NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

September 8, 2021

The Needham Planning Board Virtual Meeting using Zoom was remotely called to order by Paul Alpert, Chairman, on Wednesday, September 8, 2021, at 6:45 p.m. with Messrs. Jacobs and Block and Mmes. McKnight and Espada, as well as Planning Director, Ms. Newman and Assistant Planner, Ms. Clee.

Mr. Alpert took a roll call attendance of the Board members and staff. He 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. He reviewed the rules of conduct for zoom meetings. He noted this meeting does include two public hearings so there will be public comment allowed. If any votes are taken at the meeting the vote will be conducted by roll call. All supporting materials are posted on the town's website.

Request for temporary occupancy permit and review of zoning compliance: Amendment to Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2016-01: 57 Dedham Ave. LLC, 471 Hunnewell Street, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 15 & 17 Oak Street, Needham, MA).

George Giunta Jr., representative for the applicant, noted this is a request for an occupancy permit for the residential component of the building. He noted the Board authorized the Planning Director to authorize an occupancy permit upon receipt of documents such as the As-Builts. When doing the As-Builts it was discovered there was a survey error. The building is closer to Oak Street than thought. The setback site plan measured to the wall of the building and not the overhang. The overhang is set out 2 feet from the building so with these a revised plan/As-Built was done. It looked like there would be an issue with respect to zoning, but the text of the By-Law does not actually say any front yard setback on the side streets is required. There is only a front yard setback required on Chestnut Street.

Mr. Giunta Jr. noted there is an error on the site plan that was approved at a certain setback distance. He noted the applicant is asking for 2 things – an occupancy permit for the residential compound based on the corrected current As-Built and a deminimus change for site plan approval. He noted they are only here tonight for the occupancy permit. Ms. Newman noted there will be certification needed for the revised As-Built that references the new setback. Building Inspector David Roche stated he felt the zoning was undefendable as written. The language needs to be added but it seems there is zero setback requirement in our Zoning By-law as of now. He would correct it and move forward. Mr. Alpert stated there is an agenda item tonight to correct the language.

A motion was made to recommend a temporary occupancy permit be issued for a period of 60 days conditioned upon receipt of the updated As-Built to correct the zoning table as relates to the required, proposed existing front yard setback, the receipt of updated certification from a land surveyor as relates to compliance with special permit conditions, DPW approval of the final As-Built plan and further receipt within 30 days to get, and file for deminimus change, an amendment with the Planning Board to reflect the revised setback, and elimination of the handicap ramp provided it is compliant with the Architects Access Board Standards. Mr. Block asked if the Building Inspector and Mr. Giunta Jr. are satisfied and capable of fulfilling the requirements. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated the conditions are easily met and should be quick.

Ms. McKnight asked what the final resolution to the handicap ramp is. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated the ramp is not needed out front as long as there is adequate signage directing people to the handicap entrance in back. Building Inspector Roche stated, as of now, the residential units are complete. The commercial section will be done in a couple of weeks. Michael Tedoldi, applicant, asked if the Building Inspector would be able to issue the building permit for the commercial space. Ms. Newman noted the Planning Board was fine with the building permit on the commercial portion.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Ms. Espada, it was by a roll call vote of four of the five members present (Mr. Jacobs abstained):

VOTED: to recommend a temporary occupancy permit be issued for a period of 60 days conditioned upon receipt of the updated As-Built to correct the zoning table as relates to the required, proposed existing front yard setback, the receipt of updated certification from a land surveyor as relates to compliance with special permit conditions, DPW approval of the final As-Built plan and further receipt within 30 days to get, and file for deminimus change, an amendment with the Planning Board to reflect the revised setback elimination of the handicap ramp provided it is compliant with the Architects Access Board Standards.

Review of Chestnut Street Business District front setback zooming modification and referral to Select Board.

Mr. Jacobs stated he received the revised amendment this afternoon. He would like to discuss Section 4.4.4 for front setback in the Business District. Ms. Newman stated she would have to research the history of that block. Ms. McKnight suggested this be submitted to the Select Board and by the time there is a hearing the research will be done. Mr. Alpert suggested changing "a business district" to "the business district" and submit to the Select Board. Ms. McKnight further suggested "The Business District" be capitalized. Mr. Jacobs asked what properties would be affected with this change. Ms. Newman clarified that any parcels sitting within the Chestnut Street Business District that do not front on Chestnut Street would be affected. She listed the streets in the District that are affected. She noted, historically, a setback has been applied. Mr. Jacobs asked if those residents have been notified. There will not be a personal notice, but it will be in the local paper. This is a correction of a long-time policy. A discussion ensued.

Ms. Newman noted a 10-foot standard has applied since 1989. Mr. Jacobs commented this project got favorable treatment because the Board made a mistake. Mr. Alpert noted that Attorney Guinta did his job and found an error in the By-Law. Ms. McKnight stated the Chestnut Street Overlay District has a 5-foot setback. The Board could have gone that route, but it would mean a whole new special permit process. She noted that the buildings on the side streets would be prior non-conforming structures if they are closer to the front lot line than 10 feet. If they proceed under the Chestnut Street Overlay District they can have a 5-foot setback. Mr. Jacobs noted 5 feet is not zero. Mr. Alpert clarified that he did not vote yes on this to help Mr. Tedoldi. He voted yes because of what the attorney found, and the Building Inspector agreed. He read the By-Law and agreed with the interpretation. Ms. Newman stated this should be studied and applied in a comprehensive way. Mr. Jacobs agreed and noted that is why he disagrees with what was done tonight.

Mr. Jacobs feels all other properties situated in the same way should have a zero setback. Attorney George Giunta Jr. noted he understands and does not disagree with Mr. Jacobs. Mr. Jacobs is right that correcting the error works out to advantage one person. That is an unintended consequence. Building Inspector David Roche noted the building does not set at zero setback. He believes it is 7 feet. He feels a good compromise on the side streets may be 5 feet. He does not feel it is compromising people's rights. It may give more opportunity for them to expand their property. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated the setback is 8 feet to the building and 5 feet to the overhang. The other corner is 10 feet and 7 feet to the overhang. Mr. Jacobs stated he feels this is the type of discussion the Board needs. He wants consistency. Ms. Espada stated this opens an opportunity to look at this but agrees it should move forward for this project. This shows some inconsistency with the By-Law that needs to be repaired.

Ms. McKnight stated she would like to continue what is proposed under the Chestnut Street Overlay District with a 20-foot setback as a basic requirement and have a clear statement that side streets are 10-foot setbacks. Mr. Block wants to call this out specifically. He would like a specific notice by mail sent to the affected property owners. A motion was made to send the zoning amendment, with minor changes discussed, to the Select Board. Mr. Jacobs asked, if this comes back and needs some proposed amendments, is there a clear idea and understanding of what amendments could be adopted. Mr. Alpert stated it could not be more restrictive, but the Board could make it less.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Ms. Espada, it was by a roll call vote of the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to send the zoning amendment with minor changes discussed to the Select Board.

Board of Appeals – September 23, 2021

299 Charles River Street –Andrew and Gia Jeas, applicants

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: “No comment.”

Public Hearing:

7:30 p.m. – Article 1: Amend Zoning By-Law – Outdoor Seating.

Mr. Alpert noted this is a proposed By-Law amendment for a change to reflect changes made during Covid.

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 waive the reading of the public hearing notice.

Ms. Newman noted there is one issue with take-out facilities that have no seats. She does not want to include those entities in this. Abbotts is one example. Mr. Alpert stated the Board should close the hearing and discuss at the next meeting.

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 close the hearing.

7:45 p.m. – Major Project Site Plan: Needham Enterprises, LLC, 105 Chestnut Street, Suite 28, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 1688 Central Avenue, Needham, MA). Regarding proposal to construct a new child-care facility of 9,966 square feet and 30 parking spaces, that would house an existing Needham child-care business, Needham Children’s Center (NCC). *Please note: this hearing was continued from the June 14, 2021 and August 17, 2021 meetings of the Planning Board.*

Ms. Espada recused herself from the hearing. Mr. Alpert noted this is an open, continued public hearing. He noted he would like a hard stop deadline of 10:30 p.m. He will let the attendees speak as issues come up and get their questions answered. He noted some additions to the record: added late today were Exhibits received dated 3/1/21 through 9/2/21 with a list of 99 items. This is available in the packet on the website. He also noted a letter from the DPW, dated 8/12/21, with comments and recommendations; another letter from the DPW with no additional comments; an email from Tara Gurge with no date, with comments including environmental testing noting the applicant has satisfied that, so no further testing is needed; a memo from the Design Review Board, dated 8/13/21, with comments; minutes of the Design Review Board meeting and further comments; a memo from Attorney Evans Huber, dated 8/4/21, noting additional changes to the project since the 7/22/21 meeting; an email from Fire Chief Dennis Condon, dated 8/9/21, noting no additional comments; additional comments from the neighborhood and additional traffic study information.

Mr. Alpert noted ethical violations have been alleged. Town Counsel sent a detailed letter to the State Ethics Commission requesting guidance regarding hearings. Town Counsel Christopher Heep’s letter is in the packet. He asked the Board if they want to wait for a response or would they want to proceed. Mr. Block stated he is not convinced a legal violation has occurred, but he is not an expert. People have a legitimate right to raise these concerns. He understands the appearance but does not know if a violation exists or what impact it may have. He does not want a decision rendered by default on the basis the Board does not know the outcome of these allegations. He proposes continuing the hearing tonight on the merits of the application and have an independent counsel who specializes in ethics law advise the Board with respect to this circumstance. If other members are satisfied, it may not be required. Ms. McKnight stated she is satisfied with the research done by Town Counsel Heep noting the Board may rescind the decision after action by the Ethics Commission. She wants to proceed with this hearing, close the hearing and take a vote. If a decision is made with a condition that may require further information, the Board can take action then on the basis of the further information.

Mr. Alpert pointed out, if the hearing is continued pursuant to the zoning statute, it may be the relief is automatically given if too much time passes. That would not allow the Board to put conditions on this property. He is inclined to go forward with the hearing. If the Board would like to ask for an independent counsel, he would like that vote tonight. Mr. Jacobs agreed with Mr. Alpert and Ms. McKnight. He is not sure about the independent counsel now and feels that can wait. Attorney Evans Huber, representative for the applicant, stated he is in favor of moving forward, noting that Town Counsel

Heep had already informed the Board on 7/16/21 he does not believe the hearing should be stopped; his view is he does not appreciate people continuing to insist on the validity of their positions; they have received an opinion from a qualified counsel. Mr. Alpert does not feel it is necessary to get independent counsel now, but the Board could later if necessary. Ms. McKnight is comfortable with that.

Davis Lazarus, of Oxbow Road, thanked the Board. This is clearly a complicated issue, and he recognizes all are trying to do the right thing. He stated that the list of all testimony received to date is a great document. He noted the ethics is an incredibly serious issue. Everyone has a right to make a living and run for office. They need to be prepared to do that within the law. The Chair of the Select Board is not allowed to represent anyone in front of this Board. Mark Gluesing appeared before the Planning Board about what the Design Review Board would or would not do. The overlap is ethically troubling. All the Board has to do is request approval for a specialist to come in and make a determination. Not doing this may be disastrous. The harm to continue without an expert opinion is very significant. The harm to the developer for waiting is not as significant. The delay is small to get an opinion. Town Counsel Heep has stated the Board has not delayed this project review. It is the developer that keeps delaying it. This is public now and all the Board has to do is get an opinion to advise the town.

Mr. Alpert thanked Mr. Lazarus for his comments. He noted the delays were not always at the request of the developer. The August delay was at the Boards initiative as materials were sent too late. They have asked the State Ethics Commission for an opinion. They may or may not get one but may also need to get another opinion after that. Mr. Alpert noted Mr. Lazarus stated, by law, the Chair of the Select Board may not represent anyone in front of another Board. He asked what Mr. Huber's opinion is on that question of law. Mr. Huber stated that, clearly, the allegation that because Mr. Borrelli is the manager of Needham Enterprises LLC he cannot pursue any development in this town that requires a permit in front of another Board is absurd. The applicant is Needham Enterprises LLC, and not Mr. Borrelli. Another allegation made was that Mr. Borrelli, or the LLC, has been paid. He has not. There is no lease with the operator of Needham Children's Center (NCC). He wants NCC to be a tenant, but they have no legal obligation to do this. Mr. Borrelli is not an agent for NCC. It is incorrect to say Mr. Borrelli has engaged in ethical violations. Mr. Block stated it seems the intended use is a daycare center. If that is not the case, would the Dover Amendment still apply? Mr. Huber stated the Dover Amendment absolutely does apply. He feels the Board should be mindful Mr. Borrelli is doing this at his own risk without a lease in place, and his good faith.

Mr. Jacobs stated he does not think this hearing is about NCC. It is about this site and what is proposed at this site. Mr. Huber stated, when a special permit is approved, it will be for a childcare center. It is being designed and built for a childcare center. Maggie Abruzese, of 30 Bridle Trail, echoed Mr. Lazarus comments. She thanked all Board members for the many hours spent on this. She appreciates the time and effort. She noted this started more than a year ago. Selectman Borrelli wanted to know how he, as the developer, could get approval to build a childcare center for his client. Selectman Borrelli argues his client should prevail and not the town. She does not take this lightly. The Design Review Board (DRB) is responsible for reviewing the drawings. They have done that and expressed some concerns. Marc Gluesing stood before this Board and took a stand directly in conflict from what his Board recommended. He is pursuing the private interest of his client rather than the best interests of the town. Ethical laws were put into place to prevent this very thing.

Ms. Abruzese stated she recognizes the Planning Board members are not specialists in ethics. She is not asking them to litigate or make a determination. She is asking they pause and seek legal counsel. She is not accusing Planning Board members of improprieties. The decision is only as good as the information given. She wants to make sure the legitimate ethical questions are resolved before moving forward. Mr. Borrelli and Mr. Gluesing could ask for an opinion themselves to resolve this. This would safeguard the integrity of the Board. Mr. Alpert stated he does not take Ms. Abruzese's comments lightly. They are well researched and persuasive. There may be a middle ground. The Board could work on the merits of the project while waiting for the ethics determination.

Mr. Block stated there is some validity in some of Ms. Abruzese's arguments but some of her comments are a distraction. The Board should have expert counsel advise of what is within the scope of the Planning Board purview. Mr. Block noted Ms. Abruzese has implied an impropriety here. Mr. Jacobs stated he hears less than what Mr. Block suggests. She is saying perception is important. He would like to hear Mr. Hubers' response. Mr. Huber stated he agrees with Mr. Block. He hears her strongly imply various town officials are skewing opinions because Mr. Borrelli is on the Select Board. This Board should agree that is not happening but is going in the opposite direction. The DRB has reviewed this 3 times and made comments that are a lot of time not favorable to this applicant. The process is not tainted in his favor. He asks the Board to step back and look at the Conflict of Interest Law and why it was enacted.

Matt Heideman, of 1708 Central Avenue, stated his job is Business Development Manager to public sector of all federal government. To say holding positions on boards does not give a leg up for commercial businesses is a façade. He does this every day. The implications here are 100% warranted by what Ms. Abruzese said. Shannon Buckley, of Harris Avenue, stated she is an NCC staff member. She has a business degree and an education degree. This is so tied up with the ethical dilemma they are forgetting all the other people tied up with this. Most watching tonight are the teachers. A lot of the staff members are long time Needham residents. The center has strong ties to Needham families. The ethical debate seems more like an attack on the developer and less about the location.

Mr. Block feels the Board should continue on substance. He feels there is no harm engaging a special counsel to advise on the scope of their authority. Ms. McKnight stated the only issue is to ask if the Board has to stop acting until a determination is made. She feels comfortable going forward and does not feel the need for advice. Mr. Jacobs feels the hearing should proceed and the Board should go ahead with engaging special counsel who has expertise in this area. They do not have guidance from the Ethics Commission. He would not limit the special counsel to any one question but ask advice. Mr. Alpert feels they should go forward, get the facts and hear everything. There is a remedy. If the State Ethics Commission makes a finding and finds any issue the Board can ask that the project be rescinded. The building may have to come down. He is leaning toward getting a determination from an expert.

Mr. Block suggested the Planning Board ask the Town Manager for financial approval to engage a special counsel in this law and to advise on the scope of the Planning Board authority and give a legal opinion on the extent they can continue and finalize their process given the risk if it is delayed for a certain amount of time that the relief sought by the applicant is automatically rendered. A motion was made to ask the Town Manager to approve to engage special independent counsel to advise on the scope of authority on this particular matter. A suggestion was made to amend the motion to advise on the best course of action for the Planning Board at this time. Mr. Huber stated the applicant's position is clear. This Board has already received an opinion by a qualified Town Counsel. The applicant does not consent to further delay. Mr. Alpert stated the Board would not be delaying but will be moving on.

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

VOTED: to ask the Town Manager to approve to engage special counsel to advise on the best course of action for the Planning Board at this time.

Mr. Alpert asked the applicant to review the changes to the plan. Mr. Huber stated there have been some changes to the façade of the building that faces Central Avenue, which he will speak to. Another allegation was raised as to whether keeping the barn would create more than one use on a lot. Mr. Alpert asked to discuss the barn. Holly Clarke has raised an issue as to whether the barn would be an impermissible building. He reached out to the Building Inspector who agreed with Ms. Clarke. There cannot be 2 non-residential structures on one lot. If a daycare center is built the barn has to go. Mr. Huber stated, given this issue has been raised, it is pretty clear that the barn would need to be used solely by the child-care facility. There is a provision of the By-Law that says more than one non-residential structure on a lot would not be allowed. However, they are under 40A, Section 3, which says no By-Law shall prohibit use of land or structure for primary accessory or incidental use of operating a child-care center. He does not think it is clear that an accessory structure is subject to that restriction being discussed. Another provision says accessory structures are allowed as of right in the SRA District. A reasonable interpretation would be the prohibition does not apply to an accessory structure. Under the By-Law accessory uses are treated differently. Chapter 40A, Section 3 is not limited to a single structure. The barn is limited to accessory use to the child-care center.

Ms. McKnight asked for what purpose the barn is proposed to be used and was told, at the moment it would only be for storage. Mr. Block asked the square footage of the barn. John Glossa, of Glossa Engineering, stated the outside of the barn is 60 feet by 40 feet or 2,400 square feet. Mr. Block heard Needham Enterprise LLC would have primary use of the barn. 2,400 square feet is a big space and is not realistic as an accessory use to a daycare facility. He is satisfied this becomes a second use and not really an accessory to the primary use and therefore has to go. The only way he would want to see the barn stay would be if he advocated for a substantial setback. The cost to take down the barn would be incremental. He feels the applicant should push the building back. The barn can only stay if it becomes included in the design of the structure. Incorporated as part of the facility it could be play space. That is the only way he would support keeping the barn.

Mr. Huber stated he would like to start talking about traffic and other issues. If the Board votes the barn has to come down it would be a violation of Chapter 40A, Section 3. A full debate should be later. He does not agree the Board has the authority to order the barn be taken down. Mr. Alpert feels they do have the authority per the By-Law. Pat Day, owner of NCC, stated the space they are in now has a lot of storage space. The building they are planning has a lot of kid space and not a lot of storage space. The children's center could fill 3 double garages as of now with bikes, buggies, outdoor equipment and such. She loves the idea of incorporating the barn. Mr. Alpert stated they will defer the discussion of the barn.

Mr. Heideman stated he is not a lawyer but everything about this project has been very unforthcoming, particularly the barn plans. He heard the barn is not needed then it is needed. He lives in a 1,700 square foot house. It is ridiculous they need 2,400 square feet for storage. The building should be pushed back and get rid of the barn. That would solve many issues in the neighborhood.

Holly Clarke, of 1652 Central Avenue, thinks Mr. Huber is misreading the By-Law. The By-Law is clear that 2 non-residential buildings on a lot or 2 non-residential uses on a residential lot is not permitted and this would be upheld under any analysis. If there is another change in the plan, and this would be part of the childcare facility, what is actually being considered? She will hold back further discussion.

Stan Keller, of 325 Country Way, stated the discussion regarding the barn is surreal. He is a long-time resident. Nobody has asked why build a new multimillion dollar facility and keep an old barn. The Planning Board needs to look at the property as a whole. He urges the Board to ask the right questions. Ms. Buckley invited all to come see the center now. Having the barn would be amazing. The children talk about farming and having gardens growing. They could have so much going on there. Mr. Alpert suggested they talk about changes to the plans to date and traffic.

Mr. Glossa stated changes were made due to John Diaz' comments regarding traffic. Mr. Diaz asked, in comment 14, for directional arrows, center lines, travel lanes and such be shown for the proposed driveway. The curb is 6 inches and the pavement is 24 feet or 24 feet plus 8 feet with the new queuing lane. Mr. Glossa feels it is adequately shown on the plan. Behind at the rear of the building is the loading area. That is where the school supplies and such would be dropped off. He described the trucks as an Amazon van or equivalent. In response to comment 17, they added curb stops at the ends of the parking spaces where they abut the sidewalk. These were added to the plan. Comment 19 was the shape of the island. The island was a circle which made some confusion. It is more teardrop shaped now. Lines are painted so there is no confusion. Comment 20 suggested a second driveway. This was considered but it would be more pavement and it would be difficult to make it work. There is less availability for parking unless it is closer to Country Way. The applicant wants the front door at the rear of the building. Ten cars can queue up in the queueing lane with the door in the back. Comment 22 regards ADA handicap sidewalks. The ones at the handicap spaces will be level with the pavement; then there will be a little ramp less than 5% slope to meet ADA requirements. Comment 23 is regarding drainage. The property slopes down from the door toward Central Avenue. A set of catch basins close to the stop line and on both sides of the drive have been put in. All slopes are from the back of the site to the catch basins. Existing catch basins are there now. He noted they will come back with revised plans.

Mr. Huber noted the most significant change was the addition of the queueing lane. On the original plan there was just one entrance and exit lane. The driveway is widened and can hold 20 cars. If the queueing lane is full others will be naturally be directed to the back parking area. The building did not have to be moved to add a queueing lane. The driveway was merely widened on the north side. Another feature is a curve has been added so if the queueing lane is full cars can go straight. Ms. McKnight noted the DPW comment regarding redoing the sidewalk along the frontage of the property. Frequently the Board asks for that, but she does not see anything here. Mr. Glossa noted, in comment 22, they intend to provide new sidewalks to tie into the existing sidewalks at the property limits. Mr. Alpert noted the expansion of the sidewalk to accommodate ADA sidewalks and asked if it would be just along this property or extend from Country Way to the Temple driveway. This does not appear to be addressed in the comment. Ms. McKnight stated the comment was only along this property. She is not sure if the Board's authority allows beyond the property itself. Mr. Glossa stated there was no problem to show it.

Mr. Block noted the widening of the driveway and widening of the access point is an improvement. Sheet 8 regards the sewer extension plan. He had made a comment last time about the underground detention basin to capture all the runoff on the property between the barn and the proposed daycare center. The slope on the south side goes between 205 feet and 199 feet which is a drop of 6 feet. Water will move down the slope off this property. He sees another proposed infiltration system has been put in. He does not want water from this property going onto other properties. He thought the applicant would be adding a detention basin on the southwest corner to remove more of the surface water. There is still a lot of water on site.

Mr. Glossa stated the Heideman property is actually higher. There is a closed contour line. There is a little area that will naturally hold water. Soils are full of fine glacial outwash all the way down which means the water soaks into the ground. There will be no runoff from rainfalls. There are massive leaching galleys in back. He noted water flows from the Heideman property onto this site. Mr. Glossa noted the building site is at 205 feet elevation, but it goes up from the low spot. This project has actually slowed the rate of run off and overall, this is a better condition. Rainfall will soak into the ground.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Jacobs, and seconded by Ms. McKnight, it was by a roll call vote of the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to continue the hearing to 10/5/21 at 7:45 p.m.

Mr. Block stated he wants more clarity on the gravity of the water. Ms. McKnight stated she would like revised plans at the next hearing.

Report from Planning Director and Board members.

Ms. Espada came back to the meeting. Mr. Jacobs left the meeting. Ms. Newman stated Town Manager Kate Fitzpatrick is creating a committee for a Climate Action Plan. She would like one appointment from the Planning Board. She would also like 2 members on the Affordable Housing Study Committee. Additionally, currently there are 2 committees focusing on transit – one focused more on traffic infrastructure, and one more on transit. There is a discussion if the 2 committees should be merged. Does the Planning Board want to participate in looking at this issue of whether to merge the groups and also to identify the key transportation issues that the Town will be focusing on over the next year? Ms. Espada asked if there was information on all the Committees the Planning Board participates in. Ms. Newman noted the Community Preservation Committee, the Affordable Housing Committee, and the new Climate Action Plan Committee. There is also the Council of Economic Advisors and NUARI. She has received 15 applications for the 2 Citizen At-Large positions on the Housing Plan Group. Ms. McKnight and Ms. Espada are interested in the Affordable Housing Committee and Ms. Espada will think about the Climate Action Plan Committee.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Block, and seconded by Ms. Espada, it was by a roll call vote of the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Kalinowski, Notetaker

____
Adam Block, Vice-Chairman and Clerk