

Minutes of the June 17, 2019 Regular Meeting of the Planning Board

WELLESLEY PLANNING BOARD

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2019, 6:30 P.M.

TOWN HALL – GREAT HALL

MINUTES

The Planning Board guides the Town of Wellesley in preserving and enhancing Wellesley's quality of life by fostering a diverse housing stock, multi-modal transportation options, valuable natural resources, resilient infrastructure, and a thriving local economy. The Planning Board achieves these goals through the creation and implementation of Zoning Bylaws, policies, long-term planning and by promoting citizen participation in the planning process.

Planning Board Present: Chair Catherine Johnson, Vice-Chair Jim Roberti, Secretary Kathleen Woodward, Patricia Mallett, and Associate Member Sheila Olson.

Planning Board Absent: Frank Pinto

Staff Present: Staff not present

1. Call to Order

Ms. Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Public Comments on Matters Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments on matters not on the agenda.

3. Continued/Previous Applications and/or Public Hearings

Materials distributed to, and considered by the Planning Board regarding this agenda item are retained with the official set of minutes available at the Planning Department Office.

Ms. Johnson announced that applicants for LHR 19-01 Large House Review for 26 Oakridge Road is requesting continuance of public hearings to the July 1, 2019 meeting. Ms. Johnson noted that the applicant for 26 Oakridge Road is also requesting the continuance of action deadline until July 1st, with a note that if they are not ready by July 1st, they will withdraw.

Ms. Johnson asked for a motion. Mr. Roberti moved to continue LHR 19-01 Large House Review for 26 Oakridge Road until July 1, 2019 meeting and also continue the action deadline to July 1, 2019. Ms. Mallett seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to approve the motion.

Ms. Johnson explained that the applicants for LHR 19-07 Large House Review for 14 Strathmore Road is not ready to present revisions tonight and requests continuance of the public hearing to

July 1, 2019.

Mr. Roberti moved to continue LHR 19-07 Large House Review for 14 Strathmore Road until July 1, 2019. Ms. Mallett seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to approve the motion.

- c. Consider LHR 19-09 Large House Review for 7-11 Longmeadow Road – *Continued from 6-3-19.*

Present: Landscape Architect Scot Iermuele, Sudbury Design Group; Landscape Architect Mike Coutu, Sudbury Design Group.

Mr. Iermuele stated that he had met with Mr. Panak last week regrading Engineering approval of the applicant's engineering revisions. Ms. Johnson confirmed that approval by the Engineering Department.

Ms. Woodward arrived to the meeting at approximately 6:35 p.m.

Mr. Roberti motioned to approve the LHR 19-09 Large House Review for 7-11 Longmeadow Road subject to the conditions outlined in the report from Victor Panak, Interim Planning Director, originally dated 6/14/19 and updated for the 6/17/19 Planning Board meeting. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

4. New Applications and/or Public Hearings

Materials distributed to, and considered by the Planning Board regarding this agenda item are retained with the official set of minutes available at the Planning Department Office.

At this time, Ms. Johnson opened the Public Hearing for a revision to the PSI 17-01, Wellesley Sports Center.

- a. Request for Modification to the Project of Significant Impact Special Permit Decision for PSI-17-01; Wellesley Sports Center at 900 Worcester Street

Present: Attorney Laurence D. Shind of Kertzman & Weil, LLP; Developer Brian DeVellis of ESG Associates, Inc.; Project Engineer Philip Cordeiro of Allen & Major Associates; and Town of Wellesley Consultant and Project Engineer Kien Ho of BETA Group, Inc.

Mr. Shind stated that the applicant was hoping to receive a temporary certificate of occupancy for partial occupancy of the Wellesley Sports Center, which would necessitate the re-opening of the PSI. He added that the traffic signal on Rte. 9 is in process and rather expected that a temporary certificate of occupancy would be requested.

Mr. Schind added that the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) did contemplate that a temporary certificate of occupancy (partial occupancy) would be considered and ZBA imposed the condition that if any events were held prior to installation of the traffic signal, that police details would be provided. He stated that the Center was not anticipating any "events" to take place in the near term. Mr. Shind noted the Mr. Panak sent the Board correspondence

recommending that the Board vote to allow partial occupancy prior to the signal installation.

Ms. Johnson responded that an interim planning director has been hired who will be starting on Wednesday, June 19th and could work with the Executive Director regarding this decision. She added that the recommendation from Mr. Panak was that the Interim Planning Director could move forward pending full satisfaction of other Town Departments (Police, Fire, Health Department, DPW...etc.).

Mr. Harrington suggested that the Interim Planning Director or the Executive Director make the PSI decision.

Mr. Roberti asked Mr. Harrington about the surety aspect. Mr. Harrington replied that the Board can determine if it requires surety or not and if surety is required, he recommended consulting with Dave Hickey or the Town Traffic Engineer to decide upon a surety amount.

Ms. Johnson indicated that ultimately it is a question of the Police Department being ok with the status of the traffic light and indicated that sufficient bonding would be best.

Mr. DeVellis stated that a bond had never been discussed before this time and he has spent in excess of \$24 million thus far and the remaining aspects of the project include landscaping on the Rte. 9 side and the traffic signal, as discussed.

Ms. Johnson stated that there was money set aside for a post-construction traffic mitigation study and/or that the traffic light is an adaptive traffic light, which is more expensive than the conventional signal. Mr. DeVellis replied that within the agreement, his company agreed to a \$60,000 payment in order to retrofit with other signal lights west of the Center. He offered that the particular measure could be put in place and his surety is that he needs to open the Center and wants to get the signal completed as soon as possible. Ms. Johnson added that once the bond is released, the monies are returned back to the applicant.

Mr. Roberti had a question in reference to pg. 9 of the "Project of Significant Impact Special Permit Decision" and read: "If such installations have not occurred at such time that the applicant is seeking a Certificate of Occupancy for the building and the new signalization does not incorporate Adaptive Signal System Operations at the time of installation, the applicant shall deposit into escrow with the Town \$60,000 to pay for the additional cost of the Adaptive signal System Operation for the new signalization in the future (with the balance of any unused funds to be returned to the applicant). Should MassDOT or the town of Natick fail to initiate study of said system within two-years following the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the building, the funds shall be returned to the project proponent."

Mr. Harrington stated that the better course would be to take the surety now and reiterated that his concern was that while a temporary CO can be issued, a temporary occupancy does not necessarily go away after six months. He suggested that in six months, if installation of the signal concerns remain, then the Town might have to perform the installation.

Ms. Johnson affirmed that it is in everyone's best interest to get this aspect approved.

Mr. Roberti made some other comments regarding the ISP Decision document. Mr. Michaud addressed some of Mr. Roberti's questions. He added that at this interim period, the pool would be open, the turf field and non-overlapping rink events and traffic will be far less than when the signaling does become operational. He detailed that the Lexington Road junction would not provide for U-turns at this time and those options could occur at the CVS lights and the final comments from DOT are expected by next week, with official permitting by DOT shortly thereafter.

Ms. Johnson asked about the "queue space" at the CVS turn. Mr. Michaud replied that about a dozen cars will be able to make that turn at the signal, and is not a substantial impact and the signal will adapt for that extra demand. He added that the approval of the final plans is due in July for the signal and a bid process is being ironed out currently and the construction timeline for that is typically a three to five-month period. The goal is to have a fully functional signal signed off by DOT in late fall, based on that schedule.

Mr. Michaud stated that in regards to item #10, a plan has been prepared and he was petitioning DOT for a "way finding sign," but DOT would not allow for such a sign anywhere along Weston Road and will only allow for commercial road way finding signs on interstate highways. His advice to the town on this matter was to place and enforce restrictive signage along the commercial sections of Weston Road. Ms. Johnson replied that such action is outside of the Planning Board purview. Mr. Roberti noted that perhaps the Board of Selectmen could address this topic.

Related discussion continued.

Mr. Roberti then referred to item #11 of the ISP Decision document regarding installation of new sidewalk connections along both sides of Route 9, from the Cochituate Aqueduct to Russell Road, contingent upon MassDOT approval.

Mr. Michaud detailed that his team met with DOT on February 26, 2019 to discuss the design and the extent of sidewalk reconstruction and Mr. DeVellis has agreed to extend the limit of sidewalk improvement to Jarvis Appliance. He stated that those plans are subject to final DOT approval.

Ms. Johnson queried if that aspect was part of the same timeline as the traffic light. Mr. Michaud affirmed that and stated that in July when the permit is likely to be issued, then sidewalk construction modifications could commence, which is the same timeline as the signal work. He added that in the meantime, certain temporary improvements have been made in consideration of the gas utility work along Rte. 9 and the sidewalk around the frontage has been upgraded and is walkable, as well as the entrance itself to accommodate the future improvement of sidewalks in that area which will be cement/concrete in certain areas rather than asphalt.

Ms. Johnson asked if there would be ADA compatibility at the intersections or driveways. Mr. Michaud responded in the affirmative and detailed that in the interim period, appropriate slopes will be provided according to ADA compliance and tactile strips are subject to the permanent improvements where granite curbing, tactile strips, concrete landing areas will be provided.

Discussion regarding traffic signaling and the aqueduct area took place. Ms. Johnson mentioned possible TIP funds from the state to provide for some pedestrian crossing capability in that area for future usage.

Mr. Roberti queried the applicant regarding item #13 of the Decision Document, which referred to the applicant demonstrating to the satisfaction of Planning Director that they have worked with the Wellesley Trails Committee to enhance access to the site from the Cochituate Aqueduct, preferably from the Sewer Pump House across Dale Street to the site, as well as informing pedestrians of the connection to the northern portion of the Cochituate Aqueduct with the use of the new signalization at Route 9.” Mr. Cordeiro replied that Ms. Johnson just responded to that aspect.

Mr. Roberti then asked about item #14 of the Decision Document: “prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that they have worked with the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority(MWRTA) to create safe bus stops either on the site or along Route 9, in both east and west directions.” Mr. Michaud responded that he had conversations with MWRTA who stated that they do not allow stops along Rte. 9 for safety reasons, but will allow placement of a related sign within the property where other buses are to drop off people at the curbside of the Center. He added that his team has worked with the contractor to assign the installation prior to any occupancy. Ms. Johnson suggested that Mr. Michaud talk to MWRTA again because there is a pole on Rte. 9 near Kingsbury Street, on which is one of the small MWRTA signs/symbols in order to flag a bus down and the bus may stop since there is a carved out area that they can stop at safely. She suggested that related discussion may need to take place.

Mr. Michaud stated that MWRTA indicated that in the area of the Wellesley Center, they could not safely provide a bus stop and added that there may be certain conditions around the Kingsbury Street area that mandate stopping and added that he would be happy to provide the MWRTA conversation to the Board, but emphasized that MWRTA is willing to bring the buses into the property and it was included in the planning of the Center. Ms. Johnson commented that made good sense and is safer.

Mr. Roberti asked about items #5, #6 and #7 were Board of Public Works conditions. Mr. Cordeiro replied in the affirmative and stated that the only unresolved aspect is the Infiltration Analysis (I/I). Currently we are working to identify what that mitigation is, as well as alternatives to mitigation.

Mr. Roberti asked Mr. Harrington how the Planning Board might ensure that the discussed items/conditions are complete. Mr. Harrington answered that there is a need to differentiate between a final Certificate of Occupancy and a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Roberti mentioned that the Permit just addresses a “Certificate” and does not make the distinction between final Certificate of Occupancy and temporary Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Harrington mentioned utilization of an addendum sheet but is not sure that he can and stated that it might be best to “redline” the agreement so that it is clean and differentiate between what CFOs we are considering. Mr. Roberti agreed with that proposal.

Mr. Harrington referred to Condition Item #9 and stated that the purpose of the condition is that the developer put up the signal, provide the \$60,000 surety if Ma DOT or Natick implement certain light signaling, and if they do not, the applicant gets the \$60,000 surety refund. He elaborated that the Board wanted assurance that surety be posted to ensure that the traffic signal is installed within the six-month time frame. The Board agreed with Mr. Harrington's assessment as presented. Ms. Johnson asked if Mr. Harrington was suggesting a month or two as a temporary CFO vs. a final CFO. Mr. Harrington said not, and would rather suggest, an interim step and detailed that the temporary CFO be issued, with the ability to then require surety if the Town is not satisfied with what has been purchased regarding the traffic signal, or if the Town is not satisfied with the agreement aspects of installation. He asserted that the Traffic Engineer in conjunction with the Town Engineer would make that ultimate determination.

Ms. Johnson explained that a determination could not be made before July 1, because the Board did not meet before that time. Mr. Harrington recommended that he present the details required. Mr. Roberti queried if the vote should wait until Mr. Harrington presented those details. Mr. Harrington responded by saying that the developer sought the temporary opening of the Center by July 8th and asked Mr. Shind agreed that the decision had to be made by July 8. Mr. Shind responded that a vote tonight is being sought with conditioning of described details be agreed upon.

Ms. Johnson reiterated that the Board could not be satisfied until July 1 because the Board does not meet before that time. Mr. DeVellis mentioned that opening on July 8 requires some advance planning.

Ms. Woodward stated that she had concern was that if something got complicated with respect to the applicant's supplier/s, the Town would not have the funding for self-help measures or recourse, so feels more comfortable with surety. Mr. DeVellis stated that he would provide the surety as requested. Related discussion took place.

Ms. Mallett indicated that getting materials will likely not be difficult. More discussion ensued after Ms. Mallett's comments.

Mr. Ho asked the applicant's Engineer if the DOT permitting was eminent. Mr. Michaud responded positively and stated that the DOT permit would be likely granted in July. Mr. Ho stated that the traffic signal equipment should arrive fairly quickly and he affirmed that the arm of the signal equipment takes the longest time and if MaDOT provides approval, then the arm could be ordered immediately. Mr. Michaud confirmed that it could take from 90 to 100 days from time of order to receive the signal light arm due to backlog and there is no guarantee.

Mr. Ho provided description regarding the two key intersections affected at the time of initial opening of the Center. He commented that this is a very challenging traffic area to begin with and if the Center is to open and the traffic light will not be up until November, there will be significant traffic problems. Ms. Johnson noted that fact would also affect the Weston Road interchange.

Mr. Ho recommended that there are three or four traffic locations that the applicant would have to monitor very closely until the signaling arm is operational; firstly being the site drive

(monitoring the number of vehicles going in and out of the site to display that number is consistent with the number presented in the report). He stressed that the second location would be Lexington Road, especially in the evening rush hour and use Lexington Road as pass through. He maintained that the intersection of Weston Road (the on and off ramp) should also be monitored closely to ensure that there are no operational problems. He stressed checking these sites when school begins and ends, at a minimum.

Ms. Woodward commented that all the traffic that goes westbound out of the Center would have to travel through two lanes of traffic to get onto Weston Road and found from personal experience that doing that driving route is most dangerous. She indicated that she was very nervous about this traffic approach and asked if a temporary traffic light could be installed there.

Ms. Mallett recognized the benefit of the Center to the community but said that she lives near that neighborhood and stated that she fears the Weston Road intersection as well, especially in consideration of kids and teenagers learning to drive. She asked if the intersection will ultimately become a section F intersection. Mr. Ho responded that it would be reduced from a D Intersection to an E intersection – with reduction in level service and are limitations to what the computer software could do. Ms. Mallett emphasized that her hope was that something could be done about this intersection.

Ms. Woodward mentioned that monitoring alone does not mitigate the use of the Weston Road intersection.

Mr. Ho detailed that he had discussed this issue with the Police Department and the Wellesley Engineering Department and stated that if a temporary light cannot be installed for five or six months, then Police detail would be the best solution. Ms. Mallett commented that Police detail when school starts would be most necessary. Mr. Ho suggested conditioning that aspect when school opens.

Mr. DeVellis commented that no one wants an unsafe traffic situation and the time of events in the summer with half of an operating facility will likely be less concerning, but if traffic detail is needed at the Weston Road exchange, IP Standards can reflect such a change.

Mr. Roberti stated that he felt nervous about having to vote on a related matter this evening. Mr. Harrington suggested that the board could approve tonight, subject to counsel review and consultation with Chair and then Mr. Shind and he could further draft conditions. Mr. Roberti stated that he had no problem with that suggestion.

Ms. Woodward stated that she read the BETA report closely and was concerned about the reference to “disappearance of westbound U-Turns between the two project site driveways and the mention that these trips should be added to the eastbound through volume at the eastern site driveway as the office driveway is east of the project site.” Mr. Ho responded that the item involves data and the applicant’s response to BETA’s comments. Mr. Michaud stated that such comments had never been shared with him since the last discussion and was hoping for an open discussion in this regard.

Ms. Woodward commented that considerable implications were raised in Mr. Ho’s letter to Executive Director Meghan Jop dated June 10, 2019. Ms. Woodward stated that the letter

brings up many important issues that have to be addressed before any type of conditions can be agreed upon.

Another aspect included in that June 10th letter, which concerned Ms. Woodward, was item 5 – the Vehicle Queueing Analysis and a question about ignoring the “#” note and left lane queues. Mr. Ho responded that the analysis indicated that the related computer software typically provides a number (298) with a # sign next to it and that # sign indicates that the queue is in excess of the 298 number.

Ms. Johnson commented that the 298 number related to a full CO and the partial CO is what was being considered at this time. Mr. Ho replied that this data is related to the initial opening of the Center.

Ms. Woodward asked Mr. Ho if he continues to have concerns about the initial traffic review. Mr. Ho responded that there were flags in the letter to Ms. Jop to indicate the need for the applicant’s response at least.

Ms. Johnson suggested that Mr. DeVellis explain the camp drop off aspect. Ms. Johnson mentioned that it was understood that the summer camp program this year at the Center was very limited to kids attending a four-hour session and then leaving the Center. Mr. DeVellis affirmed that this summer is reflective of a “soft opening” with perhaps 30 skaters on the ice from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. and in the pool from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. and get lunch while they are at the Center. He emphasized that there is not a set camp scheduled for this summer and are not ready for a regular summer camp season and have not advertised for it. He stressed that next summer the signal light will be in place and the camp can operate fully.

Mr. Roberti asked when does the “soft opening” enrollment change. Mr. DeVellis responded after Thanksgiving. Mr. Roberti stated that he was concerned because it sounded like the Center would be running a full Center operation in December/ January. Mr. DeVellis responded affirmatively, if the signal is in place and that if it is not – a temporary permit has to be renewed.

Ms. Olson asked Mr. DeVellis if he thought the signal light would not be operational by Thanksgiving when the Center is planning for regular events scheduling to begin. Mr. Michaud stated that it was not impossible and the team is planning to have the equipment in place by November. Mr. DeVellis stated that it was the intention to order the signal arm in the next week and get the approvals from DOT in July. Ms. Olson maintained that the Center should not be running at full capacity without the mentioned signal light and an agreement must be set in place to assure that does not happen and added that Police detail is not the solution.

Mr. Michaud stated that the temporary occupancy includes a provision within it that stipulates that without the proper signal equipment in place, left turns on Route 9 will not occur, either into the Center or out of the Center. He detailed the three critical sites that Mr. Ho referred to.

Ms. Johnson recommended that related updates be provided throughout this process.

Resident Linda Mariani, 36 Bay View Road, commented that the Fells Library – the children’s library is located in the critical area and senior housing is in the same location and both are not being mentioned. She stressed that crossing the street in that area is very dangerous now and will get worse if something is not done. She affirmed that a full light system must be in place. Ms. Woodward thanked Ms. Mariani for reminding the Board about the Fells Library location.

Resident Patty Kidek, 33 Bay View Road, asked Mr. Ho why he did not include Russell Road in his conversation. Mr. Ho acknowledged that Russell Road should be included with the other three critical traffic areas.

Ms. Olson commented that the project is at the right focus point and reiterated that without the mentioned traffic light installed by November, action must be taken.

Resident Anson John Thomas, 35 Bayview Road, asked what “soft opening” actually meant and stressed that Mr. Ho should further measure thresholds and if those thresholds go beyond the calculated amount, then action must be taken. Ms. Johnson responded that the Board will ensure that the areas will be monitored in the summer, in September when school begins and examined again in November.

Mr. Roberti stated that the project has to stay “soft” until the necessary signal lights are installed.

Mr. Harrington stated that a proposed surety protects against things such as construction delays; but is not necessarily the Board’s biggest concern, but rather, getting access to traffic details when traffic details are needed.

Ms. Mallett suggested that the applicant and the Sports Center team give serious consideration to neighbor’s comments who might be affected and noted that establishing a baseline traffic number is very important factor and asked if baseline calculations have been established. Mr. Michaud confirmed that there were such baseline numbers and would serve as comparison. He added that peer review helped establish those baseline numbers at multiple locations.

Baseline discussion took place.

Ms. Woodward commented that she was unclear about the Fire Department’s opinion regarding the Center’s related traffic considerations. Ms. Johnson commented that the memo from the Fire Department presented a related punch list that needed to be completed and if the punch list was not completed, then all is not satisfactory with the Fire Department. Mr. DeVellis affirmed that the Building Inspector would not sign off on the temporary occupancy permit unless the Board of Health and the Fire Department approved all aspects.

Per request from the Board, Ms. Johnson stated that she was willing to review the final traffic consideration.

Town Counsel Harrington read the proposed motion draft aloud.

Mr. Harrington noted that the Planning Board should make the decision regarding surety.

Ms. Woodward recommended a specific timeline for the provided updates and provided the dates of update take place on the first and the 15th of each month. Ms. Johnson agreed to update the Board at the subsequent meeting.

Ms. Mallett queried about requiring Police detail on a more frequent basis. Mr. Ho commented that it may be preferable to require that the detail take place during the first week of school in September and to conduct the detail at the Weston Road Intersection and off ramp on July 8th. He added that detail should be provided when school re-opens in September.

Ms. Woodward asked about how long how long the detail would last on a given day. Mr. Ho suggested that the detail take place during the commuter peak hours and when school opens, especially in the morning of the first week of school.

Mr. Harrington suggested that after the traffic engineers meet, there could be further specifications about Police detail specific dates and times. Mr. DeVellis stated that he would agree to Police detail when the Sports Center was actually open and was determined to be warranted.

Mr. Roberti motioned to close the Public Hearing. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to approve the motion.

Mr. Roberti moved that the Board moves to amend PSI 17-01 for the Wellesley Sports Center at 900 Worcester Street as follows:

- 1. By adding a condition to authorize the senior member of the Planning Department staff or the Executive Director, in consultation with the Planning Board Chair at his/her discretion to authorize the issuance of a temporary Certificate of Occupancy if certain aspects of the approved plans or associated conditions are incomplete and may accept a deposit of a sufficient surety to ensure compliance. The Planning Director shall only authorize the issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy as here described if he/she is advised by the Department of Public Works, The Municipal Light Plant, The Fire Department, The Police Department, The Health Department and the Building Department, that those departments are satisfied with the progress of construction and approve the limited operation of the facility on a temporary basis.**
- 2. By adding a condition to authorize a senior member of staff or the Executive Director based upon thresholds provided by the Town's Traffic Engineer and traffic monitoring at locations identified by the Town's Traffic Engineer to require the applicant to contract for Police details at certain intersections at certain events. The Town will consult with the Town's Traffic Engineer for guidance on Police details.**
- 3. The applicant shall provide regular updates to the Planning Department on the 1st and 15th of every month on construction schedule for the traffic light and on scheduling events at the Sports Center to inform the use of Police details.**
- 4. To address inconsistencies in the original decision created by the previous amendments and to authorize Town Counsel to draft the amended special permit in consultation with the Planning Board Chair and to authorize the Planning Board Chair to execute the amendment and the special permit on behalf of the Planning Board.**

Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to approve the motion.

Ms. Johnson recommended that the mentioned decision be made by Senior Staff first and then, sequentially by the Executive Director.

5. Other Business

a. Planning Board Chair Report

Ms. Johnson announced that Laura Harbottle had been hired as the interim planning director.

Ms. Johnson noted that Mr. Tom Hunnewell was present with a duplicate mylar for an ANR regarding a property on Pond Road with part of the property in Wellesley and part of the property in Natick. The Board determined that it would be best to sign the mylar at the next meeting on July 1 so that signatures could be endorsed with the correct pen.

Ms. Johnson detailed the mini-retreat for the Board on July 9 at 6:30 p.m. Subjects to be included at the meeting would be possible topics for the next Annual Town Meeting.

Ms. Johnson commented that NRC wants to present revisions to the tree bylaw for Town Meeting. She also mentioned that the Citizen Petition to limit the size of homes in the general resident district is to be included. She suggested that Board members examine the NRP Zoning Bylaw in relation to the North 40 property.

Ms. Woodward suggested exploring the topic of accessory housing in Town.

Ms. Johnson detailed that ZBA cases will be reviewed without staff comments at the next Board meeting on July 1.

6. Minutes

Ms. Johnson stated that she had reviewed the minutes for May 20, 2019, June 3, 2019 and February 4, 2019 and noted several typos. Ms. Woodward made correction as well.

Mr. Roberti moved to accept the minutes for May 20, 2019, June 3, 2019 and February 4, 2019 as corrected. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to approve the motion.

There being no further business, Ms. Johnson adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, July 1, 2019

MINUTES APPROVED: MONDAY, JULY 1, 2019

Laura Harbottle, Interim Planning Director