

## NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

July 7, 2022

The Needham Planning Board Virtual meeting using Zoom, was remotely called to order by Adam Block, Chairman, on Thursday, July 7, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. with Messrs. Alpert and Crocker and Mmes. McKnight and Espada, as well as Planning Director, Ms. Newman and Assistant Planner, Ms. Clee.

Mr. Block took a roll call attendance of the Board members and staff. He noted this is an open meeting that is being held remotely per state guidelines. He reviewed the rules of conduct for zoom meetings. He noted this meeting does include one public hearing and 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, including the agenda, are posted on the town's website.

### Minutes

There are no comments tonight.

### Report from Planning Director and Board members.

Ms. Newman noted the minutes and the decisions for 3 projects, 140 Kendrick Street, Babson batting cages and the adjustment to the Town Common, will be on the agenda for the 7/12/22 meeting. She stated the remote meeting option may get extended by the state. Flex meetings may be extended through mid-December 2023. The meeting schedule has been adjusted for September. The 9/6/22 meeting has been moved to 9/7/22 due to the election.

Ms. McKnight gave an update on the MBTA guidelines. The Housing Plan Working Group (HPWG) is still waiting for the revised guidelines and the final guidelines will inform the rezoning recommendations the HPWG makes. She stated the timing will be tight to get the guidelines, have a meeting of the HPWG, write the report and wrap that up.

Mr. Block commented the Governor and the State Legislature may approve the ability for remote (Zoom) meetings to continue, but he feels the Town wants hybrid meetings and will start convening in person soon. Ms. Newman stated the 7/12/22 Planning Board meeting will be by Zoom and the August meeting will be hybrid. Mr. Crocker stated it is important to get to in-person meetings for the public. Mr. Alpert stated once the bill is passed, and goes into law, they will read the legislation to see what can be done. He wants to see what happens.

### Public Hearing:

**7:15 p.m. – Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2022-02: 557 Highland, LLC, an affiliate of The Bulfinch Companies, Inc., 16 Huntington Avenue, Suite 600, Boston, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 557 Highland Avenue, Needham, MA). Regarding proposal to redevelop the Property with approximately 496,694 square feet of office, laboratory and research and development uses (see legal notice and application for more details). Please note: this hearing has been continued from the June 7, 2022 meeting of the Planning Board.**

Mr. Block stated the Board had requested an updated site plan as the site plan did not show the 50-foot setback from the new layout of Gould Street. He will limit what is discussed tonight. Robert Schlager, President of Bulfinch, noted this is a world class redevelopment of the Muzi site. He noted there is a 557 Highland Avenue website where all the information regarding the project is available to all. He summarized what was covered at the 6/7/22 meeting. He received good questions and comments after that meeting. Responses have been submitted to most of the questions. He stated all are welcome to e-mail questions to the website and they will respond. He noted the focus tonight will be on transportation.

Mr. Schlager stated they have spent countless hours going through the project with everyone. There had been 7 neighborhood meetings in April and May and there has been a first hearing session with the Planning Board. Sean Manning, Principal at VHB, noted the focus tonight would be on traffic. He ran through the transportation summary. He noted there has been a lot of community input and collaboration over the last months. This will be 500,000 square feet split between office and life sciences. There will be a small amount of retail supporting use and community friendly use. A garage will

be on the north side of the site. Access will primarily be off Gould with a secondary access through TV Place. The 2 buildings will be connected with an atrium. The loading dock has been shifted over. He walked through what has been done.

Mr. Manning stated there has been close consultation with Mass Department of Transportation (DOT). A traffic study has been submitted, the study has been reviewed by both peer traffic reviewers, it has been shared with the community in multiple meetings and there has been a lot of feedback. Mass DOT requirements are to look 7 years out with impacts with known projects. They have looked at all intersections between Highland Avenue, Central Avenue, Gould Street and beyond to get a complete understanding of the impacts. They have looked at trip generations but looked at existing site trips first and actual counts taken in 2020. These uses were much higher pre Covid. On some days, the car wash had 1,300 cars at peak so 2,600 trips. He noted they needed to look at actuals. They looked at a.m. and p.m. trips and estimated proposed trips. He noted the ITE trip national data and discussed mode share. They want to attract reverse commuters. The numbers estimate 12 to 14% transit will be bike share and work from home could be 14% but he believes that number is low. Actual trip making is lower than estimated. He discussed how vehicles will get to the site from which roads. He believes it will be dominated by 2/3 coming from Route 128. The rest will be distributed through other roads.

He noted the site driveways on Gould Street and accounted for cut through traffic on Hunting Road. They have looked closely at parking. He stated there is a significant amount of bicycle parking proposed, with a secure area indoors for employees and outside for others. He noted 25% of parking spaces will have electric charging stations. He feels parking demand will be lower than zoning standards would suggest. With the percent of public transport users, hybrid remote work and bicyclists he feels the parking demand will be lower than 1,279 spaces. Life science space has far lower density than office. He believes the environmentally responsible thing to do is to have less parking. Mr. Block stated there is a footnote in the traffic report regarding Cambridge and how people will commute, but people may not take a car to Cambridge. Maybe a use in Newton or on Wells Avenue or Waltham or Lexington should be used as the model where people are not taking the commuter rail into work. He asked how Mr. Manning thinks that would change the picture if one of those models was used.

Mr. Manning stated employees and patrons are not those parking. He used Cambridge because they require all owners and tenants to do detailed surveying every year. He is saying if people chose to park there, these would be the numbers. He expects he will get a follow up from GPI. Mr. Block noted the applicant is looking for a waiver of approximately 200 spaces to 1,408 and another 130 or so. He noted that parking garages usually have an average of 130 spaces per floor and asked if this would reduce the parking garage by a floor. Mr. Manning deferred to the proponent. He showed a slide of all proposed mitigations. He noted there are multi-modal solutions particularly at Gould and Highland. The first is bike lanes on the street level. A lot of community feedback was received regarding separated bike lanes. Second was TV Place. The intersection looked big. The project does not need these improvements, but they thought it would be good for the future.

Mr. Manning noted the rezoning effort had conservative assumptions built in like 120,000 square feet of retail space. That is the use that has the highest potential for trip generation. The project is only proposing 10,000 square feet of retail. He also looked at the approach of Gould and Highland. He believes the turn onto Route 128 is necessary. They went with separated lanes and a shared through lane. There are 2 alternatives for bike lanes and the addition of a crosswalk after TV Place. There could be a separated bike lane at sidewalk level on the west side of Gould Street and rebuild the sidewalk on the east side of Gould all the way to Noanett Road. Or there could be a 2-way bicycle path from the Highland/Gould intersection to the crosswalk at the abandoned right of way that would go to the channel markers and after that to Central Avenue. Option 3 is the same as option 2 but the 2-way cycle track has shifted to the east side of Gould Street. All other aspects are identical. Both options are superior to on-street bike lanes.

Mr. Manning stated there is still work to do at the intersection of Gould and Central. He does not see any right of way impacts to any homes. There may be a need for a small easement across the street. He summarized the pedestrian and bike accommodations. There will be up to 154 bicycle parking spaces on site, a 2-lane separated bicycle lane and a fitness path. There will be a crosswalk at the railroad right-of-way crossing. There will be a direct connection to public transit via an electric shuttle with the potential to connect to the Green Line or commuter rail. He noted Noanett and Hunting are cut through streets. The applicant is committed to working with the town to reduce speed and find strategic locations to put in speed signs with embedded radar. There have been community conversations on Sachem Road regarding people making U turns on Highland Avenue. That is not part of this project, but they are looking at it.

Mr. Manning stated they are doing the Gold Standard for the Transportation Demand Management (TDM). He reviewed the proposed measures. He stated monitoring is the big thing and the applicant will become an active member of the 128 Business Council.

Rebecca Brown, from GPI, received responses from VHB last Thursday. She has not gone through all the details but read through the responses to see if the applicant has adequately addressed the questions. She is still going through the details of the analysis, but she has general comments. Some plans are new to them, and she is going through them to see if they make sense. She noted a lot of their responses adequately address her concerns. She reviewed what they had been asked to do and what is being looked for. A couple of locations have been degraded such as the Hunting/Gould/Highland intersection. Hunting northbound is at a Level F. Signal timing modifications have been included in the improvements at that location. The Highland Avenue and West Street intersection has a Level Service F (over capacity). Some signal timing improvements appear to mitigate that, and it is agreed it should be mitigated.

Ms. Brown noted that the Highland Avenue and Webster Street intersection is a Level F. They are proposing signal timing improvements which will bring it back to Level D, but it is still over capacity. It is not making it any worse, though. There may be slight changes to the signal timing to improve it more. Highland and First Avenue is not adding much delay. It is a Level F in the p.m. With signal timing improvements it could be Level E and possibly Level D. She wants to make sure the applicant is going to actually do this. It is not clear. It is similar at Hunting Road and Kendrick Street. Signal timing changes would drastically improve this and she wants to confirm the changes will be made. Those are the traffic operations she is concerned with.

Ms. Brown noted there are safety concerns with crash rates at some locations. Highland and West, Hunting and Kendrick and Highland/Gould/Hunting should be improved with the changes proposed. Hunting and Kendrick had no rationale for crashes. She asked if the clearance intervals are ok. Highland and West has no consistency with how angle crashes were occurring. She did notice a couple of crashes were bicycle crashes. She asks the applicant to look at bicycle improvements there. Gould and Central has large queues that extend back to Noanett. Signage needs to be looked at but she wants to make sure it does not impact residents. For TDM measurements, she requests the applicant contact the MBTA to advocate for continuing transit to the site. That may not be able to happen, but shuttle services would help. The separated bike facility on the site side would provide better alignment for Gould through Hunting. It may be a better option and also provides a larger stacking distance. She believes there are benefits to having it on the site side.

Mr. Block stated Ms. Brown was very methodical on the 5/27/22 letter to the Board. He asked if there are still items she is looking for additional solutions for. Ms. Brown noted there are only a couple of outstanding items. She is still digesting the plans. There will be a follow up report. Mr. Crocker asked whether, if the bike path were on the site side, would bikes have to cross Gould Street twice. Mr. Manning stated it depends which direction the bicyclist is going in. It would be a challenge on either side. Mr. Schlager feels it would be residential bicyclists. Mr. Crocker asked if it was clear to state, even with an electric shuttle, if the applicant could do a multi-modal pathway along the now-unused railroad right-of-way, it would greatly decrease traffic on Highland Avenue. Ms. Brown stated it would reduce the level of service if another way to get traffic across 128 could be found.

Mr. Crocker stated there is a desire to reduce the height of the parking structure. If the applicant took off a level that would be 10% less parking. If the project is 10% less that would alleviate the concern of having one level of the parking structure removed. Mr. Manning stated he would be concerned with underparking. He feels it is right to waive the zoning but not too much. He believes the number of parking is correct for the proposal. Ms. McKnight commended Bulfinch and the Bulfinch team for responding to the comments from the neighbors and the Board. The entrance to TV Place was changed. She is glad to see the loading dock will be accessed from the north side from TV Place and the door to the parking garage is off TV Place. If the turning radius is smaller at TV Place, it needs to be looked at. She noted the separated through/right lane from Gould to Highland. She can see the reason for making Gould Street only 4 lanes total. She is not sure 3 es for the approach to Highland are necessary, though. She wants to see if fewer lanes would be sufficient to handle the traffic. She wants to understand the bike lanes, double bikes lanes and the sidewalk. She asked if there would be a separated sidewalk and the 2 bike lanes and was informed there would be.

Ms. McKnight noted Needham allows biking on sidewalks except in downtown, thus this project will really have 3 lanes for biking, including the sidewalk. She asked if all of this is going to be within the layout of the Gould Street right of way

or would some of it on the site side and just be a site feature. Mr. Schlager stated he likes to isolate sidewalks for walkers. The solution will ultimately be based on GPIs recommendations. They have put up 3 alternatives, and will see if a consensus can be reached and they would come back. Ms. McKnight asked if, ultimately, the bike lanes and sidewalk would be within the public way of Gould Street. Ms. Brown stated that it appears traffic at Highland and Gould would work with the geometry the applicant has shown with the 4 lanes coming out. The only thing for the Town to consider is if future development may create a need for additional lanes. With a separate bike facility on the west side there is not a straight alignment. Stop lines would need to be set further back on the east side for a much straighter alignment and it gives 15 or so feet for cars to back up on the site. The big tradeoff is it is not on the same side of the street as the project. The shoulder could be widened from 2 feet to 4 feet for a bike-accommodating shoulder.

Ms. Espada thanked VHB and the team for the thorough traffic review. She asked if there are any concerns going from 4 lanes to 3 lanes to 2 lanes at TV Place regarding backups there. Mr. Manning stated the additional lanes are basically to get turning traffic out of the way of the through traffic. Past TV Place toward Highland is left turn lanes, 2 lanes moving forward and a single lane all the way to Highland and a short left lane. This will be far more efficient than what has been there, and it will be augmented with sidewalks, signals, and crosswalks. Ms. Espada noted there is a problem at the corner of Gould and Central and asked if any consideration is being given for improvements at that intersection. Ms. Brown recommends installation of a traffic signal. It meets the warrants for a signal now. Ms. Espada stated the EV charging stations are great and she is very pleased. She approves of the loading dock improvements. She asked if they have tested different trucks coming in off Gould Street to make sure it is not impairing the site. Mr. Manning stated they have tested and did turning studies.

Ms. Espada asked about the sustainability piece of shuttling people into the site. She asked if the shuttle connection has been successful with other projects. Ms. Newman noted it has been successful. Most of the businesses in the business park are members of the 128 Business Council. This applicant is proposing to join. Ms. Espada asked what the proposal is and if there are any ideas of the numbers. She asked how they can reduce parking on the site. Mr. Manning described the shuttle in Waltham and how great it works. They are using the same model here. He believes they can reduce parking and traffic by 10-12%. Ms. Espada stated the MBTA bus line goes down Webster Street and down Central Avenue but does not serve this area. Have there been any discussions with the MBTA about providing bus service to this site? Mr. Schlager stated he has already initiated with the MBTA the pick-up shuttle service. Bulfinch has other properties on Gould Street, and they have asked for shuttle service. It is a joint effort. With the 2 properties on Gould Street, and the 3 additional proposed, he feels there will be enough to justify a stop.

Mr. Alpert stated it sounds like most bike traffic is going to be neighborhood and not commuters. If bike lanes are on the site side of Gould the neighborhood cyclists would be competing with cars in and out of the project. It seems it would be safer if the bikes are on the west side of Gould Street. Mr. Block noted there would be 5,000 or so trips to the site per day with 1,000 going through the neighborhoods to get to the site. He would like to know, at the next meeting, calculations pre-pandemic of what percent of tenant's employees go to properties through public transportation. Mr. Schlager stated the numbers will be low. There was not a high ridership goal pre-pandemic. The bus was set up with an uninviting approach. For a good guide, he will be looking at other towns. He will have VHB put together a summary. He could have the shuttle pick up at the other building as well. Mr. Block asked whether the shuttle would go to the end of the Green Line and also to the Needham Center commuter rail station. Mr. Schlager stated yes, and it is possible they may work with the 128 Business Council on such options.

Mr. Block reminded the applicant the Board had to call him in due to concern about his failure to support shuttle service to other Bulfinch properties in Needham. What assurances can he provide the Town that he wants to continue to participate? Mr. Schlager stated the way it was structured was not fair. They had a vacant building and there was no one there to shuttle. The buses sat there idling and there were complaints. All are aware of what happened. Once the tenants came back, they are now in full mode with the 128 Council shuttles. Mr. Block commented the applicant seems to be providing a robust level of traffic mitigation. He opened the meeting to the public. He noted the Board has received 47 emails from the public that have been included in the packet for this evening. All correspondence is very helpful. He reiterated all members read all the correspondence.

Maureen Dimeo, of Central Avenue, noted she is about 1 mile from Gould Street. There are many small homes torn down and large monstrosities built. Sadly, her kids will not be able to afford to live here. This is another monstrosity that is being

built here. She has watched this since the beginning. Traffic is from the Highland Avenue exit; traffic is feeding from Cedar Street to Central Avenue and traffic is feeding onto the side streets. You cannot compare the business district across 128 to this neighborhood area. This is an opportunity to change the trajectory of the Heights for many years to come. Many of her friends are back to work. This is a public hearing, but she does not know how many people are here. Mr. Block noted there are 31 members from the public on the Zoom meeting. He explained the town license does not allow all to be seen.

Emily Pick, of 12 Mills Road, agrees with Ms. Dimeo. She is concerned with traffic. The analysis presented has no discussion of the side streets except Mills Road and Utica Road. She would like to see additional traffic mitigations put into place. She has heard zero reference to her street. Eva Zacepitzky, of 12 Mills Road, stated she has been here for 14 years. Traffic on Highland is worse. There are a lot of little kids in her neighborhood, and she is concerned one of them will get hit. There is no safe way to cross the street. She feels the neighborhood is cut in half. Natalie Ho, of 21 Utica Road, commented traffic is bad. They will go from 800 cars to 5,000 cars. She is concerned with the safety for kids and the carbon emissions. She feels it is not appropriate for the neighborhood. She has huge concerns with the scale of the project.

Henry Ragan, of 25 Bennington Street, echoed the previous sentiments. He feels there is a compromise on scale that could be made. He expressed kudos to the developer for the number of community meetings. The applicant does not know who the tenants are yet. Different tenants produce different traffic. He agrees with Ms. Dimeo regarding cars coming off 128. He asked, if there were MBTA bus service to this site, would that be impacted by the Governor's proposal of zoning being changed within ½ mile of routes. Ms. McKnight stated the guidelines being put out by the Department of Housing and Community development to implement a new law refers only to within ½ mile of transit stations. She is expecting them to issue the final guidelines this month. The Housing Plan Working Group will be focused on that this month. Mr. Block stated Hunting and Gould traffic goes through this site while 128 traffic does not.

Ben Daniels, of 5 Sachem Road, stated he lives across from this site. He noted the state put up No U Turn signs at Hunting and Highland, so people make U turns on Highland Avenue. With the cut through traffic, it sounds like the big dig back in the 80s. He hopes Bulfinch will commit to keeping an ongoing study regarding traffic and be willing to take mitigating steps in the future. He stated his end of Sachem Road is a private street. The people who live there have to keep it up. It is very heavily used. He hopes maybe Bulfinch would help with that. He would like a hybrid form of the meetings and would like the principals of Bulfinch to attend in person. Steven Sussman, of 30 Davenport Road, noted the public transportation shuttles. He commented no one takes shuttles unless there is no parking. He wants a police presence. Signs and no cut-through is a joke. People work different hours and Needham is not a biking town. He has been here many years. He never let his kids walk across Highland Avenue. The bike lanes are ridiculous and go nowhere. The trip distribution from 2/12 to 2/16 with 32% arriving on the Highland Avenue exit is delusional. Everyone finds short cuts. The Cedar Street/Central Avenue crossing guard does the best she can, but it is a mess. He respects the traffic study, but it is delusional. If the people from Bulfinch do not see the problem with the road, that is the problem.

Holly Charbonnier, of 94 Sachem Road, appreciates all Bulfinch has done to meet with the community. She appreciates what Mr. Crocker said regarding decreasing the parking and size. She sees the merits of the project but feels a 1.0 FAR would be a more reasonable size for the community. An FAR of 1.25 is too large when it abuts against residential houses. Ashley Scheufele, of 52 Greendale Avenue, shares the concerns of the previous speaker with regard to scale and height of the parking structure. She wants to make sure the neighborhood in the Heights stays safe for seniors and children and they keep the speeds down on Gould and Highland. It will become dangerous for the residents who live here. There will be increased pollution and dangerous intersections for bikers and walkers. She wants to make sure the project is compatible with the residences around it. The sidewalk level bike lanes are good and the improvements to sidewalks. More steps can be taken to make sure this is accessible to families and kids. Amenities will not be good if not accessible. The safety of the neighborhoods is paramount.

Dena Krieger, of 7 Utica Road, lives across from Wingate. She is concerned with the scale of the project. It is too massive for being across the street from residential. She works from home and sees things all day long. There are speeders and she is worried with kids as there are a ton in this area. That this is a cut through is not an exaggeration. People turn around in her driveway. It is a very active area. She is excited for progress but concerned with the scale. She respectfully requests the applicant listen to what the neighbors in the area are saying.

Mr. Crocker feels members of the Planning Board should get a chance to respond while people are here. It is important to balance what is going on. The Utica Road area has transitioned quite a bit and there are a lot of kids there. There has been a lot of talk about Noanett but none about the Utica/Sachem area. He is not looking for symmetry between this side of 128 and the other side. He does not know what could be done to mitigate Utica/Sachem except reduce traffic. Mr. Alpert reiterated what Mr. Crocker said. He thanked the neighbors who spoke. They brought traffic issues on the other side of Highland Avenue that the Board was not focused on. He encouraged the neighbors to continue to attend meetings and send letters with feedback. Ms. Espada feels the same. She appreciates the community's comments and takes them all seriously.

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

VOTED: to continue the hearing to 9/7/22 at 7:05 p.m.

### **Review of Brewery Zoning for 2022 Special Town Meeting.**

Ms. McKnight recused herself from this discussion. There are 3 or 4 industrial zones to be discussed and she lives across the street from the largest of these. She also serves on the Board of Directors of Rosemary Ridge Condominium. She was moved to an attendee.

Ms. Newman noted the draft in front of members is what is being put forth. Town Counsel Christopher Heep suggested a couple of minor modifications. She reviewed the areas a Brew Pub is to be allowed by Special Permit. It is allowed in B and C by Special Permit and in the Chestnut Street Business District limited to the portion south of Keith Place. A Microbrewery is to be allowed in Industrial 1, the New England Business Center both south and west of Second Avenue, in Highway Commercial 1 on both sides of Highland Avenue west of Second Avenue and both Mixed Use 128 and Highway Commercial 1 by Special Permit. Mr. Block stated the Board had found reason not to include the Industrial District on Crescent Street. A discussion ensued.

Ms. Newman noted the framework created is what would be advertised. It cannot be made broader but can be made narrower. She feels it should be made as broad as possible. Mr. Block stated the Select Board has met to update the alcohol policy so this can go forward. Mr. Alpert stated the reason he wanted to defer was to make sure the wording is correct. He asked if Mr. Block and Ms. Newman were satisfied the wording accomplishes what the Planning Board wants. The Finance Committee raised some questions and he asked if they were addressed. There are 3 other areas in town zoned industrial. He feels the 3 Squares Restaurant location may be a good location for a brew pub. He feels on Crescent Road a brew pub may make sense. He does not feel it would make sense along Hillside Avenue at all. Crescent Road is surrounded by residential and has a 50-foot setback from residential. He is not in favor of changing that. There is a question if a brew pub could go in there and meet the 50-foot setback. He is in favor of Crescent Road and 3 Squares to include brew pubs but not microbreweries.

Ms. Newman noted there is a small industrial area off Reservoir Street and a small area off Denmark Lane near Needham Center. Mr. Alpert stated it seems logical for the industrial area off Reservoir Street on the south side of Central Avenue. Mr. Crocker and Ms. Espada agreed. All agree there is no sense on Denmark Lane for either use. Mr. Crocker stated his concern about a brew pub on Crescent is the fact it is residential. Everyone would go through residential to get to this. Ms. Espada would not include Crescent Road. Mr. Alpert stated restaurants are an allowed use in all the industrial districts, and restaurants could have a liquor license. He does not see a difference with a brew pub. He asked if the Board is prepared to change the zoning to take away restaurants on Crescent Road. He is not.

Mr. Block stated he understands but the difference from the Crescent Road industrial district is not driving through over 20 homes. There is only one way to get to it. There is an elevated level of risk. Mr. Alpert stated there have been many restaurants that he has to drive to through a residential neighborhood. Every brew pub he has been to has only had beer and no hard alcohol. He feels there is more danger with a full liquor license than a brew pub. Mr. Crocker appreciates what Mr. Alpert says. They are talking about the risk. There is no need to add increased risk to this neighborhood. There is no public benefit when there are so many other possible locations in town. There is no logic to add that risk.

Ms. Espada commented she associates restaurants with families and to eat. They do not need to drink and there is more flexibility. A brew pub is a destination to drink. Mr. Block stated Ms. McKnight worked very hard on an initial draft of zoning. It went through Town Counsel and a consultant that was hired. The Board has done the best they can. He asked if they should include Industrial Districts or not. Mr. Crocker, Mr. Block and Ms. Espada are against including Crescent Road. There is a consensus on the 3 Square area and Reservoir Street area south of Central Avenue. He commented he would love to see a massive redevelopment from Central Avenue to the river and the river to Highland Avenue. He would love to see a brew pub or microbrewery here. All agree. They also agree to just a brew pub where 3 Squares is.

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

VOTED: to send the Article to the Select Board for the purpose of holding a public hearing with the 2 minor edits made by Town Counsel Christopher Heep and recommendations. to the definition of microbreweries and also reflect the changes discussed tonight to allow brew pubs and microbreweries in the Industrial area and brew pubs under the same framework to allow brew pubs in the 3 Squares location.

There was a discussion regarding the time for the public hearing on 9/7/22. It was decided to open the Bulfinch hearing at 7:05 p.m. and continue it to a time specified.

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

VOTED: to schedule a public hearing for brew pubs and microbreweries for 9/7/22 at 7:15 p.m.

Ms. McKnight returned to the meeting.

### **Correspondence**

Mr. Block noted an email from Louis Wolfson advocating to include the Crescent Road area for brew pubs and microbreweries and a memo from Town Manager Kate Fitzpatrick regarding remote participation and the town policy going forward.

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

VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Donna J. Kalinowski, Notetaker

---

Jeanne S. McKnight, Vice-Chairman and Clerk