



RECEIVED

2022 MAR -4 AM 11:02

TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
NORTH READING, MASS.

Town of North Reading
Massachusetts

Community Planning

MINUTES

Tuesday, December 21, 2021

Mr. Warren Pearce, Chairperson called the Tuesday, December 21, 2021 meeting of the Community Planning Commission to order at 7:30p.m. via Virtual Meeting (Zoom, participants may call 1-929-205-6099, meeting code 985 430 0926).

MEMBERS

PRESENT:

Warren Pearce, Chairperson
Christopher Hayden, Vice Chairperson
Ryan Carroll, Clerk
Jeremiah Johnston
David Rudloff

STAFF

PRESENT:

Danielle McKnight, AICP
Town Planner/Community Planning Administrator
Debra Savarese, Administrative Assistant

Mr. Pearce informed all present that the meeting is being recorded.

66 Winter Street - ANR

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hayden and voted 5-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to endorse as "Approval-Not-Required", the plan entitled "Plan of Land, 66 Winter Street, North Reading, Mass."; dated September 29, 2021; revised December 14, 2021; drawn by Andover Consultants Inc.

Mr. Pearce asked for a roll call: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Rudloff and Mr. Pearce in favor, none opposed.

Accessory Dwelling Unit Bylaw - discussion

Mr. Pearce asked the CPC members if they read the proposed bylaw and if they had comments.

Mr. Johnston stated that he's finds it both unnecessarily restrictive and he doesn't think that it advances the goals that were stated in the introduction.

Mr. Pearce asked Mr. Johnston what the main things is that he would change about it.

Mr. Johnston stated that there are two issues. The prohibition on the detached element which to him requirement of a special permit kind of resolves and gives them that opportunity to kind of make everything fits and is appropriate. They've already got all the other kind of restrictive elements, especially when it comes around to septic and things like that kind of make sure that the other issues that they're worried about are already kind of been addressed. He doesn't think an exception for a historic carriage house is enough, because there are a lot of new developments in town, and they simply don't have those kind of features, so it's basically an effective prohibition on those kind of properties. Then we look at restricting the tenancy to family and caregivers, it effectively defeats the purpose of ADUs as a tool in the housing crisis, and it goes directly against the first stated goal. He doesn't think that it should be a zoning where everything goes, but thinks that they should be very conservative when it comes to outright prohibiting, and prohibiting an entire wide class of tenants and styles of ADUs seems overreaching.

Mr. Carroll stated that they seem to be blending the two issues. One was the MAPC study suggesting these were a good tool to address the housing crisis and the other is the building inspector telling them that he feels like he doesn't have the teeth to make adequate enforcement to safely do these ADUs. It's vague in the sent that he doesn't see how we're enforcing how many people end up in the ADU, or what they ultimately partition it with, in terms of bedrooms, or what they use is going to be in terms of caregiver scenario, or a family

member scenario, because obviously one sale down the road and it can be a completely different thing, so in his mind he looks at it more from what Mr. Rudloff mentioned before that some properties in town that essentially create a multi-family property in a single family neighborhood and he thinks that's detrimental to the other homes in the area, even if it does, in fact increase the value of that home. He thinks it has a negative effect on the overall character of a neighborhood and something that a lot of people value in the town. So, he's more of the mind that this needs to be as restrictive as possible to make sure that the building inspector can enforce the rule, but be mindful of the fact that it is largely a single family bedroom community. He drives through neighborhoods in this town that are 70s era, where people filled their garages over time, and people are parking their cars in the grass because there's now five cars in a two-car driveway. He thinks there's a negative effect that it has on the overall character of neighborhoods and he thinks a lot of people will be opposed to that happening in their neighborhood. So, he's cautious about any sort of language here that does less to restrict.

Mr. Rudloff stated that they need to go back to go back to where they started because there's the issue of helping out the building inspector with a problem he's experiencing with use. He came to the CPC looking for solutions, so there's that aspect, but then there's going even further back to the MAPC survey which was done a few years back and started with 554 respondents, and after the first question it dropped down to 432. When it got to the ADUs question, and there were only two that noted specific areas in town, so not even town-wide, and then the responses for favorability to ADUs was in the lowest percentage of all responses. He pointed this out and at other meetings and he had Carlos of MAPC not agree, but confirm exactly what his findings were in an email he sent to him dated May 18, 2020. So, it's important for Mr. Johnston to understand what the mandate for the CPC to back up is. Is this what people in town want? In his opinion, such a small sample and a sample that delivered the lowest favorability for this particular avenue that they're pursuing right now, he thinks is hubris to think like this something that they have to do. He doesn't see the mandate, or the data that's telling them everybody in town wants this. So, he goes back to where his intent is to help the building inspector.

Mr. Hayden stated that this is a proposed bylaw, and has to go to Town Meeting, for a vote. So, Mr. Johnston may not think that this is broad enough for what he thinks should happen, but this is overly broad for the base in North Reading that's going to go to a vote for this, so he thinks small steps is a good thing. He likes what he sees here and he doesn't know if they want to go too much further, it does give them a little bit of power that the building inspector is going to get some use out of this to be able to utilize this, to make ADUs more legal and built correctly, and the town's going to know about them and that's going to indeed raise the value of the properties there in, for a tax base. If they go to the big jump, he doesn't think it's going to make it off the floor, at Town Meeting.

Mr. Pearce stated that he would like go over some of the points Mr. Johnston made. One of the things about the expansive law that Mr. Johnston is thinking about, is that would be great if they were on sewer, but if a resident converts a garage into a one-bedroom it's not going to work with the septic system that's matched up to the house, and they can't just put a one-bedroom septic system in. The minimum size is three-bedrooms, so the substantial cost associated with that. Whereas, if you're converting inside a house that's existing, one of the bedrooms can be given up for the ADU. Also, if we start allowing it in other structures we'll begin to run into the situation of people just randomly doing it and not making sure that they get a septic system that matches up, and that's the problem the building inspector is running into now, and that's what is going to slow it down and make putting an ADU inside the existing house more practicable. It's more than likely that it won't pass at Town Meeting if they go to far with this bylaw.

Mr. Johnston stated that that's what he wanted too, but he certainly didn't factor in it. The septic continues to confuse him because we're talking about septic being an issue for an attached, but there's also the law that has been mentioned several times that would apply to a detached, so there's already a regulation in place that would prevent a detached that could not meet high level of criteria. If all we're saying is that, in order to have a detached you need a special permit that shows above and beyond that all the other concerns are taken care of, but they've been accommodated and therefore special permit can be issued. Why do they need to have a probe? That's the part that confuses him because there's already two preventative measures to address the things that we want to prevent, then why do we need an overarching prohibition that just strips people from any say in any possibility of doing something that could comply. Right now he's in favor of doing something, and fully in favor of giving the building inspector everything he needs to address. So, when it comes to things like the parking spaces, the number of rooms and the septic, he's perfectly fine with limiting those things and giving him teeth to go in and really enforce those, but there are two very prohibitions in this current draft that he thinks is overstepping on the rights of a property, and that is, the detached element and the nature of who the tenants could be. He respects the fact that this is just building off of the Massachusetts model, but then let's be clear about stripping out all those introductory intentions of what we're trying to achieve here, because this current graph is very contradictory, to a point.

Mr. Pearce stated that the occupation part comes from the bylaw from the Town of Needham that passed muster and the Attorney General. It was done that way in that town, because they knew that if they opened it up to just anybody to be able to live with these ADUs that they would not have voted for it, and we have to take that into account. While he agrees with Mr. Johnston's concept to provide housing, but he had to be realistic about the fact that he wouldn't want to put together a "Pie in the sky" application and bring it to Town Meeting and have them say no, and walk out empty handed. So, we need to consider what the mentality of the town and Mr. Rudloff's data research also shows.

Mr. Rudloff stated that we have to acknowledge when we do anything like this that we are writing something that is potentially going to change what the town looks like.

Mr. Pearce stated that a few years ago they forgot to renew a portion of the ADU bylaw and for a period of time in that time there were in-law apartments that were put in legally, but then as quickly as they could they slammed that door shut. So, again that's the mentality that we're dealing with, we need to remember that, because otherwise we will be setting ourselves up for failure.

Mrs. McKnight stated that Mr. Johnston is correct that it is contradictory in that way, and thank you for pointing that out. She started with the Massachusetts model bylaw as a base. The reason she added the language from the Town of Needham bylaw is because they didn't really talk about tenancy that much, but what she heard when she went to the Development Team meeting and spoke to the department heads the concern was shared (not by all) that they didn't really feel that it wouldn't pass Town Meeting. What's difficult is they all acknowledged that's not enforceable and they can't enforce it. She's not comfortable recommending they put something in a bylaw that she knows they can't enforce because then people will turn around and say that the town is not following this part of the bylaw and why aren't they enforcing it. They will be critical and rightfully so, so she has mixed feelings about it. She thinks in general it's the right thing to not restrict the tenancy in that way, but this is an important issue that she thinks could be a deal breaker on the whole thing and they really don't know how people will respond. She doesn't know how they address that issue, other than maybe having a couple of public meetings about it, advertise it very widely, and encourage people to specifically give them comment on this issue. There was a survey included in the Master plan, but she doesn't think it phrased the questions in the right way. They did do a Housing plan prior to that with a very clear and very good survey and in that survey there was quite a bit of interest, but that doesn't mean that people would be ready to vote for it a Town Meeting.

Mr. Rudloff stated that he has a question about #2 on her memo, about family or caregivers, and he doesn't see in the bylaws where it seems like it's all family members, so how can a caregiver be someone that's not a family member live there.

Mrs. McKnight stated that's supposed to be the intent of that wording in the bylaw.

Mr. Vincenzo Stuto of the Select Board stated that if you talk to a real estate agent in the town, this is how North Reading is built. Single family home community with the possibility of some development for elderly housing. He does believe that when it goes to Town Meeting, everyone that has moved in in the last four or five years, this is going to be something where the first thing they're going to think about is that their real estate agent said this is not the town that does this. There is a magnitude of issues that are being discussed between the Select Board, CPC and other communities, where people are ignoring the fact that those moving in, are not going to go for a lot of these things if they're too wild. He does agree that if it sounds

like we're going to open the flood gates, like Malden, Medford, Stoneham, and Melrose, this won't even make it to Town Meeting.

Mr. Pearce stated that they can't do it because this town doesn't have sewer and that's such a critical part of all these other towns that we're talking about. They don't need to dig another big whole in their backyard to do this, and so, in this town what we're going to. So, by limiting it, the way Mrs. McKnight did in the bylaw and they're going to tweak it, a little bit. They're going to put a little bit of the stuff that Mr. Johnston wants in there and we're going to be conservative enough, hopefully, as Mr. Hayden mentioned to have a law that will pass muster.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she can make the changes and put this onto another meeting. She does want them to talk about why they actually want to do this because she actually thinks that of the five members, they might actually have five different reasons for wanting to do it.

Mr. Pearce stated that there is one other issue and that is if they put this bylaw in place and then somebody brings an ADU before them with some reason, such as having an infirmed prison in the house, and say that they need to do this and it needs to be over the detached garage, and they take it to the Board of Appeals, and now what. There are still some things that could happen that would accomplish some of those goals as long as we keep it a special permit and don't allow by right.

Mr. Johnston stated that he is a recent home buyer in this community, and they invested a lot in their house, and there are things that work and things that don't work. As a property owner I'd like to know that I can take advantage of my property. We're creating a prohibition, we're not removing a prohibition for creating production on a property. To him, that is something that if he was somebody at Town Meeting and they're telling him what he can't do with his property, rather than a different approach, he thinks people might have a difference of opinion.

Mr. Pearce stated that with the current bylaw they cannot do that. The prohibition already exists.

Mr. Johnston stated that he thought that it was the absence, that's why everybody was doing without and that they were creating the rules to stop them from it.

Mr. Pearce stated that the idea now is to try and loosen that prohibition up a little. So, there is a couple ways to look at it and he thinks they can get a little bit of what everybody is saying here.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she will make the changes and put this on the agenda for second meeting in January.

39 Chestnut St. & 9 Flint St. – Definitive Subdivision – cont. P.H. 8:00PM

Attorney Jill Mann stated that there are a couple of things she want to talk about with the board to be able to round out all their comments with the peer review engineer. She only received the plans after close of business yesterday and sent them to Danielle this evening which is why the board did not receive a copy of them. There was a discussion about whether they were going put in sidewalks, but none of their streets they connect to have them and they would have to create more impervious area, and the board said well how about creating a bus stop, at minimum, so that's what she wanted to show them, to look at, and should she actually have to put in the sidewalk.

Mr. Pearce asked Attorney Mann if the question is whether they would rather have the sidewalk or the bus stop.

Attorney Mann stated sidewalk, so they would need a waiver, or is it fine to just have the bus stop like they discussed at the last hearing.

Mr. Pearce stated that they look at a situation where they're told that the sidewalk goes to nowhere and that may be true today, but not necessarily tomorrow. When they put some sidewalks in on Central Street, when they did some of those other work, and then they wouldn't be now trying to put a whole sidewalk in, they'd be looking to put connectors in. Sometimes having a place to start helps quite a bit.

Attorney Mann stated that they can put a sidewalk in, but they would ask to only put it on one side, at most. She shared the plan on screen to show the board where the bus stop would be located and they will put the sidewalk on the same side of the street.

Mr. Hayden stated that at the first meeting he listed to all of the recordings, so he knew this was in there, but he didn't get a chance to speak. Sidewalks are really important, there was no sidewalk down Haverhill Street, between Foley Drive and North Street. There was a partial sidewalk up to the Hood School, but once they put that sidewalk in on Haverhill Street it is being used all of the time. The road for this subdivision will be coming out to Chestnut Street, and that street is heavily travelled, and there's no sidewalk, but at some point they're going to try to put one in there, so having sidewalks everywhere else around there as much as they can, it really helps.

Attorney Mann asked if the board was in support of doing a sidewalk only on one side, then.

Mr. Pearce stated that he doesn't personal think that they need it, he thinks, when it's a little bit of a trade off, and this is his opinion that the sidewalk on one side is adequate because if they create one on two sides they're creating a bunch of infrastructure that 20 years down the road they're doubling the amount of infrastructure that would need to be repaired.

Attorney Mann stated that there is also one comment about providing traffic level of service which requires traffic counts and all of these other things. It makes absolutely no sense in this area. All of the intersections here are A or B, its low level, there's no wait, there's no traffic, so it's just spending money. The engineer said that they need to see the level of service, that's what's in the report. They responded with no matter what they do given the number of homes, they couldn't change the level of service and that's what they have an opinion on within their traffic report. If this board says that they have to have it, then they will have it.

Mr. Pearce stated that what happens is that they get pressed about a level of service from the neighborhoods. But, sometimes when they look at it, similar to what Attorney Mann is saying and that they're probably not going to have a huge problem with traffic in any particular intersection or location, but the people come to the meetings and they want someone to give them a level of comfort, and if we don't and then something happens they'll come back and say that a traffic study wasn't done.

Attorney Mann stated that they didn't do that type of a report because there's just not enough traffic generated by this property, but they did provide a full traffic study, so that this board can actually address the abutter comments.

Mr. Pearce stated that they would ask DCI to clarify their comments about level of service, and for which intersection.

Mr. Hayden stated that the new subdivision is going to get traffic being bled off of Chestnut Street and Flint Street onto the new road.

Attorney Mann stated that the last issue that was brought up the last time with the driveway dimension. The fire department made a comment that every driveway that is 50' long, needs to be 20' wide.

Mr. Pearce stated that the State code calls for an 18' wide driveway.

Mrs. McKnight stated that the fire department has been asking for the 20' up to 50' back, or sprinkling the house to be put into the subdivision regulations. She doesn't know if this is a recommendation or if there's something that they can require, but she will get some clarity on that.

Mr. Pearce asked the members what there consensus for a sidewalk to be on one side or both sides of the road.

Mr. Johnston stated that a compromise is probably necessary. He'd like to see on both sides, because if you're on the side without a sidewalk and you've got little kids and walking dogs you

still have to cross the street, but in a subdivision like this with relatively low traffic he could see one side being a fair compromise.

Mr. Rudloff stated that one side walk is fine with him.

Mr. Carroll stated that he feels that that's the subdivision law and if the town wants to change that they should change it, but he hasn't heard any compelling reason why they should go away from what they have in place right now.

Mr. Pearce stated that they have granted the waivers to allow only one sidewalk in the past because it makes a lot of sense. The town engineer always told them that two sidewalks usually never get used and in 20 years the town has to replace or repair them.

Mr. Hayden stated that they've usually taken the single sidewalk on a dead end road because there is minimal traffic. This actually connects to different roads, and it connects to roads that are semi-busy. But, he thinks that having one sidewalk is fine with him.

Mr. Pearce stated that he is also fine with one sidewalk.

Mrs. McKnight asked that a letter of extension until March 1, 2022, be sent to the planning department.

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hayden and voted 5-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to grant the requested continuance of the public hearing for 39 Chestnut St. & 9 Flint St. until Tuesday, January 18, 2021 @ 8:00PM.

Mr. Pearce asked for a roll call: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Rudloff, Mr. Carroll and Mr. Pearce in favor, none opposed.

Minutes

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hayden and voted 5-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the minutes dated November 2, 2021 as written.

Mr. Pearce asked for a roll call vote: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Rudloff and Mr. Pearce in favor, none opposed.

CPC Budget

Mr. Pearce stated that he read through the budget and it looks like Mrs. McKnight is looking for some modest increases. Is there any explanation necessary?

Mrs. McKnight stated that the only increase would be the Housing Services office. We didn't pay any more last year, actually she thinks they paid a little less, than the year before. It should be expected to go up a little bit, it's salaries that kind of depend on that, so it's not a huge increase. The other item is that we had to ask for \$5,000.00, originally, two years ago, to review our regulations to ensure compliance with the stormwater permit and, so it was put off for a year because of the budget. She brought it back last year, unfortunately she didn't refresh the quote and now the cost is estimated to be about twice that, so we are going ahead with New England Civil doing the most important aspects of the review. But, she expects that we will need additional money, so that's why that was something she didn't know if there's money for that or not. If there isn't we'll just go with what we have and do just a nice clean, efficient review. She wanted to meet with the town administrator to ask whether there is money for us to ask for that again and if she hears that there's no money anywhere, then she'll just take it off. Nothing else is really increasing, in terms of supplies and other things like that.

There is one other thing that she almost put in the budget, but she hasn't yet, and she may submit a revision, if the CPC all think this is a good idea, and she also wants to meet with the town administrator about it, to ask his opinion too. Shortly after the sewer initial costs were approved the town meeting for the design and she had spoken a little bit about what kind of staffing would be needed to really have, in terms of economic development and she thinks it's clear that they could really benefit from someone for this coming year, to reach out to businesses and really help lay the foundation for what could be our sewer project, but the reason she hasn't requested a salary for someone like that is because she doesn't know what will happen after town meeting if the sewer project isn't approved. She's always struggled to justify that position in the absence of us having sewer. The other problem would be that she wouldn't know where they would put a person like that, so she was hoping that a sit down with the town administrator before putting something like that in our budget. The budget is due on January 4th and she was going to submit it that day, but she wanted to hear what the members thought.

Mr. Pearce stated that if they could find somebody that's already working in town hall, they could just add some money to what they're already doing and that would eliminate the additional need for benefits.

Mr. Rudloff stated that they have an untapped resource of brokers and people that have self-interest of selling these properties, getting people lined up for sewer on Main Street and he's not sure if the taxpayer's need to fund that position, but he doesn't know all of the things that Mrs. McKnight is looking to accomplish.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she doesn't know whether the taxpayers should fund that either, but she thinks that having an economic development person who is dedicated to the Economic Development Committee and helping them carry out the things that would like to do would be helpful. Her hours are very limited by the fact that this is her primary job and she doesn't have a lot to give to the EDC. Without sewer in town, she can manage that, but with sewer, she thinks that in terms of outreach to businesses, explaining to them what betterments and assessments like look like and working on the financial aspect of it, getting to know what the demand actually might be, getting a better understanding of how each business is really operating and what their needs are, and what potential for development could be, she does think that there is room for that, but she wouldn't want to hire someone, only not to need them the following year.

Mr. Hayden asked if there was a possibility of getting a contract for one year, and then possibly turning that person into a full-time, or whatever time person we need, thereafter, when sewer goes through.

Mr. Pearce stated that if you're going go to do that then you would have to start looking at an RFP and then start looking at qualifications. They would need some basic qualifications, but he thinks it would be something they would be directed and all the things they're going to do, as opposed to having to be a self-starter and you're not going to find somebody in the marketplace that has the skills to do all of these things, just hanging around. It might end up being a part-time job and may not need a contract, so it might not be terrible. He asked Mrs. McKnight if she knew what kind of budget she would be looking for.

Mrs. McKnight stated that if it's for an actual economic development director position, those are usually in the 80s, or higher. The towns that have serious economic development programs have a separate person who makes at least that much. So, she doesn't know if that's really viable for us, or not. She was hoping she could get some input from the town administrator, on that too.

Mr. Pearce stated that considering what they're going to spend on sewer that's not very much money.

Mr. Hayden stated that the problem is that Mrs. McKnight doesn't have the time to work on CPC and Economic Development and she's going to get pulled into the sewer too, because she so good.

Mr. Pearce stated that Joe Parisi, the DPW Director has a pretty good handle on the sewer. He said that he'll be able to handle a lot of that stuff.

Mr. Stuto stated that if there was a specific question that the CPC wanted the answer to, he is meeting with Mr. Parisi tomorrow, for a Wastewater meeting and could ask him.

Mr. Pearce stated that he would like to know if the town's that Mr. Parisi previously worked in have a person with this particular job, or did he do it. How did they handle that part of the job?

Mr. Stuto stated that marketing strategy preliminary, right now, is him and Mr. Steve O'Leary going door to door, reaching out to the owners.

Planning Administrator Updates

Shay Lane - discussion

Mr. Pearce stated that it sounds like the peer reviewer is not satisfied with what the builder of 9 Shay Lane presented.

Mrs. McKnight stated that Luke Roy of LJR Engineering is now the engineer of record for the project, but in the meantime Mr. Hodgson had hired an engineer to look at the drainage, particularly on 9 Shay Lane, and to run calculations just for that lot. They had this reviewed by DCI and they found that they weren't satisfied with the way that was presented and how the calculations were done. She shared this with Mr. Murray and she hasn't received a response back, yet. She doesn't really know what the outcome needs to be and may need to go back to DCI and ask what needs to be done. She has also offered to get in touch with this engineer directly, to try to talk through the issues.

Mr. Pearce stated that he understands what the problem is, but there's also a line that he put in there, where he says that he understands that there are some additional things that have been done, but he doesn't know what they were and they don't show on the plan, so he doesn't know how they affect the outcome. The infiltration that was put in doesn't really capture all the different storm events, yet they're ignored in the final calculations. Even though the report claims to reduce the quantity of runoff, not just the rate which would be really good if it was true, but there are discrepancies in the square area that's being captured. When the other engineer did his hydrology calculations, he didn't take into account some of the break out of the hill, and whether or not that's going to be captured and go into the detention pond because it's not really coming from a different catchment area.

Abacus Architects

Mrs. McKnight stated that she spoke to Mr. David Eisen today and they are going to be preparing a presentation deck. The last time the CPC discussed sending it out to the property owners. They do need to go to the Select Board to present it, at some point. She does not

know when that will be, but will request that they be put on the agenda. She did speak to Mr. Eisen about the difficulty she thinks they've had with the fact that it's been hard to plan a community meeting because they don't really have the response from the owners, and Mr. Eisen feels optimistic that we could still have a community meeting and step one might be to present it to the Select Board and then we would have elected representatives from the community, and depending on what kind of feedback we get from them that could be step one, and then the next step could be a community meeting. The property owner might not care if there's an interest, but the developers would care if there was interest, and then the property owners themselves might have an incentive to want to try to move ahead with something.

Mr. Pearce stated that he thinks that she's on the right path, but he thinks it's a rocky path. But, there's nowhere else for us to go right now. We need to present this in a positive way, but as a concept.

Housing Choice requirements for MBTA

Mrs. McKnight stated that the Housing Choice requirements that passed this year for MBTA communities is something that will be addressed over the next few months. There are certain housing related requirements, that we will have to meet and this is part of the Housing Choice legislation. The final regulations have not been published, yet. They're in draft form and she can share them with the board, if they want to have a discussion about them. She's working through them with Town Council because it is possible we already meet them. It's a requirement that even if we don't have any land area within a half mile of transit, that's the first thing communities are supposed to do if they can't meet that, even so all the communities have a zoning area of 50 acres that allows multifamily development by right, at a density of at least 25 units per acre and Edgewood meets that. If they can get credit for Martin's Landing that should take care of us, but it can't be age restricted. So, the zoning doesn't restrict Martin's Landing, but the housing development itself is age restricted, so she doesn't know if they will be getting credit for that or not. If we do not meet these requirements we lose our ability to receive a lot of the big state grants, including Massworks which she knows the town has been thinking of to fund the sewer project. By May 2nd they need to meet certain requirements, not zoning requirements, but we at least need to fill out a particular form with basic information.

Adjournment at 9:08PM

Respectfully submitted,
Ryan Carroll, Clerk

