

NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 16, 2020

The Planning Board Virtual Meeting using Zoom was remotely called to order by Martin Jacobs, Chairman, on Tuesday, June 16, 2020, at 7:15 p.m. with Messrs. Alpert, Owens and Block and Ms. McKnight, as well as Planning Director, Ms. Newman and Assistant Planner, Ms. Clee.

Mr. Jacobs took a roll call attendance of people expected to be on the agenda. 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. This meeting will allow public comment. He noted if any votes are taken at the meeting the vote will be conducted by roll call. He added the order of items has changed since the original posted agenda.

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

VOTED: to automatically continue the meeting to 7/7/20 at 7:00 p.m. with the same zoom ID number if any technical difficulties arise that keep the Planning Board from continuing this meeting tonight.

Request to Extend Action Deadline: 390 Grove Street Definitive Subdivision Amendment: Elisabeth Schmidt-Scheuber, 390 Grove Street, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 390 Grove Street, Needham, MA).

George Giunta Jr., representative for the applicant, stated this item had been put over due to COVID. It has been picked back up, but an extension is needed for the action deadline through the end of August. There will be a public hearing on 7/21/20.

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

VOTED: to postpone the hearing to 7/21/20 and extend the action deadline through August 31, 2020.

Request to Extend Temporary Occupancy Permit: Amendment to Major Project Site Plan Review No. 2013-02: Town of Needham, 1471 Highland Avenue, Needham, Massachusetts, Petitioner (Property located at 1407 Central Avenue, Needham, MA).

Ms. Newman noted this is the Jack Cogswell Building. The Town is waiting for the Land Court to issue a Consolidation Plan. Since it is not out of Land Court, an extension for the Occupancy Permit is needed to August 10, 2020. Mr. Alpert noted the courts are closed and asked if the deadline should be extended longer. Ms. Newman suggested it be extended through the Fall.

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

VOTED: to extend the temporary Occupancy Certificate through 10/30/20.

Discussion of proposed new use at 100 West Street. Redevelop and zoning change of the property to enable an 83 unit Assisted Living and Alzheimer's/Memory Care facility and 71 Independent Living Apartments.

Mr. Jacobs noted the Planning Board has had some new materials supplied in the last few days. Evans Huber, Counsel for LCB Senior Living, noted at the last meeting the substantive issue was if the uses were to be allowed by right or Special Permit. The Board members wanted the uses by Special Permit. After discussion the proposed Warrant Article has been changed to allow the uses by Special Permit. He has revised the Warrant Article and resubmitted it. He has also amended the section of the By-Law that relates to the Planning Board being the Special

Permit granting authority rather than the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). He is aware of concerns regarding traffic. He feels that could be dealt with at the permitting stage now that a Special Permit it needed.

Mr. Jacobs asked if the Board members want to support the zoning article. Mr. Owens had no comments or questions. Ms. McKnight is satisfied to go forward and would vote to sponsor this. Mr. Alpert commented he is pleased the proponents have worked with him and made the changes he requested. He is pleased with the current form of the By-Law proposal. Mr. Block and Mr. Jacobs are both satisfied. A motion was made that the Planning Board sponsor a By-Law amendment to be presented to Town Meeting in October 2020 for the creation of the Avery Square Overlay District with the form of the amendment being the form in front of the Planning Board today. Mr. Cramer noted there is a second request for a map change article that goes along with this. The Planning Board should also sponsor the map change article. This was agreed. Ms. McKnight expressed concern with being specific with an October 2020 date. The dates could possibly be postponed. She suggested saying a Fall Town Meeting.

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

VOTED: to sponsor a By-Law amendment to be presented to a Fall Town Meeting for the creation of the Avery Square Overlay District with the form of the amendment being the form in front of the Planning Board today and for the Planning Board to sponsor a second By-Law amendment that is proposed and in front of the Board for a map change that would delineate the Avery Square Overlay District.

Ms. Newman will put this on an agenda for public hearing. It will go to the Selectmen to be referred back to the Planning Board.

Public Hearing:

7:15 p.m. – Major Project Site Plan Review No. 2020-01: Spiga, LLC, 18 Highland Circle, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 18 Highland Circle, Needham, Massachusetts).

George Giunta Jr., representative for the applicant, noted this is located off Highland Avenue near the Newton line. There are 2 separate lots and separate ownerships. The restaurant is on one lot and the other lot is the parking area. The landlord owns the fee to the restaurant lot outright and has a 99 year lease on the other property with the parking which will expire in 2081. Technically it is 2 lots with separate ownership. Spiga proposes to make changes. The applicant will need a reduction to 7½ feet in the side yard setback because the line between the 2 lots is an actual lot line. The proposal is to add a fixed-construction addition to the building and a fixed location tent. The tent could be open in good weather and closed with heaters in the bad weather.

Mr. Giunta Jr. noted the setback reduction is the only reason the application is in front of the Planning Board. The rest of the relief is with the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The restaurant was originally permitted in 2005 and has been in operation since. This permit was approved in 2005 but the construction was never done. A similar proposal was approved in 2015 and never acted on. This is a new application. He explained the grounds for the change. He noted the reduction down to 7½ feet allows for the installation of the tent. It benefits the restaurant and the Town to have open air seating. He has a meeting with the ZBA this Thursday.

Marissa Iocci, Owner/Manager of Spiga, stated this is a tough time. They need more space, and with the patio, hopefully, the restaurant will get more customers. Mr. Block asked if the structure and vestibule will be maintained when all return to the new normal. Ms. Iocci stated the vestibule is for handicap accessibility and for inclement weather for the seats near the door and will be permanent. The tent is for year-round use. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated the vestibule piece is fixed permanent construction. The tent can be moved around but the framework is bolted down. Mr. Block asked if the tent would be a permanent piece after COVID19 and was informed it would be. It was proposed in 2015 as a permanent addition and will allow open air seating.

Mr. Owens clarified the parking lot is occupied under a long-term lease. He noted the issue would not exist if it was the same owner and was informed that was correct. Ms. McKnight stated the tent would make it difficult to access certain parking spaces. It is already difficult to access some of the spaces. She assumes people will come in right off of Highland Circle and it seems it is already an issue. She asked how drivers get into parking spaces. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated spaces 15 to 27 wrap around the front of the property. People pull straight in and back out to leave. Those spaces have been there since the restaurant opened in 2005 and maybe before. There have been no issues. The tent is going where the patio is now so there is no conflict with that.

Ms. McKnight noted the public safety comment regarding concrete barriers between the parking area and the tent. She asked if the arborvitae is a visual barrier and was informed it was. She asked if there are good strong barriers at the end of the row. There is nothing on the plan. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated there is nothing there now. It is a safety concern. There could be concrete barriers or planters put there. Ms. McKnight asked, in what circumstance would the tent be erected but the vestibule not constructed. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated only if the ZBA did not grant the requested variance for the minimal intrusion into the setback. Mr. Alpert asked if the Board is voting to reduce the setback on both parcels or just Parcel 7 with the building. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated Parcel 7 (Lot B on the site plan) which is the lot with the building. Mr. Alpert is not sure the decision has enough specificity that it is only one line on Parcel 7 that is being reduced. The decision should be clear that relief is only being granted on Parcel 7. Mr. Jacobs agreed. He also noted there was no reference to jersey barriers. Ms. Newman affirmed there was no reference to barriers in the decision. She thought the ZBA would condition that. The Planning Board permit is only the location of the structure relative to the property line.

Mr. Block stated Exhibit 9 references public safety officials. He asked if the Exhibit is referenced and, with the correspondence, does that satisfy the Board as is. Ms. Newman will ask for a plan modification as part of the Planning Board decision. The ZBA has operational control of the site. Mr. Jacobs asked if the Board would be satisfied if they did not address safety in the decision and left it to the ZBA only to find the ZBA did not address it in their decision. Mr. Block suggested saying "The ZBA has not addressed it and condition it upon erection of appropriate barriers requested by the public safety officers." Ms. McKnight suggested putting in the Board wants to see plan modifications showing the requested barriers. It is not burdensome. Ms. Newman agreed.

Francesco Iacovitti, Owner/Manager of Spiga, asked if it could be a fixed stop instead of jersey barriers. He noted jersey barriers are not appealing in front of the restaurant. Ms. Newman stated the police would not be agreeable to that. The Fire Chief wants a strong physical barrier. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated the police referenced concrete barriers or planters. Mr. Jacobs suggested saying the security barrier has to satisfy the police and fire chiefs. Mr. Owens noted it does not have to be jersey barriers. There are a lot of barriers to protect people such as planters or something else. Mr. Jacobs noted it could be bollards as long as the Chiefs are satisfied.

Ms. Newman noted the following correspondence for the record: a memo from the Board of Health dated 6/9/20; an email from Fire Chief Dennis Condon dated 6/10/20 and an email from the Police dated 6/16/20. Mr. Jacobs opened the hearing for public comment. Frank Holmes, whose family owns 73 Highland Avenue, stated he is confused if the Planning Board is voting on the setback issue and was informed, they were. He noted the site plan looks like the project will be one parking space short with the seating planned. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated the ZBA will be reviewing that. There will be a waiver request for one space. Ms. Clee noted the ZBA meeting will be Thursday night. She will give Mr. Holmes the Zoom ID# for the ZBA meeting.

Maria Iriti, owner of 21 and 35 Highland Circle, is in support. She feels it is a wonderful plan and will be an improvement. Ms. McKnight commented on the waiver being sought for parking and asked if an existing parking space is being lost. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated there are no changes to existing areas. There will be one space short for the additional seats planned.

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

VOTED: to close the hearing.

Ms. McKnight noted in the Findings and Conclusions Section, paragraph 1.2, it is confusing with Parcel 8, Parcel 7, Lot A and Lot B. It should say Parcel 8 (Lot A on plan) and Parcel 7 (Lot B on plan). In the description in paragraphs 1.7 and 1.8, it should be made clearer and a condition should be added for concrete barriers. Mr. Alpert wants to clarify that the request is to reduce the side setback for one side of the lot. It can be done in paragraph 1.8. He suggested saying “for reduction of side yard setback for Parcel 7 for lot line between Parcels 7 and 8 by 25% from 10 feet to 7½ feet.” In Section 3.0 it should mirror the language in 1.8.

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

VOTED: to grant the requested Special Permit under Section 4.9.3 of the Needham Zoning By-Law to allow the reduction of the side yard setback for the lot line for Parcel 7 referenced in the Special Permit request for the lot line between Parcels 7 and 8 by 25% from 10 feet to 7½ feet subject to and with benefit of the plan modifications, conditions and limitations.

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

VOTED: to adopt the decision for Spiga LLC, 18 Highland Circle, Needham, MA, Application No. 2020-01, as presented and with the amendment previously discussed at this meeting.

Mr. Alpert noted the Board did not vote to waive the reading of the public hearing notice for the Spiga LLC hearing.

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

VOTED: to reopen the Spiga LLC hearing.

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

VOTED: to waive the reading of the public hearing notice for Spiga LLC.

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

VOTED: to close the Spiga LLC hearing.

7:30 p.m. – Heather Lane Definitive Subdivision: William John Piersiak, William John Piersiak, Trustee of the 768B Chestnut Street Realty Trust, Evelyn Soule Maloomian, and Koby Kempel, Manager of the 766 Chestnut LLC, Petitioners (Property located at 764, 766, 768, 768A, and 768B Chestnut Street, Needham, Norfolk County, Massachusetts).

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

VOTED: to waive the reading of the public hearing notice for the Definitive Subdivision Plan for Chestnut Street for the Heather Lane subdivision and the Heather Lane Extension.

Mr. Jacobs noted this is a Heather Lane property subdivision and Heather Lane Extension residential compound. There is a request to hear the 2 projects together but vote them separately. Robert Smart, attorney for the applicant, noted this is 3 applications – the Heather Lane subdivision, which is 6 lots off Chestnut Street and 2 applications for a 5-lot residential compound. He noted 23 abutters and 6 abutting municipalities were given notice. There have been many meetings over the last 6 years. He showed the existing conditions. The property is just under 27 acres and abuts Chestnut Street and the Charles River and is zoned Rural Residence Conservation. There needs to be 150 feet of frontage and one acre. There are 5 existing residences owned by Bill Piersiak and 766B Realty Trust, Koby Kempel and Evelyn Maloomian. Mr. Piersiak has an agreement to purchase the property owned by Ms. Maloomian.

Mr. Smart described the existing houses. There will be a 6-lot subdivision via a new road with a cul-de-sac. Lot 4 at the end is 13.26 acres and is the subject of the residential compound’s 5 lots. There will be a total of 10 house

lots. Heather Lane Extension will have a private drive with a hammerhead. All residential compound house lots will have frontage on Heather Lane Extension. The proposal is for 10 house lots on 27 acres. There will be a benefit of a wider and consistently paved right of way with upgraded electrical and sewer service. There will be safer access and egress for Chestnut Street. He noted 3 owners have joined in the application. Some buildings will remain and some will be demolished. All have the required 150 feet of frontage on Heather Lane, which will be a 40-foot-wide private subdivision road. All lots meet all dimensional zoning requirements. The Town will have the right to enter the private way.

Mr. Smart reviewed the waiver requests. He noted the owners of the lots will have to join the Heather Lane Association and will be responsible for all upkeep and repairs of roads and drainage systems. He has submitted drafts of the Declaration of Trust, Declaration of Restrictive Covenant, which will run with the land and be enforceable by the Town, Subdivision Covenant and the Utility and Drainage Easements. He summarized what is in the documents. He noted parking will be prohibited on the road, there will be a grant of the drainage easement and a proposed utility easement. Lot 4, owned by the principals, is 13.26 acres. Lot 4 will be divided into 5 residential compound lots with access by a private drive (Heather Lane Extension) off the Heather Lane cul-de-sac. He has filed all the appropriate paperwork.

Mr. Smart noted there are several existing buildings. Some will be demolished. All zoning requirements for Residential Compounds will be met. Each lot will have at least 2 acres. Some waivers will be required and he reviewed the waivers. Heather Lane Extension will remain a private way and the owners will have their own association. Those owners will contribute to the maintenance of Heather Lane Extension and Heather Lane itself. He has received letters of support from 3 abutters. He noted the Engineering Department has reviewed the drainage calculations, the Fire and Police are satisfied and have no comments and the Board of Health commented that a form would need to be filled out for any demolition and a bond of \$3,500 per lot would apply. He will work with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Piersiak noted he is available for any questions.

The Board took a 5 minute recess.

David Kelly, of Kelly Engineering Group, Inc., reviewed the engineering aspects of the project. This is the Rural Residence Conservation District. Four existing lots comprise the subdivision with a total of 26.9 acres. The right of way is 15 feet wide. From Chestnut Street through the Piersiak property the paved way follows the topography and meanders among the trees. The new subdivision road off Chestnut Street follows the existing layout of the right of way driveway that is there today but will be widened and improved. The opening of the driveway will be widened for better site distance. There will be a 6 lot subdivision and one residential compound. The 980 foot road length will require waivers. The proposed roadway is similar to most recent subdivision roadways. There will be cape cod style berms, a 40 foot total right of way width, a 60 foot cul-de-sac and a pavement width of 25 feet. The Fire Department has approved.

Mr. Kelly noted the proposed landscape plan will follow the drive as much as possible but maximize the retention of trees. There will be some removal of trees but it has been minimized. To mitigate, 17 street trees will be planted along the right of way. The same lighting fixtures as are on Riverbend Lane are being proposed. They are lantern style with sufficient lighting and no spillage. The project is trying to maintain the rural characteristic. He reviewed the waivers which include a right of way width reduction from 50 feet to 40 feet, a pavement width reduction from 24 feet to 20 feet, a street intersection grade of 2.6% matching the elevation of the current resident's driveway, a radius of 20 feet, cape cod berms and a waiver of sidewalks. He noted there are no sidewalks on Chestnut Street and they do not feel there is a need here.

Mr. Kelly noted the storm water system will fully comply with the new Town regulations and the DEP regulations. There will be catch basins with a storm water management pond. The applicant has worked with the DPW and the DPW supports the design. All utilities are from Chestnut Street. A sewer system is being proposed on site that will connect the new subdivision to the existing sewer system. The goal is to match the rural meandering feel that is there and minimize tree removal. For the Heather Lane Extension there will be 5 new parcels. There are a number

of buildings but only 2 will remain. There will be 3 new homes built and the rest will be demolished. There is a conservation restriction proposed along the Charles River.

Mr. Kelly noted the residential compound lots range from 1 to 7 acres. The right of way follows the existing topography as much as possible. The right of way is 329 feet in length with 20-foot right-of-way width and a 20-foot paved width. Under Section 4.2.12(e)1, the project needs to provide a safe effective driveway way for safe access. The subdivision right-of-way width requirement is 50 feet and they have 20 feet. [The grade is being eliminated on site. – not clear] The slope is what is existing today. It is now a driveway and they are trying to make it look like a driveway while maintaining access for emergency vehicles. The goal of the waivers and development is to minimize the impact. Storm drainage will be handled individually on each lot. He noted the DPW had one comment that the on-site homes need to comply with current regulations for storm water. The roofs need to recharge into the ground. They have been doing that for years in Needham and will comply with that.

Ms. McKnight noted on the Heather Lane Extension the pavement at 20 feet is fine but the right of way width is only 20 feet also. She feels 20 feet is sufficient for vehicles passing but there is no right of way outside of the paved area. How is snow to be disposed of to maintain that 20 feet? She saw a stone wall and snow would be right up to the edge of the right of way. She would prefer a 25 foot right of way with 20 feet paved. She feels it is difficult to review the plans on such a small screen. There must be drainage structures in the roadway and drainage in the ways themselves. She wants to make sure the drainage structures are adequate. Ms. McKnight noted the phrase “preserve rural character” has been mentioned several times. She wants to take seriously the Conservation Commission’s suggestion for a conservation restriction. She feels it is an issue of public access along the river. They should enable people to walk along the river.

Mr. Kelly noted there is extensive drainage in the street. The detail plans are in the packet. There are a series of catch basins to the storm drains that tie into a traditional storm water drainage pond that includes recharge components and water quality components before it goes off site. Heather Lane has a traditional storm water drainage system that has been approved by the DPW. He noted there are several MWRA easements on the property with one active. There is an old easement the Town took over and they will connect to that one. Ms. McKnight noted there are no berms on the side of the paved area in the extension. Does that create difficulty with drainage? Mr. Kelly stated there is not a substantial amount of pervious surface. It is a typical driveway in Needham. He noted the applicant may want to consider widening of the right of way for a windrow for snow.

Mr. Block stated he wanted to go through the documents more thoroughly. He commented the ownership group should consider, for both, to say the owners shall be jointly and separately liable. He noted on Heather Lane there is sloping of 2.6% rather than 1%. He asked what effect does that delta have on water on the property. He also asked what the transition issues would be with cape cod berms. The Heather Lane Extension has a slope of 9% rather than 8% which is the current condition on site. He asked what effect a change would have as a result in change of slope from 8% to 9% and how the creation of the Extension is not in violation of Section 4.2.12(c). Mr. Kelly noted the goal is to create a flat level entry and they are really talking about a flat slope. They would not be able to meet the abutters’ current driveway if the slope were lowered. He discussed it with the DPW and they were not concerned. For the curbing, the By-Law allows for granite or bituminous which they do not use anymore. He is proposing curbing such as that at Riverbend. He has seen this throughout the town and it is more natural than granite curbing. The Extension’s 9% slope is in a limited area to accommodate the existing home. He feels there is no impact.

Mr. Smart noted the language changes in the Homeowner documents. He will look at the language and get back to the Board. He stated compliance with the Residential Rural Compound By-Law, Subsection (c), does not apply. He feels it would apply if the subdivision was already built but Lot 4 is not already a residential compound. Mr. Owens stated the overall project is positive. This is a remote corner of town and this is creative thinking. He likes the residential compound which is not used much. He stated he is always interested why people ask for waivers. He is not persuaded by the comment that the Board has routinely waived in the past. That may have been different circumstances. He wants to know why the waivers are necessary. He noted there should be a column on existing

conditions on the list. Heather Lane is clearly an improvement over what is there today. He would like to know the current conditions and he wants more explanation on why the waivers made sense.

Mr. Owens stated he agreed with Ms. McKnight on the right of way width. It makes sense but why do a right of way not in compliance. He is not persuaded by wanting it to look like a driveway but he may be convinced. If the Fire Chief is happy with it, he would be also but he would like the current conditions and additional commentary as to why waivers are necessary. Mr. Alpert stated he needs more time to review the project. Mr. Jacobs had the same comments as the other members. He needs to review the drafts.

Ms. Newman noted the following correspondence for the record: an email from the Fire Chief dated 6/16/20; an email from Town Engineer Anthony DelGaizo, dated 6/16/20 with comments; a memo from Assistant Town Engineer Thomas Ryder, dated 6/15/20; a recommendation from the Board of Health dated 6/9/20; an email from the Police Chief dated 6/16/20 and 3 emails from abutters George Hasiotis, dated 6/16/20; Sarah and Evan Grossman, dated 6/16/20; and Sara and Kevin Jay, dated 6/16/20, in support. Mr. Jacobs asked if the DPW had any issue with the right of way width. Ms. Newman stated it was not called out in the comments. She noted the right of way width is always wider to accommodate what Ms. McKnight talked about. She does not know any that are not wider than the paved width. Mr. Smart noted the Burr Road subdivision was granted with 20 feet paved and a 20 foot right of way.

Mr. Jacobs acknowledged comments from the public. Simeon Bruner, Manager for 700 Chestnut Street LLC, stated he is not clear if he got the proper notice. His concern is they expect to add 2 more lots to Heather Lane and he wants to make sure this leaves them enough access. He wants to know which trees are being removed and he does not want spillage of light onto his property. Mr. Jacobs asked if he has spoken with the applicants. Mr. Bruner stated he received a call yesterday afternoon. No conclusions were reached on that call. Mr. Jacobs stated the continuance will give him time to consult with the applicant and possibly resolve the 3 issues. Kevin Jay, abutter to Heather Lane, stated he supports the plans. The rural character is important to this area and the road will be much nicer than it is now. He has not had an issue with drainage or snow removal.

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

VOTED: to continue the hearing to 7/21/20 at 7:15 p.m.

Minutes

Ms. McKnight noted in the minutes of 4/7/20, 4th paragraph of the Emory Grover discussion, it should say “proposed within the setback and height limit, and parking will be behind.” All agreed

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Owens, it was by a roll call vote of four of the five members present (Mr. Block did not vote):

VOTED: to accept the minutes of 4/7/20 with the one change discussed.

Correspondence

There is no correspondence.

Report of Planning Director and Board members

Ms. Newman noted she and Mr. Jacobs are part of the Downtown Business Group and there have been discussions for outdoor seating to help businesses. They will be meeting with owners along Great Plain Avenue. She also noted that the first round of interviews for the Economic Development Director have happened and she is hoping to have a second round. There are some good candidates and she is hoping to have someone in the next month. Mr. Block stated he has had a note from a Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) member who expressed concern

with sidewalk seating that may interfere with other businesses. He will speak with that person and let Ms. Newman and Mr. Jacobs know what the specific concerns are. There may be unintended consequences affecting retail.

Planning Board Reorganization

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

VOTED: to approve Ms. McKnight as Chairman and Mr. Alpert as Vice-Chairman.

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

VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Kalinowski, Notetaker

Jeanne S. McKnight, Vice-Chairman and Clerk