Mr. Intha stated he would like to change his application opening time from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. Ms. Newman noted the town By-Laws allow a 6:00 a.m. opening time. Bakers Best and French Press both open at 6:00 a.m. Ms. Newman noted special permits are not needed for hours.

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

VOTED: to treat the application as a deminimus change and approve the application to amend the special permit to allow for opening at The Rice Barn at 6:00 a.m. for the same number of days allowed to open and to waive the \$250 filing fee.

A motion was made to approve the draft of the amendment to the decision to Site Plan Special Permit 95-2 with the single change to allow opening at 6:00 a.m. rather than 7:00 a.m. Mr. Alpert noted there was one typo. It should be Mr. Block rather than Mr. Eisenhut.

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

VOTED: to approve the draft of the amendment to the decision to Site Plan Special Permit 95-2 with the change to allow opening at 6:00 a.m. rather than 7:00 a.m. and the change from Mr. Eisenhut to Mr. Block.

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

VOTED: to automatically continue the meeting to 1/4/21 at 7:15 p.m. with the same zoom ID number if any technical difficulties arise that keep the Planning Board from continuing this meeting tonight and authorize the Vice-Chairman to continue the meeting if the Chairman has technical difficulties.

Public Hearing:

7:20 p.m. – Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2020-03: Hunnewell Street, LLC, 393 South Main Street, Cohasset, MA 02025, Petitioner (Property located at 400 Hunnewell Street, Needham, MA). Regarding request to build new residential building with 8 units (see legal notice for more info).

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

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

Ms. McKnight noted this is a request to build residential units and demolish the existing building. George Giunta Jr. noted this is in the Hillside Avenue Business District. It is mixed use with commercial and residential uses. The property is 20,123 square feet with 104 feet of frontage. There is currently a 2-story commercial building with parking and limited landscaping. The building is a 1975 concrete block building, 22 to 23 feet in height with 8,520 square feet of floor space. The property is just over the railroad bridge from Highland Avenue on the right side of Hunnewell Street. The building is 8 feet from the left property line and 20 feet from the street. The entire site will be razed. The proposal is to build a 2-story residential building, approximately 27 feet high from grade, with a lower-level garage accessed from the back. There will be 8 units with 2 bedrooms and 2 baths. Each unit will have a patio/balcony. The basement will have 16 parking spaces with small mechanical areas. There will be lush landscaping all around the property.

Mr. Giunta Jr. noted this went before the Design Review Board (DRB) and was given the thumbs up. This is a similar project to next door at 154-156-160 Hillside Avenue that was built in approximately 2000-2001. That project demolished 2 residential structures and constructed 3 buildings with 8 units totaling 22,984 square feet. This project will be one building. This minimizes the impact and can be built on the existing footprint. He showed renderings and existing conditions. There is a shared right of way easement in the middle of 2 properties. The proposal maintains the right of way. He described the site. There will be 5 parking spots in the rear of the lot with 2 handicap spaces in front of the building's main entrance. The new building follows the footprint of the old building. There will be 16 parking spaces in the basement with 4 housing units on each level. The 2 levels will be mirror images with balconies and patios on the front and back. There are no balconies or patios on the sides. There is a handicap ramp on the at the main entrance, which is on the right side of the building.

Mr. Giunta Jr. noted a walkway runs along the building from the back to the right-side entry. He reviewed the landscaping. A lot of landscaping is being added especially along the front and side. There is also a proposed fence along the sideline. Mr. Alpert asked what the new waiver requests are. Mr. Giunta Jr. reviewed the special permit and waiver requests – special permit site plan review, apartment or multi-family use, underground parking not included in FAR and a parking waiver regarding design requirements. He noted accent lighting is being proposed. There will be provisions for refuse removal with dumpsters in the back corner that will be fenced in. There is a request for a waiver of a traffic study and with parking under the building there are some requirements that cannot be met. There are also waivers for illumination, landscaping and trees. Mr. Alpert asked him to explain the landscaping waiver. Mr. Giunta Jr. noted it relates to parking. There can be no landscaping inside the building and there are only 5 parking spaces outside with 2 handicap spaces. The project may meet the requirements if all landscaping counts.

Ms. McKnight asked for clarification as to whether the area in the abutting railroad right of way is zoned or unzoned. Ms. Newman will check and get back to the members. Ms. McKnight stated she does not think parking design requirements apply to underground parking. Ms. Newman stated the Board has not applied design requirements to parking inside buildings – just exterior parking. Mr. Alpert stated on the zoning map the railroad right of way is in the Residence B District. He asked whether, if a setback rule applies, it can be waived. Ms. Newman stated it cannot be waived. Mr. Alpert noted the request for lighting waiver in the underground garage. He is concerned with safety and asked if there needs to be better lighting at night. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated there are 5 parking spots outside with low level lighting. The request is for a waiver for a photometric plan being needed. He does not feel this warrants a full plan. The 16 spaces are entirely within the building and will have lighting. Mr. Alpert wants to make sure the illumination supplied is adequate at night for the safety of those using the parking. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated the lighting is adequate and it is the same waiver as was requested for underground parking on Oak Street.

Kent Duckham, Project Architect, noted the lighting plan has been sent. This came up during design review and it was sent to Mr. Giunta Jr. yesterday. There will be illuminated bollards right down to the ground from Hunnewell Street to the front (right-side) entry which has a small canopy. There are slip lights going back recessed into the walls. The back (left-side) entry is also illuminated with 3-foot bollards. Blair Hines, Landscape Architect, noted the pathway in back has cast in place concrete steps and each step has a surface mounted light fixture on the tread. The whole path has a series of bollards on the fence side. The bollards follow the stepping stones out to the sidewalk. There is inset recessed lighting that goes along the wall to the garage entrance. The handicap ramp has a railing with bottom mounted LED fixtures that create a zig zag on the ramp. The handicap spaces have bollards that line the steps out to the sidewalk and soffit mounted lights over the doorways.

Mr. Block asked if all the lights are on all the time or if they are motion sensed. Mr. Hines is not sure and will check on that. Mr. Duckham stated all lights are lighting downward and will not glare. It is subtle lighting. Mr. Hines stated all lights are below the elevation of the fence. The fence will step down and will go from 6 feet to 4 feet. Mr. Alpert asked if there will be too much parking. The requirement is for 1.5 spaces per unit for 12 spaces. The proposal is for 23 spaces. This is encouraging 2 or more cars per unit rather than trying to discourage cars. He asked if 7 spaces are really needed outside. He noted landscaping could be added where the parking spaces are now shown. He asked if there was space for a bicycle rack somewhere. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated the standard is usually 2 parking spaces per unit. These are 2-bedroom units so there would probably not be large families. The expectation is 2 cars per unit and there will need to be several guest spaces. There is no parking on Hunnewell Street. Mr. Giunta feels it makes sense to have extra spaces but he will defer to the applicants if they want to eliminate 2 spaces and maybe put in a bike rack. Mr. Duckham stated next door has a large parking area. He wants to deter people from using their parking. He stated there are really only 2 parking spaces that can be seen from any vantage point and there needs to be a place to put snow so the back spaces may be used for snow at times. The applicant is mindful of that.

Mr. Jacobs stated he would like to get the information on whether the lights are on sensors or will be on all the time. He asked if Tara Gurge had any issues in her 12/10/20 letter and noted a 12/4 letter from 3 abutters at 160 Hillside Avenue. He asked if there was any response. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated he did not recall Ms. Gurge having any concerns. He noted the abutters are in the project next door in the building closest to this building. He noted that FAR is .7 and this is .69. The height of the building next door is 31 feet and this project is 27 feet, which is 8 feet lower than the 35 feet maximum height allowed in this district. This building is in keeping with the building there now and is well below the threshold allowed and lower than the neighboring building. He stated a shading study was done. Ms. McKnight would like that formally submitted. Mr. Giunta Jr. showed the shading study. He noted the shade is not much more than the existing. He does not feel there is a significant impact and, if there is, it is relatively minor.

Ms. McKnight noted the following correspondence for the record: a letter from Police Chief John Schlittler regarding a traffic-safety concern as to the proposed maple tree on the front corner and a letter from Tara Gurge, of the Health Department, dated 12/10/20 with comments and noting trash dumpsters and recycling. It was noted the maple tree will not be planted. Mr. Duckham stated the dumpster area could accommodate 2 small dumpsters. Mr. Jacobs noted the abutters' comment about the drainage being filled with debris. John Grenier, Project Engineer, stated the drainage structure was filled with leaves and debris. That is a current condition. It will be cleaned out so it functions properly if it is kept. Ms. McKnight noted the DRB letter, dated 12/7/20, with issues, including the slope of the driveway and entry to the garage and the lighting plan. The project was approved by the DRB in total as presented. There is also a letter from Assistant Town Engineer Thomas Ryder, dated 12/14/20, with comments, and a letter from the abutters. Mr. Block and Mr. Owens had no comments or questions.

Evelyn Adlerstein, of 210 Hillside Avenue, asked if the units were for sale or rentals. Dennis Cronin, Project Developer, stated the units will be sold as condos. Inga Puzikov, of 210 Hillside Avenue, stated she is a Trustee and owns a unit there. She does not live there. She feels this is very squishy. It gets unbearable. People use their parking lot now. She feels the Board should not encourage more traffic with more spots. There will be tons of cars. This is a mixed-use area and the 20,000 square foot lot would allow one house. Special permits and reviews need to be taken into consideration. The Board should let people know who they can contact with concerns. No one has mentioned construction here. They have the train idling day and night behind them. A lot of elderly live there and

they are tired. This will be very disruptive. There needs to be a traffic study. She warned the Board to be careful of what they grant and take into consideration the people who live nearby. A clean slate needs to be by the rules. A couple of bushes and a couple of trees do not make up for it. She noted their driveway is directly across from the project. If cars try to go out at the same time there will be accidents.

Mr. Giunta Jr. showed both buildings and a google map of the driveways. He noted construction hours are limited per the Town By-Laws. Noah Atlas, of 160 Hillside Avenue, noted the fence is 6 feet high. He asked how high are the trees and bushes. He is concerned with lighting but more importantly the units would look right into each other. He asked if the developers have looked at that and if anything can be done to mitigate that. Rushit Kamani, of 160 Hillside Avenue, Unit 6, is concerned with the height. There are chimneys on top of the building and he asked if that was factored into the study. Bette Vogel, of 160 Hillside Avenue, Unit 8, stated there are major concerns. She disagrees with Mr. Giunta Jr. regarding shadow and light. She gets full light in the upstairs and into the rear. It is not shadowed currently. She is concerned with the height and patios and balconies. There is less area between the property line and the proposed building, and she will not get sun. She asked if the building could be moved 4 feet so they can get sunshine. She noted her utilities will go up because there will be no sun to heat the unit during the day. She would like someone from the Planning Board or DRB to come to see them to see the current sunlight.

Mark Lane, of 312 Webster Street, stated he is the property manager for the Hillside Avenue condos. They had an annual meeting last week regarding fencing, lighting, landscaping and dumpsters. These are the big issues. He needs more details. He would prefer not to see dumpsters and would prefer Toter trash carts inside. There are some good points such as there is not a sea of asphalt, less outdoor parking and more modern lighting. Mr. Giunta Jr. clarified the height of the building is 27 feet which is only about 4 or 5 feet higher than the existing building and lower than conventional designs. Mr. Duckham noted the building is 8 feet off the property line which is the same as the current building. The proposed building and the building at 160 Hillside Avenue are 16 feet away from each other. The current building is office and the new building is similar in use to the abutters. The shade study was done from an app. It does not take into account the height of the buildings. The shade is showing at ground level. The height is 27 feet and the balconies are in front and back. They are not on the sides. The balconies will be glass and steel and will not cast any shade. He noted the building cannot be moved due to the 20 foot setback limit. The building meets all requirements for driveway width and other requirements. The left side is exactly where the current building is. The landscape plan shows lush plantings. It is a very decorative planting scheme and the plan shows the plants and heights.

Mr. Hines stated there are examples of the fence, trees and plantings on the plan. Ms. McKnight suggested the applicant take time to meet with the abutters. Rhonda Altman, of 156 Hillside Avenue, Unit 4, stated she did not see any information on water flow. Is the ground level being raised in a way to impact them? Ms. McKnight stated there is a utility plan. Ms. Newman noted the storm water report. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated the storm water analysis went through Town Engineering Department review. It does not increase water flow off the property. Water will be captured into catch basins to the town system. Engineering had no concerns. Ms. McKnight confirmed that the report was reviewed by the Town Engineer and he had no issues.

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

VOTED: to continue the hearing to 1/4/21 at 7:30 p.m. and invite people to submit comments or questions to the Planning Director so the Board can review them and also invite them to attend the next meeting.

Mr. Owens left the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

7:40 pm. – 390 Grove Street Definitive Subdivision: Elisabeth Schmidt-Scheuber, 390 Grove Street, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 390 Grove Street, Needham, MA). Please note this is a re-noticed hearing that began on February 4, 2020 and is continued from the July 21, 2020, August 11, 2020, September 8, 2020 and November 4, 2020 Planning Board meetings.

Ms. McKnight noted this is a continued hearing. There are revised plans and a Stormwater Analysis and Calculation Report. She noted the following correspondence for the record: 2 letters, dated 11/23/20 and 12/8/20, from Attorney Gary Lilienthal, of Bernkopf Goodman LLP, representative for the abutters; a letter from Assistant Town Engineer Thomas Ryder, dated 12/14/20, with a request for more time to review and an engineering report from Robert Stetson of Bernkopf Goodman for the abutters.

Mr. Giunta Jr., representative for the applicant, noted the applicant provided an as-of-right plan that establishes how many lots could be created by a subdivision plan requiring no waivers. The roadway has changed a bit and now has a conforming rounding. Parcel A is expanded to include the storm water infiltration system. Additional soil testing has been done and the lotting plan keeps the curve coming in a 20 foot radius rounding. Waivers are no longer needed. Parcel A is the same. David Kelly, Project Engineer, noted the infiltration system is completely in Parcel A. Soil test pits were done to establish ground water levels and the system was done accordingly. The cul-del-sac was modified slightly to accommodate the changes. Utilities have been relabeled and modified.

Mr. Giunta Jr. stated some notes were put on the plan. Instead of a roadway, a driveway will serve the house in back. He addressed the concerns of the abutters. The abutters claim Parcel A cannot be created. There is no evidence it cannot be done. The abutter's attorney gave irrelevant cases. Nothing in the law says you cannot create a non-buildable parcel. In fact you can. The Board has authorized this type of thing including a 10 foot strip for Heather Lane and the creation of a 10 foot strip of land with the Woodworth Road subdivision. The Board should continue to apply past policy and process as long as the parcels are clearly identified and labeled on the plan. The abutters' attorney stated that the curve violates Section 3.3.4. That is a gross misreading of the application and does not apply at all. Section 3.3.3 applies and the curve follows the rules. The sidewalk on the as-of-right plan would be right up against the neighbor's property a waiver but does not apply. Needham Engineering has not completed their review. He would hold off at this point addressing the other concerns if the meeting is to be continued.

Mr. Lilienthal stated they will wait. He disagrees with Mr. Giunta Jr.'s summary regarding the parcel. There is well-verified law on this. The parcel serves no distinct purpose other than to separate Lot 1 from Grove Street to keep it from being a corner lot. The Heather Lane reference is faulty. There are things yet to be resolved with this plan. He feels a decision should deny this. Karlis Skulte, of Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc., speaking on behalf of the abutters, read the criteria regarding corner lots and street jogs. This refers to street jogs less than 30 feet. A number of items came up with discrepancies, and additional work needs to be done on the engineering side. Ms. Newman noted the action deadline is at the end of January. This should be continued to the end of February and continue the hearing to 1/4/21 or 1/19/21. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated he has no objection to extending the action deadline. He would like the hearing sooner than the 19th if possible. Mr. Lilienthal asked if it would be the first item on the agenda and was informed it would be at 7:30 p.m.

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

VOTED: to continue the hearing to 1/19/21 at 7:30 p.m. and accept Mr. Giunta Jr.'s request to extend the action deadline to the end of February.

Ms. Newman noted she will need the written request for the extension this week to record with the Town Clerk.

8:00 p.m. – Amendment to Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2012-07: The Children's Hospital Corporation c/o Boston Children's Hospital, 300 Longwood Avenue, Boston, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 66 B Street, 360 First Avenue, 410 First Avenue and 37 A Street, Needham, MA). Regarding request of to building out development for Children's Hospital (see legal notice for more info). Please note: this hearing is a continuation from November 17, 2020.

Ms. McKnight noted this is a continued hearing. There is a slight concern that Assistant Planner Alexandra Clee discovered. The legal notice references a Special Permit needed under Site Plan Review under a Major Project. The notice did not say a Special Permit for use. The notice did refer to the application for people to see and the use issue was clear. Her opinion is the discrepancy does not render the notice deficient. She wanted all to know the issue. She stated there is additional information regarding the traffic review.

Applicant's attorney Timothy Sullivan, of Goulston & Storrs, stated a lot was covered last time. They are left with traffic and the questions that BETA raised. Ms. Newman stated the wastewater needs to be determined - whether this will be done themselves or with a contribution to the Town fund. Jaklyn Centracchio, of BETA, responded to the outstanding comments. Comment 1 was why the remaining intersection volumes were not included in future volume diagrams. The response is the data was collected for trip generation of the existing office park. A post-occupancy study will be conducted.

Comment 2 was consideration should be given to a raised crosswalk between Garage B to 360 First Avenue. This is currently under study and will be included into the design if feasible, or other safety measures will be looked into. Comment 10 was the full build plans do not show a 3-way stop at the New Way/Founders Drive intersection. The applicant has agreed to do that and it will be included in the design plans. Comment 23 was the signal timing and phasing adjustment. The applicant has agreed to retain a signal contractor to make an appropriate one-time adjustment to the signal timing and phasing at Kendrick Street and Third Avenue within 6 months after the Building Permit issuance.

Comment 26 is the intersection improvements at Third and Kendrick to mitigate the impact to the intersection. The applicant has offered \$30,000 and the question was how the contribution was determined. They feel the amount is sufficient to implement Audible Pedestrian Signals (APS) at the intersection. Comment 28 was to consider realigning the overhead signal head to improve safety at Kendrick and Third Avenue. The hospital will make a one-time signal head adjustment within 6 months after Building Permit issuance. Sean Manning, of VHB, noted the traffic mitigation. At Kendrick and Third they plan to adjust the timing and phasing. There are currently 2 lanes and right turn indicators can be added. The signal head adjustment will make it easier to see and will improve pedestrian safety. The applicant is committed to a full Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis and Road Safety Audit at Kendrick and Fourth. They will meet with Mass. DOT and the Town to determine what would be best for the intersection over the long run. That would be considered down the road with no impact on the 380 First Avenue project.

Mr. Manning stated a parking monitoring program will be conducted annually one year after the Certificate of Occupancy for 380 First Avenue. Transportation Demand Program (TDP) Measures are continuing and ongoing. The applicant will provide a shuttle service, 50% transit pass subsidy, emergency rides home and bicycle and walking amenities among other measures. Mr. Jacobs stated he is quite satisfied with the mitigations. Mr. Alpert agreed. Ms. McKnight noted the following correspondence for the record: a letter, dated 12/14/20, from Assistant Town Engineer Thomas Ryder regarding the Traffic Peer Review and Sewage Flow Comparison, with comments, and the Transportation Impact agreement with findings from BETA and VHB. Mr. Sullivan stated this project was previously approved. There are 3 pads left. 380 First Avenue will be built first, then 2 offices. 380 First Avenue will not exceed mitigation already provided. There should be a condition prior to moving forward with the next phase that there either be a payment made or do a sewer inflow mitigation project acceptable to the Town Engineer. Mr. Jacobs asked if that proposal was consistent with what the Town Engineer says. Ms. Newman would need to speak with the Town Engineer to see if this is acceptable. This is the only outstanding issue.

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

VOTED: to close the hearing with the one exception of getting input from the Town with regard to the proposal on timing of a Sewer Inflow Mitigation payment or work done.

Ms. Newman noted this will be on the 1/4/21 agenda at 7:15 p.m. for the decision.

Highway Commercial 1 Rezoning and Planning Study: Review of Work Program.

Ms. Newman stated she had hoped to have Natasha Espada's proposal tonight but did not get it yet. It is in the form of the framework the Board wanted. She reviewed the framework. There will be site plans with aerial perspectives and street perspectives. She stated she had put together a tentative schedule. Zoning is due to the Selectmen at the end of March. There is the possibility of a community meeting on 2/3/21 but the schedule will be very tight. Once

they get the drawings, there would be a meeting in mid-January, the community meeting on 2/3/21 and zoning in by 3/16/21. The question is how to use the time period from January to the end of February. She has not received confirmation from Ms. Espada yet if she can do this. There would need to be the drawings by 1/8/21, a 1/14/21 Planning Board meeting and a 2/3/21 community meeting.

Mr. Block feels the Needham Heights Neighborhood Association (NHNA) would welcome hosting the community meeting in a Zoom model. He will speak with others on the NHNA Board to see if anyone would Chair the meeting. Ms. Newman stated the Planning Board would have to host the meeting if the NHNA cannot do it. She explained the process and asked if there was anything to be gained from a community meeting. Would other issues come up that did not come up at the earlier meeting? Mr. Block asked if the League of Women Voters would consider hosting if he cannot get anyone from the Board to host. Ms. McKnight will check but feels it would be hard to do. Ms. Newman noted the Town Manager told her to plan for a May Town Meeting.

Ms. McKnight noted one question out there that needs to be resolved is if housing is going to be included or not. There needs to be community involvement for that. Mr. Block feels both options should be presented but he tends to favor office and research and development. Residential could be an option but not included in the zoning. Ms. Newman stated it could be in the zoning but with further information it could be taken out. Mr. Alpert sees the community meeting as a way to let the townspeople know they were heard and the Board has addressed their concerns. There does not need to be a full blown presentation. Just a short presentation to let people know they have heard the concerns, here is what we have come up with, and have a traffic study and summary done with conclusions. It should be 10 minutes tops. The Board needs to make a decision on including residential and needs to have that discussion on 1/14.

Ms. McKnight stated it would seem to be better as a Planning Board sponsored meeting. A discussion ensued. Mr. Alpert asked if the NHNA would be able to help get information out to the neighbors. He is concerned with people who live in that neighborhood. They need to be satisfied the project is something they can be satisfied with. Mr. Block stated there should be support from the Select Board and Finance Committee. Ms. Newman stated she could invite them to the Planning Board meeting along with Ms. Espada so they can hear it. Mr. Jacobs reiterated he feels there should be a community meeting. At the formal noticed hearing the focus will be on language. He wants to know if they got it right. He feels there is great value in a community meeting. Ms. McKnight stated if a community meeting is feasible, there should be one. Three members see value in it, Mr. Block is doubtful and Mr. Owens is against it. She would like a consensus. Mr. Block stated if the Board agrees he would go along with it. He will confer with the NHNA to see if someone would open and close the meeting. He will notice their membership and publicize the meeting.

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

VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 11:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Kalinowski, Notetaker

Paul Alpert, Vice-Chairman and Clerk