



TOWN OF
STONEHAM
MASSACHUSETTS

PLANNING BOARD
781-279-2695

STONEHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
(in accordance with provision of M.G.L. c.30A, §§ 18-25)
Wednesday, July 13, 2022
Town Hall
Hearing Room
7:00 PM

Members present: Chairman Frank Vallarelli, Vice Chairman Kevin Dolan, Terrence Dolan and Marcia Wengen.

Member Absent: Daniel J. Moynihan., Jr

Also present: DPW Director Brett Gonsalves, Attorney Charles Houghton, Director of Planning & Community Development Erin Wortman, Stoneham Ford/China Moon property owners John & Ralph Melkonian, Conservation Commission Co-Chair Ellen McBride, David & Kathleen Luciano, Alden Ave, Town Clerk Maria Sagarino Acting as Clerk to the Planning Board

The Chair, Frank Vallarelli, called the meeting to order at 7:01PM and introduced the Board members.

Mr. Vallarelli asked for a motion to approve the minutes of May 18, 2022. Ms. Wengen made the motion which was seconded by Mr. K. Dolan. Mr. Vallarelli, Mr. K. Dolan and Ms. Wengen voted in favor. Mr. T. Dolan abstained as he was not present at that meeting.

The Board chose not to approve the minutes for June 15, 2022 until the next meeting date in August. They wanted more time to review.

The Board then confirmed the next few meeting dates. They will meet on August 17, 2022, September 14, 2022, September 21, 2022 and October 12, 2022.

Mr. Vallarelli introduced the subdivision regulations as the first item for discussion which was a continued conversation from the last two meetings. DPW Director Brett Gonsalves mentions that he had made some final clerical adjustments as discussed with Ms. Wengen. He made sure that the shade tree language was in concert with the Tree Chapter in the bylaws. Mr. Gonsalves also added language for the process of naming streets. He included the language on page 33.

Mr. Gonsalves also clarifies the language about the cul de sac. He made sure the turning radius worked with the layout as written in the regulations.

Mr. Gonsalves asks the Board to adopt the regulations tonight so that we could have something more up to date regarding the most recent design standards should a subdivision application be submitted.

Mr. K. Dolan thanks Mr. Gonsalves for all of his work on the regulations and Ms. Wengen for her help with proofreading and acting as a copywriter.

Mr. Houghton has a few questions about the regulations. He is looking at an earlier version and asks about page 40 which is page 41 on the most recent version. He questions the grade being different than the 9% currently in place. Mr. Gonsalves states that 8% is a standard he has seen in many communities and that's what he is recommending. He said applicants can apply for waivers if necessary but he feels 8% is a sufficient grade. Mr. K. Dolan asks if in his experience, 8.5 is standard. Mr. Gonsalves responds that it is. Mr. Houghton comments that we are 98% built at 9%. Mr. Vallarelli said that not all streets are at 9% and Mr. Houghton mentions that some are over 9%. Mr. Houghton just wants to make sure that he was reading it correctly.

Next, Mr. Houghton questions the maximum length of a cul de sac being 600 feet. Mr. K. Dolan asks what the current regulation is. Mr. Houghton responds that there isn't any. Mr. K. Dolan asks what most of them are. Mr. Houghton states that they are longer. Mr. K. Dolan asks Mr. Gonsalves if he is suggesting that the cul de sacs can't be longer than 600. He mentions that it wouldn't be more than 3 or 4 lots. Mr. Gonsalves responds that it could be more than four lots. With ninety feet of frontage you'd get about five lots. Mr. Gonsalves states that if a subdivision comes in longer than that then they can request a waiver. Mr. Houghton says that if they don't get a waiver then what. Ms. Wengen asks if that goes to the DPW Director or the Board. Mr. Gonsalves, Mr. Vallarelli and Mr. K. Dolan respond that it would be to the Board. Mr. K. Dolan asks Ms. Wortman if she has any input. Ms. Wortman doesn't believe it matters to have a limit on the length. She mentions that any subdivision approval can incorporate waivers if necessary. She doesn't see it as more of a burden on the applicant. Mr. K. Dolan states that to Mr. Houghton's point you might be denied the waiver. Ms. Wortman states that in that case the Board would most likely be denying the subdivision. If you don't want the subdivision, you don't want the subdivision. You are going to find a reason to deny something if you don't want it as you will grant a waiver if you do want it. Mr. K. Dolan doesn't believe they have ever denied a subdivision. Mr. Houghton says that it would be difficult to deny because you'd end up in court.

Mr. Houghton thinks if we'd had a 600 limit before it would be different. He states that you might end up land locking somebody. Mr. K. Dolan asks Mr. Houghton his thought. He responds that you should leave it the way it is. Mr. K. Dolan asks Mr. Gonsalves the rationale for it. Mr. Gonsalves responds that we are using these regulations as a guide. He doesn't believe that you would deny a subdivision if it's 700 feet and it meets all other design standards. If you

are just talking about that length, the Board has the right to accept that additional length. Again, he says that it's just a set of standards to have in place as a guide. He modeled them after Woburn which has had this in place since the 80s. They have similar lot size and frontage requirements Ms. Wortman also points out that where feasible, you don't want to run into cul de sac after cul de sac, you want things to connect. Mr. Gonsalves states that the Board can strike that language out if they wish but the purpose was to have a set of design standards in place. Ms. Wengen asks if striking that would impact items two and three on the same page. Mr. Gonsalves needs to look to see what that would affect. Mr. Houghton thinks that if it was back in the 80s and you had 600 feet, you would have had them all like that and designed them differently. You're taking a subdivision that's already built and if they want to extend it, you can't. Mr. Gonsalves states that they can, they would just need to request a waiver. Mr. Gonsalves tries to explain that he sees these as design standards not as a way to deny subdivisions that meet all standards except for one item.

Ms. Wengen asks Mr. Houghton what he'd like item two to be. She wonders if he takes issue to the 110 feet. Mr. Houghton answers yes, we are built mostly at 90 feet. Mr. Houghton believes that we are going backwards with more pavement.

Mr. K. Dolan believes that neither Mr. Houghton nor Mr. Gonsalves is wrong. Mr. Gonsalves reiterates that these are recommended rules and regulations. The Board can choose to adopt them or not keeping in mind that if an application comes in it will need to adhere to whatever regulations are currently in place.

Ms. Wortman recommends that the Board adopt the rules and regulations tonight but can continue the conversation remembering that you can amend them at any time with one meeting. She continues to say that if necessary they could have a more focused conversation on specific language, not the entire 91 pages.

Mr. Houghton adds that we have had a 90 foot radius on cul de sacs for the past 70 years. We are all built out. He would like to know the reason for changing this. Now you are going to land lock somebody. Mr. Gonsalves states that you need to be mindful of storm water management requirements which have changed. Additional pavement means additional runoff and larger drainage systems. All of that needs to be accounted for. While adhering to storm water requirements, a reduction in the pavement is beneficial. Mr. Houghton says, but now your cul de sac is 110 feet. Mr. Gonsalves corrects him to say 110 is the right of way. The pavement width is 86 feet. Mr. Houghton says that it isn't 86 feet now. Mr. Gonsalves says he is proposing instead of having 90 feet of pavement, to have 86 feet of pavement, but the layout line itself is 110 feet. Mr. Houghton says that the layout right now is 90 with the pavement being in the seventies. Mr. Gonsalves stated that with 86 feet, the fire truck just makes the turn. Mr. Houghton talked to the fire chief who stated the existing cul de sacs are fine. Mr. Gonsalves shows the Board a CAD drawing he had done to show the layout with the fire apparatus. Mr.

Houghton thinks that they are going backwards and reducing the pavement. Mr. Vallarelli agrees that the pavement is being reduced. Mr. K. Dolan said that Mr. Gonsalves is reducing the pavement while trying to address safety concerns. Mr. Houghton doesn't agree that there is a safety issue with the existing layouts of cul de sacs. Mr. Houghton is concerned about waivers, although the Board is fair, the waivers aren't guaranteed.

Mr. K. Dolan understands Mr. Houghton's concerns. Mr. Vallarelli wonders what the problem would be with keeping it as it is. Ms. Wengen asks if the motion could be to adopt the regulations with the understanding that they can have subsequent discussion. Mr. K. Dolan states that they could amend them to strike sections of Table Two but he realizes that they'd want to keep something in there. Mr. Houghton thinks that if they aren't broken, don't fix them. Mr. Vallarelli agrees that the 90 foot cul de sacs have been fine. Mr. Houghton mentions with more pavement there is more runoff and Mr. Vallarelli agrees. Mr. K. Dolan asks Ms. Wortman if she can look into what other Towns have in place. Ms. Wortman responds that she had gone over these regulations with Mr. Gonsalves and they seemed consistent with other communities that she had experience with. Mr. Houghton asks about the other communities and Ms. Wortman answers that it is Woburn. Mr. Houghton stated that we've been doing this since the 80s but we should have been doing something like this since the 60s. Ms. Wortman says that if we should have done something like this in the 60s, why wouldn't we now. Mr. Houghton doesn't agree with changing the rules in the middle of the game. Ms. Wortman asks if that means we shouldn't ever make any changes. Mr. Houghton explains that if you have an existing cul de sac with some land behind it. With these changes, you can't build without a waiver. Ms. Wortman responds that you also can't build without a definitive subdivision. Ms. Wortman doesn't see the big deal with a waiver. It is common when trying to get development done.

Mr. K. Dolan made a motion to accept the most recent version of the subdivision rules and regulations submitted by Mr. Gonsalves in its present form which was seconded by Ms. Wengen. Mr. K. Dolan adds that the thought would be that the Board could revisit some items in Table Two but it's a good idea to get this on the books now. It's a very good document. All members present voted in favor (Wengen, K. Dolan, T. Dolan, Vallarelli 4-0).

Next, Mr. Gonsalves provided a list of outstanding subdivisions and the money being held as requested by Mr. Vallarelli at the last meeting. He mentions that Birch Street is missing from the list but the rest seems accurate. He explains that a lot of the subdivisions on the list were developed twenty plus years ago and are still outstanding today. He explains this is an example of why the new regulations include a time limit of two years with a possibility for two six month extensions for a total of three years. The new regulations also address once a bond or surety has been set, there will be an annual review make sure that the money being held is still adequate. This should help to mitigate the numerous outstanding subdivisions that have been out there for so long. Mr. Gonsalves states that the longer a subdivision sits dormant without being accepted

costs the town money. The more subdivisions accepted create more lane miles for the town and more Chapter 90 funding for the streets. He continues to say that the longer these subdivisions are sitting there unfinished allows for more of a deterioration causing the funds being held aside to no longer be sufficient. Mr. K. Dolan sees the bond balances on the list provided. He asks Mr. Gonsalves if we have estimates of the dollar amount required to finish the subdivisions. Mr. Gonsalves responds that the only one on the list he has really looked at was Beacon Street after Mr. Houghton had brought it up. He looked at the numbers about a year and a half ago, at which time the cost was about \$35,000-\$40,000 to complete it. Today it's probably a lot more. Continuing to use Beacon Street as an example, Mr. Gonsalves mentions that there were so many structural deficiencies that part of the road would probably need to be reconstructed before it could even be paved. He continues to say that it could get to the point where the town is on the hook to finish it which could include curbing, paving, milling, etc.

Mr. K. Dolan states that if we take the bond money, we don't have to accept the road. We could use the money and finish the job. Mr. Gonsalves agrees. He says that it is up to the Board if they want to accept the road. He continues to say that typically the Board would ask his department if they should accept the road. He would write a memo stating possible deficiencies and whether it should be accepted or not to the Board. If the Board agrees to accept it then it goes to town meeting. Mr. Gonsalves refers back to the existing list and states with these there is so much work to be done, As Built plans, acceptance plans, deed descriptions among other things need to be done before a street can be accepted. Mr. K. Dolan mentions as a practical matter that the town still plows it. Mr. Gonsalves agrees and says they plow and do minor pothole repair, but nothing else. Ms. Wengen asked if trash is picked up. Mr. Gonsalves answers yes along with plowing and pot hole repair for emergency services, but the street is owned by the developer.

Mr. K. Dolan adds that after a while, it will become a private way owned by the abutters, so the tax payers would own the street. At a point in time those taxpayers will most likely go to the Select Board and ask for the road to be accepted. Mr. K. Dolan continues to say that we have these balances, we can send out letters telling them that their subdivision is expired and they should come before the Board. He doesn't think they would get any more money out of them. He guesses that the next step would be to see what is left to finish on each of them. Maybe a rainy day to do item for Mr. Gonsalves. They would then call the developer in to see if he would finish the work to get the bond back or the town would keep the money. He asks Mr. Gonsalves if that would be subbed out. Mr. Gonsalves explains that if the developer walks away and the town retains the money with the intent of finishing the roadway. He said in the case of these subdivisions, there isn't enough money to finish so the town probably wouldn't want to take the bond. Mr. K. Dolan asks what you would do in that case. Mr. Gonsalves says it puts the town in limbo. Mr. K. Dolan states that the new rules and regs try to cure some of this. Mr. Gonsalves agrees. He's trying to alleviate these subdivisions hanging out there too long. It's not exclusive to Stoneham. Other communities he has worked in have the same issue. Things slip through the

cracks. The developer would get most of the work done and it just stayed that way. Mr. Gonsalves is hoping with these new regulations there will be oversight through the process and if there are issues with finishing it'll be picked up earlier.

Mr. K. Dolan believes with this current list of outstanding subdivisions that we have to determine how many we might be upside down on and how many have sufficient funds. With the sufficient funds, you call the person in and say, you want your dough back then you're going to finish this. Mr. Gonsalves says that they need to take a look to see what's still require. Do they need As Builts? If so they need to hire a surveyor. There is a process, but Mr. Gonsalves says he can look through the old records and see what's been done and what is still outstanding and then come up with an estimate we feel will finish it. He continues to say that it's a snap shot in time. You can have an estimate today, but if you don't revisit it for a year or two that all changes.

Mr. K. Dolan, through the Chair, would like the Board to request that Mr. Gonsalves take a look at what still needs to be done so that the Board can have a better understanding of where to go next. Mr. Gonsalves offers to look at the files and to come up with estimates for the work that still needs to be done so the Board knows where they stand. Mr. Vallarelli asks how often they are reviewed as far as what work still needs to be done. Mr. Gonsalves says they are working on setting that. There was no mechanism in place to say the bond wasn't sufficient anymore. So it would only come up if the developer came in. Mr. Gonsalves uses Birch Street as an example. If the developer came in and said he did x,y and z, I would take a look at it to see that is true and recommend release of some money back. He's hoping the new regulations help it to not sit out there to long before completion. He believes three years total is ample time to give developers. Stoneham is not looking at 30 plus lot subdivisions, if that were to be the case, three years might need to be addressed with an extension due to extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Houghton talks about the existing list and each subdivision being different. He says you can't take a cookie cutter approach and the amount held in bond probably isn't sufficient. He's happy to help look at the ones done during his time to see if things can be worked out. He says that with Skyewood, that's finally on the last house and should get done.

Mr. Gonsalves agrees that each subdivision is different and is in a different stage of construction. So they all need to be looked at individually to see the best approach to get it finished. Mr. Gonsalves will continue to work with the Board.

Mr. Vallarelli introduces the next agenda item, discussion of potential rezoning of China Moon at 170 Main Street. Mr. Houghton reminds the Board of the discussion that began at the last meeting. It seemed everyone liked what was proposed last meeting [72 condos with a small commercial space for Stoneham Ford beside the residential]. He mentions the alternatives. They can go the 40A, §3A route. It would eliminate the Special Permit but would require Site Plan and changes threshold at Town Meeting to a

majority vote. He also proposes a possible overlay to add residential. Mr. K. Dolan states that either way it has to go to Town Meeting. Mr. Houghton agrees that the office there now is the only part of the proposed project that is an allowed use. Mr. K. Dolan asks about the size of the parcel. Mr. Houghton answers less than three acres. They discuss possibilities if it weren't to be 40A, §3A. Mr. K. Dolan mentions mixed use and Mr. Houghton talks about the parking requirement for the retail space not making that possible.

Mr. Houghton is looking for direction from the Board. Mr. K. Dolan believes that the project is a good project. You don't like to lose a business, lose a restaurant, but you've got to because it's gone. The option is now what's going to replace it. Is residential the best use? What about 40A §3A. Mr. K. Dolan says that he has done some research. It's still a moving statute. He mentions what the Town of Wakefield is doing and talks about a handout they have. They had a twenty five page presentation that told what was required, an allowed use of residential housing and what grants they'd miss out on if they don't comply. They looked at what was best for the Town and what areas were options. They have small groups studying it until December and then recommendations will be made. Mr. K. Dolan believes it is something that we should study. We shouldn't rush it. It's something you really want to bring to the community to let them decide. Mr. Dolan believes that going from North Street to William Street on both sides runs the risk of losing a lot of businesses. Someone could make a godfather offer to Redstone and it could become all apartments. You'd lose your business tax base there. He doesn't know if it's likely, but it could happen if we pass this. He'd rather see it rezoned from China Moon down to North Street on the east side. It's almost all apartments anyway. It would bring them into compliance. Mr. Vallarelli asks if the existing apartments would count towards 40A, 3A. Ms. Wortman and Mr. K. Dolan both respond that it wouldn't count. Mr. K. Dolan continued to say that one of his concerns is that the owner occupant to renter ratio is about 65-66% in Stoneham, if we put in an additional 2000 units, most of them are going to be rentals. You'll be getting closer to 50-50 which might not be good for the taxpayers. Also, 2000 more units means about 7000 more people, including more school children. He'd rather take it in smaller chunks.

Ms. Wengen asks what Mr. Houghton's other rezoning options are. Ms. Wortman feels that she needs to explain 40A§ 3A. Mr. Vallarelli says that they aren't to her agenda items yet. She explains that China Moon was the catalyst for this 40A§ 3A discussion of Highway Business zoning change. Either China Moon does an overlay, they rezone their property in splitting up Highway Business or you change Highway Business District. Those are the three options. She doesn't want to speak for China Moon but as long as they get to wherever they need to go, she doesn't believe they care how it's done. She continues to say that they are flexible but we have to think about what's in the best interest of the Town while being conscious of their needs. Mr. Vallarelli states that the developer has various options and Ms. Wortman says that the Town has various options. She says that the developer wants seventy two residential units, they are indifferent to the path they take as long as they get their seventy two units. It's the Town that has the power. It's your zoning code and they have to comply.

The chair allows resident Dolly Wilson to ask how long we have to comply with 40A§ 3A and where are we with our compliance. Mr. Vallarelli states that we have until December 2023. Ms. Wortman agrees and adds that our zoning from the Annual Town Meeting hasn't been approved but with the district at Fallon Road we would have 36 acres. There is a 50 acre benchmark but its 50 acres plus a minimum capacity of 2032 units. So it could be a minimum of 100 acres. It's a moving target with the state because they are trying to figure out how to calculate for communities.

Mr. Vallarelli asks Mr. Houghton to continue. Mr. Houghton states that if the Board is asking what they would prefer to do for the rezoning it would be a combination of 40A§ 3A where you take the east side of Main Street most of which is housing anyway into 40A§ 3A up to North Street. The Planning Board would give up Special Permit. It still needs Site Plan and Town Meeting for the initial change. It'll get you, not all the way but part of the way to 40A§ 3A. He continues to say the east side of Main Street is mostly housing so why not. Mr. Dolan asks if it was all rezoning. Mr. Houghton said that it was a retail zone that incorporated lesser uses. That changed in 1985. Stoneham built a lot of apartments and condos from 1975-1985 and then wanted to stop it. Mr. Houghton says that we weren't building housing. He stated that from 2000-2010 US Census the town lost 800 residents. No other community saw a decrease like that. In the last ten years the Town started again to get some housing built. Ms. Wengen asks what impact rezoning would do to existing housing like Oklahoma. Mr. Houghton says that they are existing nonconforming and would become conforming.

Mr. Vallarelli moves the discussion to the proposed articles for the October Town Meeting submitted by the Director of Planning which include language for 40A§ 3A and invites Ms. Wortman to speak. Ms. Wortman begins by directing the Board to the June 29th memo that she gave them with the three proposed zoning changes. The first topic would be 40A§ 3A and rezoning the entire Highway Business District. She would add an allowed use of mixed use, housing, and multifamily housing to the Highway Business District. She proceeds to say that the challenge with only changing the east side from China Moon to North Street would be that most of it is in Residence B not Highway Business District. She believes that you need to think about what there is today and can existing properties add density. Instead of thinking that someone would offer WS a deal to knock down Redstone and build residential units, instead you think that WS is allowed residential so they build up from what exists. You think that Sunnyhurst Plaza is a single story retail property. They could put housing above. Farmhill is also single story retail that might put residential above and add density. She knows they think what about traffic, what about parking. When you add those uses that is addressed through Site Plan. As a follow up to the last time, the big concern was the commercial base and how housing would effect this. She had the tax collector's office pull the top twenty nonresidential taxpayers. Only three reside in Highway Business District. Number one was Redstone, number ten on the list was Stop & Shop and number sixteen on the list is Brickpoint Properties which is 2 Main Street, the property next to the 99. So when you talk about the worries of this with the commercial tax base, the idea that Sato II all of a sudden becomes housing, which could happen if it were to be a 40B application, is that really a negative change? Mr. K. Dolan believes it is as a business would be going away. Ms. Wortman's response to that is that it's currently vacant. There are a lot of single story properties along Main Street that could redevelop creating more density. Mr. K. Dolan says that is assuming the people in Town want that. He believes that's a decision that they are going to have to make at Town Meeting. Do we want more density or not? He knows that's the charge under 40A§ 3A, give us more density, but does the Town want that. Mr. K. Dolan mentions that he doesn't believe Redstone adding residential above would be bad, but Mr. Houghton believes that they'd have to knock it down. He doesn't believe that you could do housing and retail and make the parking work, not even close. Ms. Wortman adds that that isn't a design issue but a regulatory issue. The parking requirements could be dealt with. Ms. Wortman reiterates that she feels strongly about adding those uses to all of Highway Business district which is not just the China Moon property area. It's all of the highway area, like the bottom of Montvale. Ave. There are a couple of properties there. It's the navy blue on the zoning map. It's got to go somewhere to comply with 40A§ 3A. When you think of tax revenue, it's a way of making change without risking the bottom line as much. She continues to say that the highest contributors to the nonresidential tax base are in the Commercial I

District when you take Redstone out of the equation. She wouldn't use Commercial I to meet the requirements of 40A§ 3A.

Mr. Vallarelli asks what Ms. Wortman is looking for. Is this for the next Town Meeting? Ms. Wortman responds that it is. Mr. Vallarelli talks about his surprise with the 65% owner occupant number Mr. Dolan had mentioned. Ms. Wortman states that with the mixed use residential the units can be condos or rental units. It is nice to provide rentals to give people the opportunity to live here because it's expensive. Mr. Vallarelli would like to keep the flavor of small town Stoneham. He doesn't want to be Malden. He believes that if Redstone becomes apartments the town will go downhill. Mr. K. Dolan brings up the proposed meeting with the Select Board. Mr. K. Dolan and Mr. Vallarelli agree that they might see how the Select Board feels about complying with 40A§ 3A. Ms. Wortman states that she was looking for direction tonight. She believes it would be great if they'd like to meet with the Select Board. Ms. Wengen wants to be clear that Ms. Wortman prefers both sides of Main Street be rezoned. Ms. Wortman states that she would like all of Highway Business included. Mr. Vallarelli believes that they should have a broader discussion with the Select Board and other entities in town that might want a say like the School Committee.

Next Ms. Wortman discusses her proposed inclusionary bylaw change. She brings up fee in lieu of as an option. If we are going to amend the bylaw would the Board like to do something like that? She asks if they are interested in density bonuses. She would like the Board's appetite before drafting something. Mr. K. Dolan likes her thoughts in the memo provided. He believes inclusionary zoning is a must, but should it be in multifamily zones or all zones? Ms. Wortman believes that a thought to consider is keeping the language standard but allow a process in which applicants can seek a Special Permit to waive or lower units in lieu of payment. It is discretionary and it is optional. It allows a waiver of sorts. And the Planning Board can always say no. Mr. K. Dolan states that Somerville has that option. You can pay your way out of it a little bit. Mr. K. Dolan thinks you'd definitely want inclusionary with the multifamily, not sure about single family, you might want a payment in lieu of. It might be appropriate. Ms. Wengen asks what the density bonus gets us. Ms. Wortman uses the example that if the parking requirement is 1.7 and the affordable component is 12%, the developer might build 18% affordable to get their parking requirement lowered. It's like bartering. Mr. K. Dolan says that you reward them for building more affordable units. The Board would like Ms. Wortman to look into that. Ms. Wengen believes it's an interesting concept. Mr. K. Dolan would like it be by a project by project basis. Some sites like 95 Maple make perfect sense with nothing else around there is appropriate. A site on Main Street might not be appropriate.

Ms. Wortman discusses lowering the parking requirements in the Central Business District and with multifamily. She suggests reducing parking for housing in the downtown be 1.0 space per unit/dwelling. While reviewing the parking requirements, she noticed multifamily (3+units) is inconsistent. Most developments in recent years, Fallon Rd, Maple St, the hospital, have had the parking reduced to 1.7. Mr. K. Dolan thought you'd get credit for what was already existing. Mr. Houghton explains you get what is currently allowed. Ms. Wortman continues to explain what changes she has made and why with the 1.7 spaces per dwelling.

Mr. Vallarelli recognizes Anthony Wilson, 181 Central Street. He supports the goal of reducing the parking requirements but he asks the Board to look around when they drive home. There is a problem with cars parking on the sidewalk. We need to correct this problem before reducing the requirements. Ms. Wortman states that that is an enforcement issue. She mentions that the Traffic Advisory Committee is aware of it. Mr. Wilson

mentions that when the snow ban, winter parking ban comes into play, it is worse. Mr. K. Dolan states it is a legitimate concern, but he doesn't believe it should hold up this zoning change.

Mr. Houghton asks for clarification regarding who would submit the article to rezone China Moon. Mr. K. Dolan believes he should work on one, but it's likely Ms. Wortman or the Board will have something. Mr. Houghton could do a backup with just an overlay.

Mr. Houghton discusses 72 Central Street. It's mixed zoned. This property is primarily Central Business District but the portion that abuts Central Street is Residence B. He would like to make it all Central Business District. Mr. K. Dolan asks if he is proposing to fix just his client's parcel or the rest of the mixed zoning on the street. Mr. Houghton feels that's up to the Board but believes it should all be made Central Business District. Ms. Wortman thinks that the goal should always be to fix the zoning when you see that the lots are split. Mr. K. Dolan asks if the houses are preexisting nonconforming. Mr. Houghton states that housing is allowed in Central Business. Ms. Wengen asks if that means they wouldn't be impacting the owners of the other properties by fixing the split lots. Mr. Houghton thinks they should have consistency. In Central Business you need to have commercial on the street in the front, so it would make them existing nonconforming. Ms. Wortman states that split lot zoning is bad. Ms. Wengen asks what the mechanics are to do this. Mr. Houghton states that part of the street is fixed and the map is amended. Ms. Wengen asks if we ask Ms. Wortman to work on an article. She can write it with Mr. Houghton. Ms. Wengen asks if we would tell the property owners. Ms. Wortman states that we will make sure the zoning map is accurately depicting the zoning before proceeding. Zoning changes do not require notice, but the Town will make these property owners aware of what the Town is planning with the rezoning with these few affected properties.

Ellen McBride, 30 Butler Avenue asks a question about housing and our affordable calculation. She wants to know how close the calculation is to the 1.5 land calculation. She would like it formally calculated. Ms. Wortman states that the State has to approve the calculation and they haven't done so yet. Mr. Houghton states that it's hard to prove what is affordable. He uses halfway houses as an example. Mr. K. Dolan states that it is a good topic to discuss with the Select Board.

Ms. Wortman explains that the Stoneham Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) would like the Board along with other stakeholders in Town to consider sending a letter to the MBTA in support of the new bus route. She drafted a version of the letter for the Planning Board to send. Mr. K. Dolan asks where the bus route would run. Ms. Wortman explains they would do an east west connection from Melrose to Anderson train station in Woburn. The hospital site would continue but then connect in Medford to a faster connection. Ms. Wortman explains that she and the Town Administrator asked the MBTA to consider taking care of the hole that exists near Fallon Rd. They need these support letters to know that they are on the right track. Mr. K. Dolan made a motion to send the letter of support which was seconded by Ms. Wengen. All members present voted in favor 4-0. (Dolan, Dolan, Wengen, Vallarelli)

Ms. Wengen asks if the Chamber of Commerce letter would be part of the Summit Meeting. Mr. K. Dolan doesn't mind talking to the Select Board about it. He respectfully disagrees with the content of the letter. The Boards are very pro-business and responsive to the Chamber. Mr. Houghton doesn't believe the whole thing should be thrown out, but it could be looked out.

Mr. Houghton asks that 371 Main Streets public hearing be continued again. This public hearing had been continued from April 13, 2022, April 20, 2022, May 18, 2022 and June 15, 2022. Mr. K. Dolan has recused himself as an abutter and Mr. Moynihan is not present. Mr. K. Dolan asks Mr. Houghton if time standards would be waived. Mr. Houghton agrees. Mr. T. Dolan made a motion to continue 371 Main Street until August 17, 2022 at 7PM which was seconded by Ms. Wengen. Three members voted in favor (T, Dolan, Wengen, Vallarelli) with Mr. K. Dolan abstaining.

The petitioners for 33 Country Club Road also asked that their public hearing be continued while waiting for an architect stamp. They have also waived all time standards. This public hearing had been continued from May 18, 2022 and June 15, 2022. Mr. K. Dolan made a motion to continue the public hearing until August 17, 2022 at 7PM which was seconded by Mr. T. Dolan. All members present voted in favor 4-0.

Mr. Houghton asks the Board to sign an ANR for 0 Washington Court so that it can be recorded.

Motion to adjourn made by Mr. K. Dolan and seconded by Mr. T. Dolan. All members voted in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 9:07 PM.

Documents and other exhibits used by the Planning Board during this meeting to be made part of the official record but not attached to these minutes:

Final draft of Town of Stoneham Subdivision Rules and Regulations 2022 as provided by DPW Director Brett Gonsalves

Memo from the Director of Planning & Community Development Re: Zoning Bylaws Review

A copy of a letter sent to the Stoneham Select Board by the Stoneham Chamber of Commerce regarding the use of ARPA funds

Respectfully submitted:

Maria Sagarino
Town Clerk