NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 21, 2022

The Needham Planning Board Virtual meeting, using Zoom, was remotely called to order by Adam Block, Chairman, on Tuesday, June 21, 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 in a hybrid model 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.

De Minimus Change: Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 99-2: BP 140 Kendrick Street LLC c/o Boston Properties Limited Partnership, 800 Boylston Street, Suite 1900, Boston, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 140 Kendrick Street, Needham MA). Regarding proposal for outdoor roof deck.

Frederick DeAngelis, Senior Counsel for Boston Properties, noted the original project was permitted in 1999. This is a minor modification to create a rooftop deck on a low-rise building. The applicant went to the Design Review Board (DRB) and received approval with some constructive comments they found helpful. The Building Commissioner had one question on whether there were 2 means of egress. He had a deadline to write his comments and did not have an answer to his question. Mr. DeAngelis noted there is a second means of egress, and it complies with all requirements.

Brett Lambert, architect for Stantec Architecture and Engineering P.C., noted this is at the corner of Kendrick Street and Route 95 with the pond abutting. The roof deck will be between Building A, a three-story building, and the new curved building. It will be on the second level of the building accessed by Building A. At 40 feet by 40 feet the whole roof will become the new terrace. Two new doors will be added into Building A, a distance apart to support the overall terrace. Mr. Block asked if it would be accessible from the other building and was informed it would only serve Building A. The entire roof will be black locust pavers grown domestically. The existing brick parapet will have a glass rail system 42 inches above the roof surface to act as a guard rail, topped with a stainless-steel rail. Two gates will be in the design. The gates will be locked for occupants and will only be for maintenance. The terrace will have furniture by tenant. They are trying to make sure there is not a lot of visual effect.

Mr. Block noted the following correspondence for the record: an email from the Building Commission with the comment he was unclear on 2 means of egress and a memo from the Design Review Board with approval without conditions. The Building Commissioner has confirmed there are 2 means of egress and noted his satisfaction. Ms. Espada asked what the occupancy limit is. Mr. Lambert noted it can be over 50 with 2 means of egress. The doors are roughly 50 feet apart. Ms. Espada noted there is only one stair inside the building and asked if the Building Commissioner was ok with that. Mr. Lambert stated there are 2 stairs existing in the building. Ms. Espada noted both doors go to one stairway. She asked if the Fire Department had any comments. Ms. Newman has not heard from the Fire Department.

Ms. Espada asked if the wood would age naturally or if they will be staining it. She also asked about the lighting and hours. Mr. Lambert stated it could be stained but they will let it age naturally. There will be lights to light the egress doors and exit signs. Ellesse Lunde, of Stantec Architecture and Engineering, stated there are no hours right now. She can ask the tenant what they plan. She does not foresee usage during the nighttime hours. Ms. McKnight stated the plans do not clearly show the 2 doors. Mr. Block noted on page 6 in the packet the red outline shows the doors. He could ask the applicant to revise the sheet of plan and mark in yellow where the outline of the doors are for the files. Ms. Newman will add as a condition to clean up the plans.

Ms. Lunde noted the applicant has a building permit. Mr. Alpert noted there needs to be something from the DRB or revised plans in the file. Mr. Lambert showed pages of the plan that show the doors with a dashed line.

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 determine this is a de minimus change.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Mr. Crocker, it was by a roll call vote of the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to approve this with updated revised plans as discussed.

<u>ANR Plan – Four Forty-Four Group, Inc., Petitioner, (Property located at 444 Hillside Avenue, Needham, MA).</u>

George Giunta Jr., representative for the applicant, noted this is a minor revision to the site plan. There was an inadequate lot width shown for the 422 parcel. The second survey results came in after the hearing and it determined there was sufficient lot width to carve off as a separate piece. There is an ANR plan to create a stand-alone lot. He noted the tenant wants a lot with parking in front and back. The piece cut off will be added to the 444 property. If the Board votes in favor of the ANR plan it will make the other application moot and the applicant will withdraw it. Adam Dash, representative for Gentle Giant, explained the survey discrepancy. Mr. Block noted the line going through the building shows 115 feet. Mr. Dash stated it only shows the worst-case scenario.

Ms. McKnight stated she is concerned with the lack of maintenance of the landscaping. She asked how that will be addressed. Mr. Dash noted it will be the same as was discussed at the last meeting. It will still be what was proposed before. Ms. McKnight asked if they would need a modification of the original permit as there is a different arrangement for parking through an easement. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated they will need to come back with respect to the 444 building to add parking. Ms. McKnight noted the 422 parking is changing also. Mr. Giunta Jr. noted it is but does not require a special permit. The landscaping was approved through a minor project review. He noted the landscaping was there and has died off over the years. Ms. Espada asked if there was a landscape plan or if they are replacing with the same kind. Mr. Giunta Jr. stated there will be limited landscaping put in to begin with. He feels it was rhododendrons and other shrubs. Ms. McKnight commented this is across the street from a residential district. She wants it to be nice. Mr. Giunta Jr. showed the As-Built with the original. Mr. Block stated the applicant has committed to refreshing the landscaping now.

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

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Crocker, it was by a roll call vote of the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to accept the request to withdraw the previous special permit application without prejudice.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Crocker, it was by a roll call vote of the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to approve a waiver of the filing fee seeking endorsement of ANR.

<u>Public Hearing:</u>

<u>7:20 p.m. – Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2005-02: Babson College, 231 Forest Street, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 0 Olin Way, Needham, MA, Assessors Plan No. 309, Parcel 17). Regarding request to construct a baseball batting building to be located at Govoni Field.</u>

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.

Jonathan Charwick, Landscape Architect with Activitas, noted this is Govoni Field at 0 Olin Way. It is the northwest corner of the existing baseball field. The Sudbury Aqueduct goes through the field, and this will be north of that. There are 2 existing outdoor batting tunnels in this location. This is to enclose the 2 batting cages and make adjustments in the layout. There will be an exterior building with 2 batting tunnels, men's and women's bathrooms, storage room and utility closet. There is a 25-foot side yard setback from the northern property line and the aqueduct. They also have a drainage easement on the northwest corner. They have rotated the building slightly. A permit with the MWRA has been filed as they are crossing the aqueduct, the Conservation Commission has reviewed and approved and the DRB has approved with comments. The DPW comment is there needs to be one-inch capacity for stormwater recharging. The area needs to be revised as there is only ½ inch proposed. He believes they will be adding a leaching basin to meet that requirement.

Thomas Scarlotti, architect, note the batting cages are covered but will be open on the sides and will be 90 feet by 40 feet. There will be netted batting cages. The toilets have outside doors. This will be a pre-engineered structure with a metal roof and corrugated metal siding. It will be open but enclosed on the bottom. Doors lead into the space for security. There will be emergency lighting, but it will basically be a daytime use. Mr. Charwick stated there will be electric and water. The sewer system will be tied to the system on the Olin property as there is an agreement between Babson and Olin.

Mr. Block stated this was a creative use of the space. He noted the following correspondence for the record: correspondence from the Design Review Board approving the design; a memo from Fire Chief Dennis Condon, dated 5/25/22, with no objections; a memo from Police Chief John Schlittler, dated 5/25/22, with no issues; approval from the Conservation Commission and a letter from Town Engineer Thomas Ryder commenting about the capacity change from a ½ inch pipe to a 1-inch pipe. Mr. Block thanked the applicant for their proactivity to the town comments. Ms. McKnight asked for clarification as to whether all construction is on land that is already hardscaped or impervious so the ground cover is not changing. Mr. Charwick stated the ground cover is changing slightly. A small amount of lawn may be removed. It is mostly impervious now.

Ms. Espada commented it is open air and was informed it will have small, heated spaces for the rest rooms. Ms. Espada asked if there are any mechanicals with acoustic implications and was informed there were no acoustic implications. Mr. Alpert stated the Board needs a copy of the agreement with Olin in the file. Sharon Daly, of 30 Curtis Road, asked if the facility will be locked during off hours. Mr. Charwick assumes so, but it has not been discussed. It is for the college use only although they may allow the rest rooms for when there are activities.

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 close the hearing.

Ms. Newman stated she will prepare a decision that can be voted at the next meeting. She would like some direction. Mr. Block stated it should be approved with a condition regarding the agreement with Olin College as discussed and plan modifications on the impervious calculation as requested by Engineering. Mr. Alpert suggested there be a condition the building be locked when not in use. Ms. McKnight agreed with that. Ms. Newman will draft the decision with these and the other usual comments.

De Minimus Change: Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2009-06: Town of Needham, 1471 Highland Avenue, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 1471 Highland Avenue, Needham, MA). Regarding minor design changes to the proposed renovation of the Town Common.

Christopher Heep, Town Counsel, noted this is a site plan approval for the Town Common. He stated there are 2 proposed changes. The project will shift from exposed aggregate concrete to concrete pavers and there will be a reduction in the caliper of some trees on the planting plan. This is intended to keep the project within the appropriation by Town Meeting and the reduced caliper is what is available. Mr. Block commented that the DRB approved the plan. Ms. McKnight stated that the applicant shows a change in the way the crescent shape of the sidewalk will meet the other pavement. She asked what the change is as it is not clear. Mr. Heep stated the walking path meets the entrance path from Garrity Way. The prior joinder was square. At the request of the DRB the path was extended in a curved shape to continue the oval path.

Mr. Crocker asked about the longevity of the new pavers and the longevity of the 2 materials. Mr. Heep stated, with the substitution, it remains fully accessible. He noted the new material is easier to repair and maintain. Mr. Crocker stated the question was longevity. The pavers are on the subsurface. DeFazio needed repair after 10 years. The original pathway had a life expectancy and so does this new one. He asked what the life expectancy is. Justin Savignano, Project Manager, noted this material will be used for the high impact area. All concrete will inevitably crack. The original material cracks and never goes back to original. Mr. Crocker asked what the life expectancy was of the substrate system if installed correctly and maintained. Will it exceed the life expectancy of the previously proposed aggregate concrete?

Ms. Espada asked what the substrate is. It says 4-inch concrete that is continuous. She asked if concrete pavers were going to be on the concrete base. Mr. Savignano does not think there will be 4 inches throughout the walking path. It will be a compacted gravel base. The curved inner walkway will have concrete pavers. It will be cast in place along Garrity Way. They will not have concrete subsurface under the walking path. Only under the furniture. Mr. Crocker asked what was under the walking path and was informed compacted gravel and pea stone. Ms. Espada commented her concern is things will start shifting and there will be a lot of tripping hazards. She does not feel it has the same longevity as pavers with concrete substrate has. Mr. Savignano stated the entire perimeter of the entire walkway will have a set border course set in concrete. Mr. Crocker noted the walkway does not have it but just the border. He asked if it was fair to say it will have minimal effect on the structure of the walkway. Mr. Savignano stated, if prepared per specifications, there should not be any issue with movement of pavers.

Mr. Block asked if the Town will recognize any liability due to movement and tripping hazards and replace quickly. Mr. Heep stated this is an important piece of public property. The Board can expect the Town will move quickly to address any issues. Mr. Block asked if these 2 changes reflect deminimus changes. Mr. Crocker stated the changes are being made for financial reasons and no other reason. He appreciates why it is being done. He does not know if the changes are deminimus but part of him says no. Ms. McKnight explained the difference between a deminimus change and the alternate. She recalls the comments made by the public at the public hearing and feels it is unnecessary to go through the process again.

Mr. Alpert stated he would like to hear from Ms. Espada. The caliper of the trees change is deminimus, but he is not sure about the paving. Ms. Espada agrees with the trees but has a concern with a right type of substrate. This is a public bidding process. She is worried with something that would need repair sooner rather than later. It seems more significant than the trees. Mr. Heep stated the layout of the walkway is staying and the overall layout is the same. There was no real discussion during the hearing about materials used for the walkway. There could be a condition it is to be installed to the manufacturer's specification. He can attest the Town has a strong desire to keep it walkable in the future. Mr. Crocker stated there were no comments about the walkway because it was solid concrete. There may have been comments with pavers. The odds of issues increase with the change.

Mr. Block asked what the recourse is if there are issues. He asked if the Board could register comments formally with the Select Board. Ms. Newman noted it could be addressed in the decision the Board drafts. Ms. Espada stated she is not concerned with pavers but the installation and substrate part of it. It is a less expensive installation but what is the warranty of it. She noted many towns require concrete substrates. A lot of things will make it move and it is a durability issue. She asked if the savings was enough to warrant it. Mr. Savignano stated the DPW has no concerns. Cataldo will be installing the project, but it is not the cheapest alternative. They could have gone with broom swept concrete, but it is not a good product. Mr. Crocker asked the cost difference between them. Mr. Savignano stated the savings on pavers rather than concrete is roughly $23,000.

Ms. McKnight clarified there are 2 ways to go – deny the request or allow the applicant to use one of 2 approaches. They can either do the original proposed material or concrete pavers with a concrete base that would preserve the walkway. Mr. Heep stated they would be maintained to the manufacturer's specifications. He is concerned with the idea of reengineering the installation and is struggling to see what the concern is. Mr. Crocker feels it is a legitimate concern with the extended use of the walkway. Ms. Espada understands it would be built to specifications, but the issue is things start shifting after a period of time unless it is on something solid. It needs to be built well so it lasts a long time. Her recommendation is to do concrete with aggregate that would last longer for the Town. She respects they are trying to save money but does not want to lose the integrity of the project. Mr. Heep stated the Town will maintain the walkway. The Board could include a condition it needs to be maintained in good repair at all times. Ms. Espada is comfortable with that, but it is short money for longevity.

Mr. Alpert stated $23,000 is not a lot of money. He understands time constraints but feels there may be a way to get that money from the Finance Committee. Towns have problems getting money for repairs all the time. He feels the applicants are being penny wise and pound foolish. Mr. Heep stated he has not heard objections to pavers themselves. The sub material on the long-term runs a higher risk of needing maintenance. Mr. Alpert commented a lot in Town is in disrepair as they defer maintenance all the time. Mr. Heep does not believe a change in material runs afoul of any site plan review By-Laws. Mr. Crocker agrees with Mr. Alpert. There is a visual difference and a longevity issue. Mr. Alpert asked the Planning Director if the Board is going beyond their authority under Site Plan Review if the issue is cost and maintenance. He stated pavers may look better. Ms. Espada stated pavers are nicer but need a concrete substrate.

Ms. McKnight clarified the 3 issues are the caliper of trees, the shape of the oval walkway where it meets the other walkway and a change in material. The Board needs to determine if all 3 are deminimus changes and treat each request separately. Mr. Heep stated there is no purview in the Special Permit Review criteria that would allow the Planning Board to deny the request as the applicant has stated it will be maintained in good condition. He appreciates Ms. Espada's comments how other towns are handling their substrates. He listened to that comment and will think about it. It does not change the request. The applicant needs to get moving on this. They will comply with all By-Laws and regulations they need to. He noted the applicant has come to the Board after considering all options. The DPW has given this a lot of thought and come up with this solution.

Mr. Alpert stated the project cannot wait until a Special Town Meeting. He would appreciate if the Town considers Ms. Espada's comments and see if they can do a different substrate for the base and save money elsewhere. Ms. Espada stated if the DPW is ok making sure they repair it she is fine. If there is enough budget to make it stronger the applicant should go that route. This needs to be universally used by the entire town. Mr. Savignano stated the Town will maintain the front yard of the Town to the highest standards possible. As the Project Manager he intends to ensure all products are installed to the Manufacturer's specifications.

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: the changes proposed by the Town as applicable to the Site Plan approved by the Planning Board for the renovation of the Town Common, as provided in the Special Permit Amendment granted, are determined to be deminimus.

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: the proposed change in caliper of trees to be a smaller caliper as compared to those approved in the Site Plan, which was part of the Special Permit Amendment, be approved by this Board.

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 approve a minor change to the dimensions of the oval shaped walkway where is meets the walkway from Garrity Way, as compared to what was shown on the Site Plan approved with this Special Permit Amendment, be approved by this Board.

A motion was made that the changes proposed by the applicant in the composition of the paving material for the oval walkway from exposed aggregate concrete to concrete pavers be approved by this Board with the condition the concrete pavers will be installed to manufacturer's specifications and maintained in good repair in safe, passable, walkable condition at all times. Mr. Crocker stated he appreciates what the Town is trying to do but does not think it will hold much weight with what could happen over time. The Board always wants thing to be maintained. Mr. Alpert stated when there is a condition that is not met it carries a lot of weight. Ms. Espada suggested an amendment to the motion to add "to meet the standards of universal design. The amendment was accepted.

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 accept the amendment to the motion.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Alpert, it was by a roll call vote of four of the five members present (Mr. Crocker voted in the negative):

VOTED: the changes proposed by the applicant in the composition of the paving material for the oval walkway from exposed aggregate concrete to concrete pavers be approved by this Board with the condition the concrete pavers will be installed to manufacturer's specifications to meet the standards of universal design and be maintained in good repair in safe, passable, walkable condition at all times.

Parking Determination—Sira Naturals, Inc., dba Ayr, formerly Sage Naturals (Property located at 29-37 Franklin Street).

Scott Thornton, of Sira Naturals, prepared a letter dated 6/7/22 with the changes he would like to implement, and Town Engineer Thomas Ryder sent a letter dated 6/16/22 that summarizes the changes. Mr. Block stated there is a parking determination as a result of changes from 5 to 7 sales stations; it will no longer be by appointment only, it will offer other products and to allow for vans to be parked overnight in a locked indoor facility. He feels there is enough on and off-site parking available. The Town Engineer concurred there is sufficient parking.

Mr. Alpert would like a condition included that no product can be stored in the vans overnight. Ms. Newman clarified this is just establishing parking for this use. There will be a hearing for the other changes in August. The purpose is to set the parking requirement for the medical marijuana use and selling other items. Engineering has gone along with the 18 spaces recommended by the applicant. Mr. Thornton stated he will be requesting a hearing. Ms. Newman noted there is no parking standard for the use, and she is asking the Board to set a standard for the use as has been described.

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 determine the Board finds 18 spaces sufficient for the proposed uses.

Discussion and Comment on Select Board Goals for FY 2023.

Mr. Block stated the Select Board has identified a number of goals that include: making Needham livable with 8 initiatives within that goal; economically vital with 5 initiatives; accessible and connected with 5 initiatives; to propose a healthy and socially thriving community with 13 initiatives; ensure public safety with 2 initiatives; for the Town to be responsibly governed with 10 initiatives; and ensure environmental sustainability with 4 initiatives. He noted a lot of these initiatives intersect. Ms. McKnight likes what has been listed in Goal 1 particularly bullets 2, 4 and 5. She would like the Board to continue those goals. She hopes initiative 1.4 will continue. Mr. Block stated he supports each initiative. He asked, for the Planning Board goals, should exempting municipal buildings from the site plan process be considered. Ms. McKnight stated it is common for Zoning By-Laws to exempt municipal buildings and is something to be considered.

Mr. Crocker stated, as a Planning Board, environmental impacts are important. Mr. Block stated the Board can propose certain standards for municipal buildings administered internally. They will deal more substantively when dealing with the Planning Board goals. For the second goal, he asked the Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) to focus on 3 components – the community, the district-focused subcommittee, and a third component is cluster-based economic development strategy, to build an inventory of the retail in town to better understand the composition of the economy, to ensure a diverse workforce and a diverse mix of businesses in Town. The CEA subcommittee is focused on the Chestnut Street area and the center of town. They will still meet to determine if any action the subcommittee would make would be for the CEA or the whole town. Chestnut Street remains a vital opportunity for the town to increase housing and affordable housing stock. People can walk to the Town Center from Chestnut Street and it is close to transportation.

Ms. McKnight stated she has language she wants to put in. She asked if the Board wants to include it in the list of initiatives that the Select Board is encouraging and then list the initiatives. She feels, in the goals somewhere, there should be a statement the Town intends to respond to the MBTA Communities Act requirements. She is not sure where it belongs, but it should be said. She thinks the Select Board should make a statement that it intends to respond. She noted for Initiative 1.2 this is what she was thinking for Chestnut Street – evaluate zoning for Mixed- Use buildings in the town center, Chestnut Street and Avery Square to encourage such development. She noted the Board needs to revisit that zoning. Mr. Block agreed with the suggestion. Mr. Alpert stated that is a Planning Board goal. The Board is looking at the Select Board goals. They are all laudable goals but are all part of the Planning Board's charge. He does not want the Select Board evaluating Planning Board goals.

Ms. Espada asked if there was something in the Select Board goals missing that the Planning Board would like to include. She stated it is imperative the Planning Board set goals for themselves as well. She asked if there is anything that should be global as opposed to Planning Board specific goals. Mr. Block noted there is specific action he feels the Board should take. He would like to see the Planning Board modify the applications to take on more information like minority or women owned businesses. Ms. Espada asked what their equitable goals are. She noted they appoint committees and asked what are the goals for the appointed committees. The Board may want to talk about policies for different things.

Mr. Crocker stated the Board needs to have what their goals are, then look at the goals from the Select Board and other committees to see how their goals fit with the Planning Board's. The Board may want to reframe their goals. Does the Planning Board have some unnecessary regulations? What can the Board do to make it easier to be a developer in town but still meet the regulations? Mr. Alpert agreed with Ms. Espada and Mr. Crocker. The goals they are raising, such as diversity, climate, environmental, are all goals for both Boards. These should be brought up as goals that should be at the forefront of the Select Board list and the Planning Board list. It is appropriate for this Board to have conditions when a site plan use comes up and where there is diversity.

Mr. Block stated he is looking to build a framework for the Board, so they set aside dedicated time to set goals and set aside time going forward to peruse each of the initiatives. He met with Green Needham regarding some of their initiatives and will be meeting with Climate Action tomorrow. Mr. Alpert stated the Board had special meetings beginning a few years ago quarterly for planning purposes and they should consider starting that again. Ms. McKnight noted Select Board Goal 6.1(b). The Select Board acknowledged the Tree Strategy needs to be discussed. It also needs to mention "and housing plan strategies implementation." She feels it should include those words. These goals should also mention responding to the MBTA Communities Act requirements and insert in 6.1(b) the housing plan strategies implementation. The Select Board talks about amending the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) By-Laws, so perhaps that should be a goal.

Mr. Alpert likes the first part but does not want to include ADUs. The Select Board did not put that in, but it is encompassed in the generality of housing. He is not sure he wants to invite the Select Board to focus in on that. He likes the housing plan strategies and responding to the MBTA Act. It makes sense to include it. Mr. Block thanked Ms. McKnight for her thorough review of the goals.

<u>Minutes</u>

Ms. McKnight noted in the 3/28/22 minutes, page 2, 3rd paragraph, "He stated they are open until 9:00 p.m." It is not clear who "He" is. It will be deleted. On page 3, it references "decorate dumpsters." Mr. Block noted it was jersey barriers. The reference to dumpsters will be deleted. Ms. McKnight noted on page 5, it notes seat limits and dates, which are different from above. Mr. Block stated it is relating to different service hours. It should be left as is. Ms. McKnight noted on page 7, there are 214 commercial breweries. Is that in Massachusetts? Mr. Block stated it was and Massachusetts should be added. Ms. McKnight asked on page 8, state regulations, is it ok to make the change the way she suggested and was informed it was.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Alpert, it was by a roll call vote of four of the five members present (Mr. Crocker abstained):
VOTED: to accept the minutes of 3/28/22 with the red line changes as shown and the additional changes discussed.

Ms. McKnight noted in the minutes of 4/5/22, page 3, 2nd paragraph, the reference to the opinion by Foley and Lardner is not clear. Mr. Block stated there were varying opinions. It relates to the Panera Bread complex. It was dealing with the technical question of what is regarded as a medical clinic. It was their opinion the applicants are not required to apply for a license as a clinic as a whole. Ms. McKnight stated it could be deleted or left alone. Mr. Block stated it should be left in. Ms. McKnight noted on page 4, 3rd paragraph, Jill Kahn did not give an address. Ms. Newman stated it will be looked up in the list of residents. In the 5th paragraph, it should be "more" rather than "less." That was agreed. On page 7, 1st paragraph, "the amendment to the Zoning By-Law should be made." She feels the word "carefully" should be added. This was agreed.

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

VOTED: to accept the minutes of 4/5/22 with the red line changes as shown and the changes discussed tonight.

Report from Planning Director and Board members.

Ms. McKnight noted at the last meeting of the Housing Working Group, the zoning subgroup had a presentation given by Oscar Mertz on the zoning subgroup's ideas for rezoning, particularly to respond to the MBTA Communities Act requirements, although the MBTA Act guidelines are still in draft form, and to suggest some other zones for multi-family housing. There are just a couple of areas along the Highland Avenue spine but mostly he had suggestions for responding to the MBTA Communities Act guidelines.

Ms. Espada noted there are 3 subgroups – preservation, zoning and then Ms. Espada's housing capacity subgroup. The capacity subgroup talked about racial equity and diversity, Needham Housing Authority, town owned land, school capacity and the capacity of the town for zoning, ADUs, new neighborhood development, communication and transportation. She noted they will implicate the first draft of the housing plan. By the end of the summer there should be a first draft for members to review. Then there will be a community meeting and a final draft by October. Ms. Newman stated this will be on the agenda for the meeting at the end of July. Strategic action items will be looked at. Ms. McKnight stated the Preservation Subgroup also focused on the Large House By-Law as a restudy is needed. The Zoning Subgroup mentioned 3 or 4 areas like Hunting Road that are now in the Single Residence A Zone, but are developed with smaller lots.

Ms. McKnight mentioned the zoning for breweries. The goal is to have a zoning article on the Planning Board's agenda in July regarding brewery zoning. There are 2 things – the definition of tasting room and what zoning districts to allow the brew pub and brewery uses in. She will get the materials to the Board members.

Correspondence

Mr. Block noted there was correspondence from The DeWolfe's at 242 Dedham Avenue, regarding the streetscape project and an email from Rob Petitt regarding the same.

Minutes (Continued)

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 accept the minutes of 4/19/22 with the red line changes as shown.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Crocker, it was by a roll call vote of the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to accept the minutes of 4/25/22 with the red line changes as shown.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Alpert, and seconded by Mr. Crocker, 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