NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

July 11, 2017

The regular meeting of the Planning Board held in the Charles River Room, Public Services Administration Building, was called to order by Ted Owens, Chairman, on Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at 7:00 p.m. with Messrs. Jacobs and Alpert and Mmes. Grimes and McKnight, as well as Planning Director, Ms. Newman and Assistant Planner Ms. Clee.

Ms. Newman introduced Daphne Collins who currently works for the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). She will cover for 12 to 13 hours per week to support the Planning Board while Assistant Planner Alexandra Clee is on maternity leave.

Correspondence

Mr. Owens noted a copy of the warrant for the 5/8/17 Special Town Meeting of Article 11 as approved by the Attorney General and that is now in effect and an article from the Needham Times regarding the opening of the SharkNinja headquarters.

Appointment:

7:00 p.m. – Devra Bailin – Review of Proposed Zoning for the Industrial-1 and Industrial Districts.

Devra Bailin noted the Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) has been working on the Industrial District rezoning since Needham Crossing rezoning was approved in 2011. Four years ago the CEA decided to focus on areas that abut Route 128. Industrial 1 District includes Muzi Ford, Ellis and Crawford Streets and the Reservoir areas. More than 3 years ago the CEA presented preliminary views in many meetings. The CEA is pressing for long delayed zoning initiatives to go to Town Meeting in the fall. The goal is to make the area more economically competitive. Delays may have created a risk of missing the commercial market. Zoning changes have to precede any sort of development.

The CEA has held three meetings with the public, including one with the Board of Directors of the Needham Heights Neighborhood Association and there will be another meeting with its membership in early September. The CEA is recommending changes to the layout of Route128/ I95, which is presently zoned SRA or SRB Districts. The CEA is recommending that the layout should be zoned neutrally. There is also an existing50 foot side, rear and front setback, which is applicable only to Industrial 1. The CEA believes this to be excessive and there should instead be a landscape buffer between neighborhoods and development. The CEA is recommending a 20 foot landscape buffer.

A build out analysis was done by John Connery. Both in Reservoir and in the Crawford Street area, there are a lot of small lots under separate ownership. A traffic analysis was done as promised to the neighborhood during the 2014 meetings. Ms. Bailin noted that both in Reservoir and Crawford Street zones, the consultant determined that numerous lots would need to be combined to create 75,000 to 80,000 square foot lots. As in Mixed Use-128, this would require massive consolidation of lots. The estimated time for a full buildout would be 20 to 25 years, according to our consultant. Under the current zoning, development is at a maximum; further development is not possible in any meaningful sense. Zoning in Industrial 1 now only allows 2 stories. The CEA recommendation is to create three separate Highway Commercial Districts. The commercial zones would be Channel 5 and Muzi , the Ellis and Crawford Street area, and Reservoir Street area.

Highway Commercial 1 would be Highland and Gould to the railroad tracks; the CEA is recommending increasing the heights along the Highway to 5 to 6 stories or 70 to 84 feet (by special permit). Height would be lower, four stories or 54 feet on the residential side along Gould and Highland. Given that the Elder Services

District already allows four stories and that the topography of these lots slope down to the Highway, even a six story building, as shown by the elevation drawings, will appear to be four from the street views at Highland and Gould.

Highway Commercial 2 would be the area bounded by Gould, the railroad track and Crawford and Ellis Streets. In light of the flat topography of the land, its proximity to residential neighborhoods, and in views of the neighbors' comments, the CEA is proposing a 36 foot height (or three story) at the street fronts facing residential zones with a transition of up to 54 feet at the highway. Again the recommendation is to create a 20 foot landscaped buffer. Ms. Bailin noted a residential abutter commented after seeing the revised proposal that he was pleased the CEA had listened to their concerns. There has been good feedback thus far.

Reservoir Street, including the Reservoir B pumping station, would be Highway Commercial 3 and, like the other districts, would have an increased height and density. The height is proposed to be increased to 5 stories and 70 feet along the highway except along the Charles River which would be 54 feet. Much is limited by the size of the lots and the limited egress and access currently existing on Reservoir Street.

These recommended changes will create a visible Needham along 128 and incent economic development in areas seriously underperforming. There was also a brief discussion of use changes. Open for discussion is the size of retail, restaurants, and consumer services allowed by right(the CEA used the 15,000 square feet by right as is the case in Needham Crossing) and by special permit (the CEA considered but did not decide 15,000 to 45,000 square feet, which may depend on which Highway Commercial District was considered). The CEA also recommended a change in the zoning which would allow by right more than one non-residential use on a lot and more than one building on a lot.

Ms. Bailin noted the traffic impacts. BETA did the traffic study and separated out those traffic mitigation measures required under the no-build scenario. She noted that a traffic signal at Central and Gould Streets is already warranted , as is an adjustment of the timing of the light at Highland and Gould. Depending on the level of development, signs would also be warranted at Central and Reservoir, as well as other detailed mitigation.

She presented the plans showing maximum proposed elevations as seen at various street levels. Based on the build-out analysis, the elevation drawings show that the Muzi site could have a 6 story building set along the highway layout and a lower one along the Gould Street edge. (The six stories would appear to be four from Highland and Gould.) The northerly side of the tracks could only accommodate 5 buildings with structures and commercial parking. Development will be limited by the parking requirements. Ms. Bailin showed elevation pictures of what could be built and how it would look. The CEA had discussions with the neighbors and feedback is that they appreciate being heard. The Needham Heights Neighborhood Association meeting is 9/11/17 and will give the CEA a broader response from them.

Mr. Jacobs noted in Highway Commercial 2 that if it would be 20 to 30 years before it substantially changes, the urgency does not appear to pertain to Highway Commercial 2. Ms. Bailin stated nothing would change if no rezoning action is taken; it is important to put the zoning in place before the market ends. Mr. Jacobs noted the urgency really pertains to the other districts. Ms. Bailin commented it would be hard to say, but that district is a longer process because of the land consolidation needed.

Mr. Alpert stated it sounds like the CEA talked to the residential neighbors. Ms. Bailin noted there were both residential and commercial neighbors. The most recent meeting had mostly businesses. Mr. Alpert asked what the feedback was from the business owners who own lots. Ms. Bailin stated no business owner had spoken negatively at the 2014 meeting or at the ones this year. There was concern about zoning out existing uses but the table of uses is not changing so there is really no issue. Mr. Alpert asked, given the time constraints, does it make sense to carve out Highway District 1 for October and the rest for later. The Board needs to have a draft in front of them for the 7/25/17 meeting in order to get a rezoning article on the Fall Town Meeting Warrant.

Ms. Grimes commented she feels she has been left in the dark. Ms. McKnight agreed she feels the same way. Ms. Grimes stated she feels there is something being proposed that she does not know about. She has read it, gets why these are being looked at, but feels there is a bigger driving force that she is not aware of. She is not comfortable the neighborhood has been involved. There are a lot of homes in this neighborhood. Ms. Bailin stated many neighbors were at the 2014 meetings and she anticipates the September meeting will be well attended. One of Ms. Grimes' concerns is the CEA is moving forward with commercial zoning changes without including the Planning Board. Ms. McKnight agreed it is a concern.

Ms. Bailin stated there were open meetings and some Board members came to them. There were also Planning Board representatives on the CEA. Ms. Grimes stated she was invited but not able to attend. She noted she is in Real Estate and has been hearing rumors of issues with zoning specifically around the Muzi property. She is not happy. Ms. Bailin stated this rezoning has been the long-standing goal of the CEA. It has taken a long time with a lack of funding and other factors. Ms. Grimes stated she would like to see a full report and a traffic analysis to review and would like to think about it. Ms. Bailin noted there has not been a lot of engagement from the Board as a group.

Ms. McKnight noted she found the material very confusing. There is no narrative that tied all the initiatives together. All the CEA has to do is get on the Planning Board agenda if they want to discuss something. She feels this is a big change that has been sprung on them. She has not seen any press about it. She feels it is impossible to get a vote on it on 7/25. Ms. Bailin stated this is the same process that was used for Needham Crossing. Mr. Alpert commented if there is no vote on 7/25 nothing would go on the Town Meeting Warrant. If the Board votes something, the Board still has time to examine the situation and can always withdraw it or portions of it. Voting on the 25th leaves the options open. He would like something ready on 7/25.

Ms. McKnight stated she does not feel it has been vetted enough. This is the entrance to the town. She thinks this is too big and too sudden. Mr. Owens requested Ms. Newman review the timing for this and the police and fire issue to put something on the warrant for the Fall Town Meeting. Ms. Newman stated she would need the zoning drafted to the Selectmen, a vote by the Planning Board on 7/25, the Selectmen would need to accept it and refer it back to the Planning Board. A public hearing is scheduled for 9/12 on the Police and Fire Station zoning amendments and language would need to be final on 9/12. It is due the next morning for the Warrant. Mr. Alpert noted there is not enough time to address any concerns. Ms. Bailin stated the town cannot afford to keep pushing off commercial zoning. Ms. Grimes commented she is committed to looking at this and moving it forward. Mr. Alpert stated the town could have another Special Town Meeting in March if necessary.

Plan Endorsement: Cartwright Road Definitive Subdivision: Mary Stare Wilkinson and Bradley Wilkinson, 260 & 267 Cartwright Road, Needham, Norfolk County, Massachusetts, Assessors Plan No. 218 as Parcel 1).

Roy Cramer, representative for the applicant, noted the Board approved the subdivision on 5/16/17. He had prepared and submitted all necessary paperwork. The applicant needs the amount of the bond. The subdivision plans have been approved. The applicant is asking the Board to endorse the plans so they can get a building permit. Mr. Owens noted a letter from Assistant Town Engineer Thomas Ryder with comments and a letter with a determination of a bond amount.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Grimes, and seconded by Mr. Alpert, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to endorse the plans.

Public Hearing:

7:30 p.m. – Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2017-02: Town of Needham, Permanent Public Building Committee, Petitioner (Property located at 585 Central Avenue, 597 Central Avenue, 603 Central Avenue, 609 Central Avenue, 573 Central Avenue, 567 Central Avenue, 559 Central Avenue and 45 Sunset

Road, Needham, MA 02494). ***Note: this hearing has been continued from the June 13, 2017 meeting of the Planning Board.***

Hank Haff, representative for the applicant, noted all open issues have been addressed. He would like the Board to close the hearing and issue a permit. Mr. Owens noted a letter from Hank Haff responding to comments and the draft decision. Mr. Alpert stated he is confused about the shed, which appears to have been moved. Michelle Rogers, of Dore and Whittier, noted it has been moved and is on the plan in yellow adjacent to the playground. Mr. Haff stated the abutters have accepted the location. It is compliant with zoning and the location works with the use of the shed. The shed has been changed from 10 feet by 10 feet to 8 feet by 20 feet. Half will be used for Kindergarten outdoor equipment and the other half is for service equipment. Ms. Rogers stated it will be a custom-made shed similar in materials to the building.

Ms. McKnight stated she went to the site. She was pleased to see the knoll trail that is being proposed. Mr. Haff noted it has long been in the planning process. He had submitted a Request for Determination of Applicability from the Conservation Commission and received a Negative Determination and wanted the documents in the Plan Documents. The Town of Wellesley has been supportive. He noted it will start to be constructed in 2 weeks and has been approved by the Conservation Commission. The bids will be out in mid-August, completed and awarded by mid-October and the town hopes to break ground in mid-November.

Ms. Newman asked about timing and the temporary Certificate of Occupancy.

Rick Rosen, of 39 Sunset Road, met with the town regarding the location of the shed structure, which seems to be growing in height. He was told about the bike racks and 10 foot high ceilings in this 10 foot high structure. He is concerned with the height of the structure. Even with a fence and some vegetation it will still be seen. Mr. Owens asked about roofs on the bike racks. Ms. Rogers stated 50% of the bike racks need a roof over them. It will be the similar material as the roof on the school. The highest point is 10 feet high. Mr. Rosen reiterated he is concerned with the heights. Mr. Haff noted it will be within the zoning setbacks.

Ms. McKnight noted the site slopes downward and away from Sunset Road and Mr. Rosen's property. The 10 foot height does not seem very high to her. Would it not look lower at the lower elevation? Ms. Rogers stated that area sits lower and there is a lot of vegetation. Mr. Haff stated Mr. Rosen has a white fence that ends. The applicant is proposing to jog a similar fence inbound by about 5 feet along the town property. He wants to protect Mr. Rosen's arborvitae. He will heavy up the buffer and will match the existing fence. Mr. Rosen commented it just seems like a very tall structure for a shed. Sue Cotton, of 40 Sunset Road, asked why the shed is necessary. Ms. Rogers noted mowers and anything with gas should not be within the school. There needs to be a shed away from the school to store the equipment. Julieann Rosen asked how long the last house would be left standing. The town should keep the property in decent shape during construction. It is overgrown and the screens in back are falling out. It is a huge eyesore. The abutters should not have to tolerate this during this process. Mr. Haff stated a work order went in last week to repair the screens. He will talk with the DPW about mowing. He would expect it to be done soon.

Ms. McKnight asked if the 2 houses left might be used by the construction companies. Mr. Haff stated the houses may be used. Mr. Jacobs asked why the shed is 10 feet tall. Ms. Rogers noted it is a standard 8 feet and with the roof it is 10 feet tall. Mr. Jacobs asked if it could be lowered to accommodate the concern. Ms. Rogers noted sheds need 7 feet for the doors then there are the beams and the roof.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Jacobs, and seconded by Ms. Grimes, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to close the hearing.

Mr. Jacobs stated Section 3.31 refers to 3.28. Ms. Newman noted it should be paragraph 3.30. She did some renumbering. Mr. Alpert noted a couple of typos of Glenn Gary Road and the title page number. Ms. Newman will check and correct if necessary. Ms. McKnight noted she was not at the prior hearing. She did listen to the tape and reviewed the materials. She has signed an affidavit to this effect.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to grant (1) the requested Major Project Site Plan Special Permit under Section 7.4 of the By-Law, (2) the requested Special Permit under Section 3.3.3(b) of the By-Law to permit new construction within the Flood Plain District where it is demonstrated that such new construction will not increase the water surface elevation of the 100-year flood; (3) the requested Special Permit under Section 3.3.3(d) of the By-Law to permit the construction of a walkway in a Flood Plain District: (4) the requested Special Permit under Section 3.3.3(e) of the By-Law to permit the construction of a synthetic surface playfield in a Flood Plain District; (5) the requested finding under Section 4.2.1 footnote (a) to permit the replacement and extension of the existing fence along Sunset Road; (6) the requested Special Permit under Section 4.2.8.1 and 4.2.8.2 of the By-Law to waive strict adherence with the requirement of Section 4.2.8.1 and 4.2.8.2 so as to allow a reduction in the width of a required Transition Area from 25 feet to 18 feet to accommodate a bus lane for a distance of approximately 80 feet along the property line that borders the south side of the property located at 39 Sunset Road; and (7) the requested Special Permit under Section 5.1.1.5 of the By-Law to waive strict adherence with the requirements of Section 5.1.2 (Parking Requirements) of the By-Law; subject to the plan set forth in the decision.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Ms. Grimes, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to adopt the decision as presented to the Board with the typographical changes.

8:00 p.m. – Scenic Road Act: Reginald C. Foster, 898 South Street, Needham, MA 02492, Petitioner (Property located at 898 South Street, Needham, MA and is shown on Assessor's Map 205 as Parcel 6).

Wesley Wirth, of Thomas Wirth Associates, noted he has submitted a set of 5 drawings. He has met with the Tree Warden, DPW, Public Safety and Conservation. This has been approved by the Conservation Commission.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Ms. Grimes, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to waive the reading of the public hearing notice.

Mr. Wirth described the current conditions and noted Farley Pond is across the street and a stream runs through the property. He has focused on the right of way and residential rural issues. The primary agenda is the removal of trees from the right of way and putting back many more than they are removing. There is a 35 foot buffer zone. Mr. Alpert requested Mr. Wirth show the limit of the Conservation Commission limitations. Mr. Wirth noted almost all is under Conservation Commission jurisdiction except for a small area. Vegetation is the first issue. The second issue is the driveway. The current driveway is very dangerous and is very narrow at 22 feet. The applicant is proposing an exit where the sight lines are improved and proposing an exit that sits on the existing service access so it is not a new access. The DPW spoke favorably about the improved sight lines.

Mr. Wirth noted the third issue is the construction of a sound fence with an 18 inch high stone base and a 4½ foot high width gravity stone wall. The fence is 6 feet high and the 4 foot high gravity wall is made to look like all the field stone walls around town. There is a 20 inch hemlock tree they are trying to preserve so the fence jogs 4 feet off the property. The applicant would need to get a street occupancy permit. This is a character tree and they would like to keep it if possible.

Reginald Foster, owner, noted the fence was replaced last year and it turned out to be 3 feet in the public way. He lost space for parking. He could not have 3 cars parked if the fence has to be jogged inside the property. Ed Olson, Tree Warden, stated he has had several discussions and visits. He is pleased to see the comments have been taken and revisions made. He looked at the trees requested to be taken down and agree with the proponent. He noted the town probably never planted any of these trees. Mistakes were made way back when. He supports this and feels it is a betterment. The area is in decline and he is supportive of the plan. His only comment is against the sycamores. Sycamores are problematic trees. Mr. Wirth stated he has read a study and sycamores were prevalent years ago but he actually agrees with the Tree Warden so will do other alternative with nature species. Maybe not London Planes but another tough street tree and will get it approved prior to installation.

Ms. McKnight noted she went out and walked around. She noticed a large oak tree that is to be removed. Mr. Wirth stated initially he meant to keep it but the Tree Warden noted it had a lot of dry rot in it and the fence would have to go around it so it will go. Ms. McKnight stated she does not like fences that block houses. She noted this fence is nice but she is disappointed to see the fence will be extended. Mr. Owens stated the fence is not under the Planning Board jurisdiction. Ms. McKnight noted it is in the 35 foot undisturbed area. Ms. Newman stated it is part of zoning. The applicant has filed to do work under the Scenic Roads Act and the issue raised by Ms. McKnight is whether the placement of the fence is an allowed use. The Building Inspector has taken the position it is an allowed use. Mr. Foster stated earlier concepts had the fence all the way around. The gravity stone wall achieves the same objective so they have eliminated 150 feet of fence leaving part open and preserved.

Mr. Owens stated 18 shade trees are being removed in the right of way. The fence is not the issue here. He noted for the record: a letter from Assistant Town Engineer Thomas Ryder with no objections; a letter from Police Lt. John Kraemer with no safety concerns and a letter from Fire Chief Dennis Condon with no issues. Mr. Alpert asked if the applicant is replacing 18 trees. Tree Warden Olsen stated the applicant is replacing them with 6 sycamores, rhododendrons and a vigorous landscaping plan. It is a stratified landscape. Smaller trees are being replaced with larger trees. Mr. Owens noted for the record there is no one from the public at the meeting.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Grimes, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to close the hearing.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to approve the applicants request to remove 18 specified shade trees within the right of way as listed in the notice subject to the plantings as shown on the plan and subject to amending the plan to change certain trees in consultation with the Tree Warden.

Mr. Alpert asked when the previous applicant did work on the stone wall in the right of way should they not have come to the Planning Board. Ms. Newman noted, yes, for any work done within the right of way the Planning Board has jurisdiction.

<u>Review of Board of Selectmen Draft Food Truck Regulation.</u>

Mr. Owens asked if there was any feedback for the Selectmen from the draft food truck regulations. Mr. Fox will be at the next meeting to give his thoughts. The Board needs to get back to the Selectmen by 7/25. Ms. Newman stated this could be discussed at the 7/25 meeting, put in a letter and the Selectmen will vote. Mr. Jacobs asked if, as a Board, they would have enough time to put their thoughts together. Ms. Newman noted the Selectmen will hold the meeting open for the Planning Board comments.

Mr. Alpert stated he has looked at the draft regulations and feel it is pretty well stated. He has no comments or changes. He feels the draft regulations and the By-Law change are 2 different things. He feels the Board is free to consider the regulations and make a recommendation to the Selectmen. Mr. Jacobs does not think this should be discussed at this meeting. Mr. Owens stated it makes sense to do it all at once.

De Minimus Change: Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2012-06: Brookline Development Corp., LLC, 93 Fisher Avenue, Brookline, MA 02445, Petitioner (Property located at 50 Dedham Avenue (formerly 36-58 Dedham Avenue, Needham, MA).

Mr. Owens noted this was regarding the dumpster. Ms. Newman noted this is to implement legally what the Board did earlier this year. It cleans up the record and closes it out. She noted there is a $250 filing fee associated with the application. The applicant is asking it be waived. She has enabled that in this draft. Mr. Alpert stated changes were made to the dumpster fence without coming to the Board first. The Board decided to accept it rather than make the applicant take it down. He does not agree with waiving the fee. Mr. Jacobs noted he voted against it in the record.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by two of the five members present (Mr. Owens, Ms. Grimes and Ms. McKnight voted in the negative):
VOTED: to deny the waiver of the fee.
The motion did not pass and the fee was waived.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Alpert, it was by four of the five members present (Mr. Jacobs voted in the negative):
VOTED: to grant the requested amendment to the Major Project Site Plan Special Permit decision dated 7/10/12, as previously amended, and as set forth in the findings and conclusions in the proposed decision as a deminimus change.

Review of zoning for Fall Special Town Meeting.

Ms. Newman stated she met with the Public Facilities Department to understand the zoning requirements for their requests. She put together zoning that solves their problems. The first article deals with the proposed fire station in the Heights. The maximum FAR is .3 in the General Residence District. The town proposes to combine the Fire Station parcel and the Daley Building parcel. This will have an FAR of .368. The Town will need a special permit and she has prepared a draft zoning for FAR up to .5 for Municipal Buildings. The other constraint is that the maximum lot coverage is 15%. Combined the new proposal would be 21.68% coverage. She has revised the By-Law to allow with a Special Permit up to 25% lot coverage.

Ms. Grimes asked why .368 FAR goes up to .5 FAR and 21.68% lot coverage goes up to 25%. Ms. Newman stated she could make it tighter but that was what the Town initially asked for. Mr. Owens asked if Town officials are certain the requested changes will solve their problems and was informed they are. Mr. Owens asked if there is no chance they will come back and want more. Mr. Newman stated she cannot tell what the town will want. Ms. Grimes stated she is concerned the Town does not know their plans yet. This is a lot bigger than what the town needs. Ms. Newman stated it could be advertised as that, and then the Board could bring it down.

Mr. Jacobs asked why the Board of Appeals would not be the special permit granting authority. Ms. Newman stated site plan review is triggered. The other change is the Center Business a map change is proposed to extend the Center Business District down to School Street. This is not touching the General Business District behind the Fire/Police Station. The requirement for FAR is .3 and this project is at .8 and lot coverage requirement is 15% and this project is at 11%. Ms. McKnight asked if the expansion of the Center Business District includes the parking lots behind. Ms. Newman noted it does not. It is just for the current location of the Police/Fire Station which is now zoned General Residence.

Ms. Grimes noted the Board needs an updated list of problems that are not addressed with zoning. Ms. Newman will ask for a site plan and a memo outlining what is still problematic. Ms. Grimes stated she has an issue with this and would not move forward until the Town lets us know this is what they need and will not be coming back. She does not feel it is fair to the abutters. Ms. Newman stated this is narrow and is only the General Residence area. Ms. McKnight asked if the Town can satisfy Ms. Grimes' concerns in the next month. Ms. Newman stated there is a deadline to send it to the Selectmen. Ms. Grimes noted she feels it puts the Board in a bad position. The Town does not even know what the plans are.

Ms. McKnight stated the Board is telling the Town this is what they have to live within. Ms. Grimes feels it is premature. Mr. Jacobs asked if the Board would do this for a private entity and was informed no. Mr. Owens asked if the Board could ask the Town to supply the latest site plan. Ms. Newman will ask for the latest site plan. Mr. Alpert noted this is only changing this one lot from Single Residence B to Center Business District. He asked if this was not spot zoning. Ms. Newman stated this is extending the Center Business District. Ms. Grimes feels it is important to look at all of Chestnut Street. Ms. McKnight stated it is not spot zoning if for a public purpose rather than a private purpose. Mr. Alpert stated he would like to accommodate the Town as much as possible. The Board will have August and September to consider this proposal and make it more restrictive if necessary if the abutters complain.

Mr. Jacobs agrees with Mr. Alpert. He wants to make sure there is a clear explanation of what is needed. It is not clear. Mr. Owens stated the Board also needs an explanation of the timing. He would like clarification. Mr. Alpert noted the Board is only changing the maximum FAR and the maximum lot coverage. They are only saying the applicant can exceed those limits by Special Permit for municipal projects in the General Residence District. Ms. Grimes stated she does not know what this looks like and it makes her nervous. The Board does not have enough information. Ms. Newman stated she will ask for additional information.

Board of Appeals – July 20, 2017.

North Shore Development, Inc. – 294-296 West Street.

Ms. McKnight asked if any of the new setbacks apply to this project. Ms. Newman stated the new setbacks in the Single Residence B District apply. Ms. McKnight noted she likes a two-family project that was done near her on Hillside Avenue. She thinks it came out very nice.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Grimes, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: "No comment."

Minutes

Ms. McKnight passed in her changes.

Report from Planning Director and Board members.

Ms. Newman stated Matt Varrell, Director, is leaving the Conservation Commission at the end of August. He will be a consultant 4 days a week on his own. She wants to know the priorities for this. She is short staffed. She feels first would be the permitting load, then there is zoning to accomplish and third would be setting up a meeting in August on the Chestnut Street corridor to discuss what the town wants to achieve. Lower down on the list would be permitting streamlining and the downtown study. She will put these off until Ms. Clee returns from her maternity leave. Ms. McKnight noted medical marijuana is coming this year. She also noted the Tree By-Law. Ms. Grimes stated that is through the Board of Selectmen. Ms. McKnight stated she would like to add lighting to the discussions.

Mr. Owens asked for an update on Rockwood Lane. Ms. Newman noted the meeting has been rescheduled for tomorrow afternoon. The Town Manager has taken it off the Planning Board's plate. Mr. Alpert commented the Board took out the provision for the dumpster to be enclosed at the new school and asked why. Ms. Newman stated none of the schools require a fence around the dumpsters.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Grimes, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the five members present unanimously:

VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Kalinowski, Notetaker

Paul Alpert, Vice-Chairman and Clerk