

Approved March 8, 2023

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Zoom Video Conference
Thursday, January 23, 2023, 6:00 p.m.**

Those present from Advisory Committee included Shawn Baker, Doug Smith, Madison Riley, Rani Elwy, Gail Sullivan, David Prock, Bill Schauffler, Al Ferrer, Jenn Fallon, Christina Dougherty, Wendy Paul, Susan Clapham, Neal Goins, and Andrea Ward.

Chair Shawn Baker called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and Vice Chair Doug Smith took roll call of Advisory members in attendance.

Citizen Speak

Christie Kovacs, 20 Clifford Street – urged Advisory to vote in favor of Article 43 so that all the issues surrounding nighttime games could be understood. Wetlands concerns were cited.

Jeanne Mayell, 27 Seaver Street – expressed support for Article 43 citing concerns over the number of nighttime games and the environmental impact of lights at night.

Brent Willess, 33 33 Bellevue Road – expressed concerns with Article 43 and the composition of the proposed committee. He questioned why members of the NRC and School Committee were not on this proposed committee. He felt that this Article undermines the decisions of the elected boards and is concerned at the precedent this sets. He further added that there are no plans for lights in other areas of town.

Lara Crawford, 15 Rice Street – spoke in favor of Article 43 citing her long-time involvement in this issue and the need to slow down the proposal to put in the lights and the need to preserve the character of Wellesley.

Larry Shind, 40 Grove Street - expressed concerns about Article 42, although supports the Sisters of Charity's efforts to remain in the property. However, it was felt that the proposal does not address that issue but leaves open the possibility of a large housing project on this site. It is believed that there are other ways to zone the property to allow the Sisters to stay. A history of the RIO was provided; previous uses of the RIO have involved extensive discussion and debate with the neighbors. In this case the neighbors have not been involved in this process. A comment was made that the NRC voted unanimously to ask Planning not to move forward because of potential impacts to the nearby Centennial Park. It was felt that the protections offered through other town development processes would not offer any impact or protection on a potential 340 units if a RIO were in place.

Marlene Allen, 29 Rice Street - spoke in support of Article 43 and asked Advisory to take a deeper dive into Article 43 to benefit the future.

Justine Okun, 15 Cottonwood – spoke of the importance of a good process to respect the collective decisions.

John Dyer, 36 Whiting Road - spoke about the process that has been going on for a decade and does not support Article 43.

Paul Battaglino, 29 Longmeadow Road – spoke against Article 43, citing the decade-long efforts of a grassroots process and the number of volunteers who have devoted time to the light project.

Cynthia Westerman, 25 Seaver Street – spoke against Article 43, citing appreciation for being part of the whole of Wellesley. She said she chose to live near the schools and the sounds from the schools bring joy. She mentioned that the high school parking lot has more lights than the old high school parking lot and these are lit at night for safety. She cited that Phase 1 of the project improved wetlands and drainage.

Margaret Lyne, 89 Crest Road – spoke against Article 43 and cited the amount of time involved in the process of approving the lights. She indicated that she and her family find great joy in being part of this community and expressed confidence in the town and leadership. She encouraged taking a big picture look.

Approved March 8, 2023

Nancy Stakun, 32 Rice Street – expressed support for Article 43 and encouraged a study of equity of athletics as she felt the lights support a small group of athletes.

Article 43 – Citizen Petition – Q&A

Judy Barr presented the changes to Motion 1 and 2 of Article 43 and made another presentation on Article 43. Nancy Cooper and Cliff Canaday were also present.

Questions

- Why are the stewards of the land--NRC and School Committee --not included as voting members of the committee?
 - It is recommended they would be consulted. The five town boards/committees that were identified were felt to be more global and townwide.
- A comment was made that the NRC is the actual steward of the land, so they are very global concerning active and passive land in town.
 - They will be invited to be part of the process, and it is hoped that the committee will be able to engage with them.
- Clarification was requested about the number of potential events, as the numbers mentioned have been different.
 - It was believed that the School Committee is saying 21 events. The other events are the assumption that the Playing Fields Task Force wants to use the lights for more than academic games. Clarification was provided that Article 43 is not about saying yes or no to the lights at the high school field. It is a broader approach, taking a step back and setting policy for the whole town about nighttime events, about lights, and how these events will be run.
- Clarification was requested as to the intent of the article, since according to Town Counsel as cited in the answers to Advisory's questions, if Town Meeting wants to place specific controls on land, it needs to go through either a general or zoning bylaw. A comment was made that instead of a public land task force, a zoning bylaw is needed to achieve the goals.
 - There are policies and procedures and a bylaw, if necessary.
- How will you achieve what you want to achieve without a bylaw, when a moratorium and a public lands task force alone will not meet the goals?
 - It will get us a little bit there. The idea would be to establish a bylaw. The task force can come up with guidelines that people generally follow that would get us closer. This article is for all public land.
 - The task force will evolve to make recommendations and one recommendation might be a bylaw. This gives us a bridge as we can't propose a bylaw without the background work.
- A question was asked about the change in the composition of the task force from the original draft motion including abutters to the revised motion including a committee of 16 residents, two from each precinct, preferably abutters to public land.
 - There is representation from precincts across town and abutters, but if there is an outstanding environmental scientist who is not an abutter, we might want to capture that individual.
- Is there dissatisfaction with the environmental analyses that have already been completed and is the implication that additional environmental studies are needed which would be a delay of more than a year? It was noted that according to the terms of Motion 2, possible installation of lights would be delayed until after the 2024 Town Meeting and the review of the recommendations called for in Motion 1.
 - The seasons need to be covered, which would result in a 9- or 12-month study. It's an intervention that could change what happens the following year. We are exploring this as

a project with some of the local universities and there are local resources we are exploring as well as local funding for the study.

- Is there any precedent for damage to the trees in town? A comment was made that the DPW director is not aware of any damage to the trees caused by lights.
 - European studies indicate damage takes about 5 years to become apparent.
 - A comment was made that DPW changed lights in town from LED to amber in areas of high tree density.
 - Additional responses were made regarding evidence and studies about tree damage from lights.
- What are the top two or three reasons for this project?
 - To have a policy for public lands at night
 - To have a level playing field for all land within Wellesley, so it's not different for residential land and night events; lights would be one of those things.
 - The Epsilon report and its negative conclusion that the environmental damage would be negligible is based on two 4-hour visits, with no listing of the 102 species we have found. The ecosystem is unknown or not specified in this report.

Linda Chow, School Committee, and Jay McHale, NRC, provided information regarding the approval process for the Hunnewell track and field lights.

Discussion and Vote 2023 ATM Warrant Articles

Article 43, Motion 1 – Establish a committee to conduct analysis on impacts of nighttime sports and events

Susan Clapham made, and Jenn Fallon seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 43, Motion 1, as proposed by citizen petition, that the Town direct the Moderator to appoint a committee to conduct an independent, comprehensive analysis of all costs and benefits of additional night-time sports or other outdoor night events on public lands, as set forth in the Article and the Motion.

Discussion

- A comment was made that Wellesley is the only town in the state that has an NRC that controls both active and passive lands; it was felt that there can sometimes be a conflict. This is public land that is an active space with active participation. With respect to private funding and public lands, there is precedent in town for private funding of public needs, such as the softball fields, the library, and PTO funds accepted by the School Committee.
- A comment was made that the lights are pointing down and focused on the field, which is why the poles are so tall.
- A comment was made that it is troubling that the NRC is not included in this task force as they are the global mechanism in the town for the land.
- A comment was made that students must leave classes to play games during the day.
- A comment was made that much of what is being asked in Motion 1 has already been conducted with respect to the Hunnewell track and field, so there is no justification to delay the lights.
- A comment was made that the essence of this proposal is the objection to the lights and sound in the dense residential neighborhood. In the petitioner's presentation to Advisory in support of this article on 2/23/23, it was explicitly stated : "The proposed lights and sound do not belong in this dense residential neighborhood."
- A comment was made that daytime problems are being extrapolated into what would happen at night. If the problem occurs during the day, then why limit the study to the nighttime use?
- With respect to environmental concerns, the Hunnewell field and the Brook Path are built environments. The NRC, in its Open Space and Recreation plan, indicates that with lights at the

Hunnewell track and field, there will be more available field hours and will reduce the number of new fields needed.

- A comment was made that the lights have been discussed as far back as 2006.

It was felt that the proposed public lands task force membership is skewed towards the abutters and excludes several important stakeholders, such as NRC and School Committee and other Wellesley non-abutter residents who might have an interest in this issue.

-
- It was felt that the hours of use should not be a problem for the abutters because the usage can be restricted to specific hours. It is understood that there is a draft usage policy. Once the lights are installed, changes and accommodations could be made.
- Wellesley Unified Plan statistics related to lights were cited. In response to the question “How would the addition of lights to athletic/recreational areas in Wellesley affect the surrounding areas? 17% said detract; 17% said no change; and 66% said no adverse impact.
- It was felt that Motion 1 and Motion 2 are closely related.
- What role does Advisory play in this if an elected board has already had a vote on this?
 - Some of the matters coming to Town Meeting can be more aspirational; a Citizen Petition needs only 10 signatures to put an Article on the Warrant. In this case a committee is specified in Motion 1. Motion 2 is more aspirational in terms of asking Town Meeting to go back to the board that controls the land, the NRC, and ask them to deter the installation of the outdoor lights. The mission of Advisory is to evaluate matters that are coming before Town Meeting.
- A comment was made that in Motion 1, the public lands task force feels duplicative with NRC goals. Concern was expressed that the NRC is not on the public lands task force, whereas Recreation and School Committee are on the Playing Fields Task Force.
- A comment was made that the cost piece of this proposal is a concern.
- Agreement with previous comments was expressed: it is important for the kids to be able to play games and not miss school. It was felt that the lights are just not wanted in this neighborhood.
- A comment was made that there are already bylaws for lighting, and that this task force should try to work to adjust the bylaws to address this type of athletic field lighting, and that should be done by the Planning Department.
- An additional comment was made that the timeframe is compressed and does not seem realistic.
- Advisory Committee members by a show of hands acknowledged the petitioners and thanked them for their presentations.
- It was strongly felt that the kids should have the ability to have night games and that there be an agreement and enforcement regarding the 21 games, including traffic control and emergency procedures.
- A comment was made that it is possible that the lights might have negative impacts which might not have been fully studied. In addition, it is understood that there is concern about privately funded projects on public land having a different approval process. However, on the process side, all the existing town governance processes were followed. If the process for privately funded projects on public lands needs to be changed, then that needs to go through Town Meeting. The elected boards are satisfied with the studies on the subject.
- Concern was expressed about the task force not having the correct stakeholders on it and the revision to the motion did not address these concerns.
- A comment was made that the Playing Field Task Force (PFTF) is not analogous to this public lands task force, as the PFTF in its charter has representatives from those land-owning boards. This is not a committee that Town Meeting typically creates. The committees typically created by Town Meeting are generally related to the governance of Town Meeting or to the operation of town government, not broad policy committees. The proper location for this kind of study is with engagement in the planning process.

Approved March 8, 2023

- A comment was made that Motion 1 is not about stopping the lights at Hunnewell track and field, it is about putting together a task force to look into the future use of public land for night use. Advisory members were encouraged to look at Motion 1 and take the lights out of the consideration.
- A comment was made that it is challenging to break apart Motion 1 and Motion 2. It was agreed that in Motion 1, members that should be on the committee are not represented. It was felt that the data has been looked at and studies completed.
- A comment was made that there are two duly elected boards, the NRC and School Committee, which are acting within their purview and have voted according to the processes in place, and they were elected for their expertise.
- Additional concerns about costs and the correct stakeholders were expressed.
- A comment was made in agreement with previous comments but that the goal of trying to establish some guidance on lighting on public lands could be worthwhile. It was felt that the composition of this proposed committee was problematic.
- A comment was made that need for a study on this topic should be done by the elected committees that have care, custody, control of the land and they can delegate that down to staff members if they want to.

Roll call vote

Jenn Fallon – no
Neal Goins – no
Doug Smith – yes
Andrea Ward – no
Al Ferrer – no
Wendy Paul – no
Pete Pedersen – no
Madison Riley – no
Christina Dougherty – no
Rani Elwy – no
David Prock – no
Bill Schauffler – no
Gail Sullivan – no
Susan Clapham – no

Advisory recommends unfavorable action on Article 43, Motion 1, 12 to 1.

Article 43, Motion 2

Susan Clapham made, and Madison Riley seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 43, Motion 2, as proposed by citizen petition, that Town Meeting vote to request the Wellesley Natural Resources Commission to defer the installation of sports lighting at the Hunnewell Track and Field until the committee composed in Motion 1 has presented its recommendations for action to Annual Town Meeting 2024 for outdoor nighttime events on public land, and Town Meeting has taken action on those recommendations.

Discussion

- It was felt that there could be an infinite delay in the installation of the lights.
- A comment was made that if the lights are installed, the results and benefits could be analyzed and used in creating policy/bylaws for other areas of town.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends unfavorable action on Article 43, Motion 2, 13 to 0.

Approved March 8, 2023

Article 39 – Amend Wetlands bylaw and non-criminal disposition for Wetlands

Susan Clapham made, and Wendy Paul seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 39, Motion 1, as proposed by the Wetlands Protection Committee, to amend the Town’s General Bylaw to allow the Wetlands Protection Committee to enforce its regulations by imposing a fine of \$300 for violation of the bylaw, regulations, or permit, as set forth in the Warrant and the Article.

Discussion

- Support was expressed, as an enforcement mechanism is needed if there is a law.
- A question was asked whether the fine would be in lieu of criminal charges?
 - This change was required by state law to have a number for the fine. The town bylaws had a range, so the punishment was arbitrary. NRC is not a police state. They are trying to meet state law.
- Support for this article was expressed as it preserves the ability for people to appeal if they have a fine.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 39, 13 to 0.

Article 18 – Weston Road construction and repair

Susan Clapham made, and Al Ferrer seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 18, Motion 1, as proposed by the Board of Public Works, that the Town appropriate the sum of \$3,500,000 to be expended under the direction of the Board of Public Works, for all costs reconstruction and repair of Weston Road as set forth in the Warrant and Motion.

Discussion

- A comment was made that the town has been very successful in completing repair projects of roads and sidewalks. There have been turnbacks on other projects because DPW runs the projects so well.
- Clarification was requested on the portion of Weston Road being repaired.
 - The repairs will be on the section of Weston Road from Cleveland Road to the Weston town line; this has been on DPW’s capital plan for the last several years and is an anticipated project.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 18, 13 to 0.

Article 25, Motion 1 – Accept/Abandon easements

Susan Clapham made, and Bill Schauffler seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 25, Motion 1, as proposed by the Select Board, that the Town authorize the Select Board the authority to grant, accept, or abandon grease trap easements located within public rights of way within the Business, Business A, Lower Falls Village Commercial, or the Wellesley Square Commercial Districts.

Discussion

- Overview and the background of the article was provided as well as information on easements.
- In this article the Select Board is granting an easement in public properties, rather than an easement over private property, which is the case with utility and public works easements.
- Support was expressed for the article and the Select Board’s efforts. A comment was made that if Town Meeting is giving specific powers to the Select Board, as a record, this needs to go into the bylaws that govern the Select Board or in the Select Board’s policies and procedures.

Approved March 8, 2023

- A question was asked whether the easement runs to the next owner.
- What happens when the restaurant leaves? Is there any liability to the town if there is an issue if the grease trap fails or collapses, for example.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 25, Motion 1, 13 to 0.

Article 15 – Electric Program

Susan Clapham made, and Neal Goins seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 15, Motion 1, as proposed by the Municipal Light Plant, that the Town vote to appropriate \$39,311,361 to be expended under the direction of the Municipal Light Board for purposes of operating and managing the Municipal Light Plant, as set forth in the Warrant and Motion.

Discussion

- Does this budget include the battery storage system or is that part of another article?
 - The battery storage is Article 31. In addition, there is no budget impact because the contractor is paying all the capital costs for the battery storage system.
- The MLP budget is a non-tax impact budget.
- A question was asked about the \$1 million payment in lieu of taxes reflected in the MLP budget.
 - This is a payment that has been paid for many years and recognizes that the town is the owner of the MLP, so they provide a benefit to the town. This is separate from Citizen's Energy PILOT for personal property tax.
- The \$1 million is reflected in the MLP budget and the money goes into the town's General Fund and the acceptance of this by the town is Article 8, Motion 1. It is a transfer of money from rate payers to taxpayers.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 15, 13 to 0.

Article 16, Motion 1 -CPC, Administrative costs

Susan Clapham made, and Doug Smith seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 16, Motion 1, as proposed by the Community Preservation Committee, that the Town vote to appropriate.
a) \$100,000 to the Community Preservation Committee for administrative purposes, and
b) Reserve from the Community Preservation Fund revenues received in FY23, \$220,000 to Historic Resources, and \$220,000 to Community Housing, to be made available as provided in the Warrant and Motion, and further that debt service appropriated under Article 8.2 satisfies the Open Space reserve requirement.

Discussion

- Is this non-tax impact and is it part of Article 8, Motion 2, the omnibus budget?
- Is this for the accessible doors at Washington Street housing authority property?
 - This is different. Currently CPC funds cannot be used for housing that was built before the Community Preservation Fund was established. There is another motion to petition the state to change this for Wellesley. None of Wellesley's community housing was built recently enough to qualify for CPC funds. The money identified here for community housing is put into a fund, and CPC is saving it for potential use on a project in the future.
- The town is required to set aside money each year in each of three categories. The open space category is covered by the debt service on the North 40; this debt service payment is reflected in Article 8, Motion 2.

Approved March 8, 2023

- Town Meeting approval is required by the town bylaws and as part of the Community Preservation Act.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 16, Motion 2, 13 to 0.

Article 16, Motion 2 – Morses Pond erosion project

Susan Clapham made, and Madison Riley seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 16, Motion 2, as proposed by the Community Preservation Committee, that the Town vote to appropriate \$26,500.00 to the Natural Resources Commission for the Morses Pond Shoreline Erosion Mitigation Project, such appropriation to be funded with funds entirely from the Community Preservation Fund undesignated balance as of June 30, 2022.

Discussion

- This is CPA funding for NRC’s cleanup of a few remaining sites. There is about \$100,000 left from the original project, but this request is for contingency funding in case the bids come in higher. It is possible it won’t be needed.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 16, Motion 2, 13 to 0.

Article 16, Motion 3 – Sprague fields bathroom project

Susan Clapham made, and Wendy Paul seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 16, Motion 3, as proposed by the Community Preservation Committee, that the Town appropriate \$200,000.00 to the Department of Public Works, on behalf of the School Committee, for the construction of bathroom facilities at the Sprague Field, such appropriation to be funded entirely from the Community Preservation Fund undesignated balance as of June 30, 2022.

Discussion

- A comment was made commending the CPC for funding the bathrooms at the Sprague fields and the DPW and FMD for helping to make this happen.
- A comment was made that the portapotties at Sprague fields are next to the accessible parking spots; it will be wonderful to have the bathrooms separate from the accessible parking and to not limit the parking for people who need it.
- Support for this article was expressed by several members.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 16, Motion 3, 13 to 0.

Article 35 – Amend Chapter 202 of the Acts of 1932 for consistency with Town bylaw.

Susan Clapham made, and Gail Sullivan seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 35, Motion 1, as proposed by the Town Clerk, to authorize the Select Board, on behalf of the Town, to petition the General Court for passage of a special law to propose certain amendments to Chapter 202 of the Acts of 1932, which would amend the language to be consistent with Town Bylaw, as laid out in the Warrant and the Motion.

Discussion

- This article will go forward only if Article 34 passes.

Approved March 8, 2023

- The Town Clerk has been vigilant about making sure bylaws are consistent with state laws and with keeping everything up to date.
- This act concerns Chapter 202 which is at the back of the town's general bylaws and is the state law that established representative Town Meeting in Wellesley; because it's a state law and not in the town's bylaws, it requires a special act every time you want to change it.
- The ways in which the town bylaws have changed and are not consistent with state laws have been compiled. The Town Clerk has been waiting for an opportunity to make those changes which include gender-neutral items and aligning language with the bylaws. Most are housekeeping items except for the proposal to change the manner in which the Town Clerk can provide notice to Town Meeting members.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 35, 13 to 0.

Article 14 – Sewer Enterprise fund

Susan Clapham made, and Bill Schaufler seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 14, as proposed by the Board of Public Works, that the Town vote to appropriate the sum of \$11,258,864 to be expended under the direction of the Board of Public Works for the purposes of operating and managing the Sewer Program, as set forth in the Warrant and Motion.

Discussion

- A comment was made about the rate increase this year.
- Are grants being pursued?
- A comment was made that from personal observation, the DPW runs their funds very efficiently and it is assumed if there is grant funding available, then DPW is pursuing it but perhaps it needs to be related to a specific project.
- The rates are going up and some of it is out of DPW's control like the MWRA rates.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 14, 13 to 0.

Article 26, Motion 1 – Authorize sewer fund bond.

Susan Clapham made, and Rani Elwy seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 26, Motion 1, as proposed by the Board of Public Works, that the Town vote to appropriate \$295,000 for the purpose of financing the construction and reconstruction of sewers and sewerage systems for inflow/infiltration purposes, and to authorize the Town Treasurer, with the approval of the Select Board, to borrow said sum and contract for and expend any federal or state aid available for the project as set forth in the Warrant and the Motion.

Discussion

- A comment was made that this motion speaks to the question about grants.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 26, Motion 1, 12 to 0 with 1 abstention.

Article 26, Motion 2 – Authorize water fund bond.

Susan Clapham made, and Al Ferrer seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 26, Motion 2, as proposed by the Board of Public Works, that the Town appropriate the sum of \$500,000 for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, alteration, remodeling or other improvements of the Town's water system, as set out in the Article and the Motion, and that the Town Treasurer, with

Approved March 8, 2023

the approval of the Select Board, is authorized to borrow the sum of \$500,000 and to contract for and expend any federal or state aid available for the project.

Discussion

- This is for an authorization.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 26, Motion 1, 12 to 0 with 1 abstention.

Article 36 – Adopt Municipal Specialized code (Stretch code).

Susan Clapham made, and Rani Elwy seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 36, Motion 1, as proposed by the Climate Action Committee and the Select Board, that the Town adopt the Municipal Opt-In Specialized Code, effective January 1, 2024, as set forth in the Warrant and the Motion.

Discussion

- In 2021 ATM adopted goals that are aligned with Massachusetts and United States climate targets to reduce Wellesley’s greenhouse gas emissions by 50% from a 2007 base by 2030, 75% by 2040, and to net 0 by 2050. At that time 87% of TMM voted in favor of adopting those greenhouse gas emission goals since the energy use in buildings contributes over 60% of the town wide greenhouse gas emissions. Adoption of this opt-in code is critical to the goal for those emissions standards. The largest emissions impact from building stems from the heating loads and the choice of heating fuel in the building. Buildings reliant on fossil fuels don't have a clear path to getting to zero emissions. Electrically heated buildings help lead to zero emissions, due to the steady increase in renewable and clean energy sources. The state building code has a base level code in 2000; in 2009 stretch codes were introduced. The town adopted the stretch code in 2011 at ATM. About 300 other communities are following this. The opt-in code goes one step further and was introduced in December 2022. It applies to new construction only and is different from the stretch code in terms of mixed fuel and in terms of buildings that have mixed fuel, or any fossil fuels. If it’s an electric building-- like the new schools—the opt-in code does not apply because these buildings will have already met the standards of this opt-in code and the differences from the stretch code. In new construction in a mixed-fuel building, electrical wiring will be required to support future conversion to all-electric and solar readiness for future conversion in new construction. There are gradations for residences of under 4,000 square feet, multifamily housing, or commercial. New construction is only about 1% of housing stock.
- A comment was made that it is not a large impact, but it’s an important step towards the goals the town has supported.
- A comment was made that multi-family housing is compliant with the code and has realized the benefit of this change, which will help lead to a more energy-efficient and healthier environment.
- There will be a 6-month transition period to allow builders and inspectors to get up to speed. The implementation date is January 1, 2024.
- It was commented “every bit, every year, every choice matters” and that this is a step in the right direction.
- A comment was made that the CAC is holding a special webinar session on March 6 for building professionals about this opt-in stretch code.
- Several members expressed support for this article.
- A comment was made that there will be a opt-in stretch code presentation for the community on March 8.

Roll call vote was taken.

Advisory recommends favorable action on Article 36, 13 to 0.

Approved March 8, 2023

Adjourn

Al Ferrer made, and Bill Schauffler seconded a motion to adjourn.

Roll call vote was taken and the meeting unanimously adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

Meeting Documents Reviewed

<https://www.wellesleyma.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/2009>; Article 43, Motion 1 and 2; Article 43 presentation