1. 7:01pm - Call to Order

Chair Brian Charville called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm and identified the Planning Board (PB) members in attendance, including himself, Vice Chair Flaws, Clerk Ed Champy III, Amy MacNulty and Page Wilkins. Chair Charville introduced staff members in attendance – Director Emilie Cademartori and Administrative Assistant Sondria Berman, and stated the meeting was being recorded by video and audio to assist with the preparation of minutes.

2. Continued Public Hearing- 200 Essex Street - Scenic Road Bylaw and Public Shade Tree Bylaw Hearing

Chair Charville requested a motion to re-open the public hearing at 200 Essex Street for public shade tree removal requests under the Scenic Road Bylaw; Vice Chair Flaws moved in favor and Ms. MacNulty seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

Chair Charville requested a motion to open the public hearing for the removal of four public shade trees under the Public Shade Tree Bylaw at 200 Essex Street; Ms. Wilkins moved in favor and Vice Chair Flaws seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

Chair Charville requested a motion to waive the reading of the published public hearing notice for the Public Shade Tree Bylaw request; Clerk Champy moved in favor and Ms. Wilkins seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

Attorney Andrew Delory, Esq., presented on behalf of 200 Essex Street and noted the following members were in attendance: James MacArthur, certified arborist; James Emmanuel, landscape architect; and Eric Lane, civil engineer for Hayes Engineering, Inc. Atty. Delory stated his clients were slated to arrive shortly. Atty. Delory offered a summary of the changes made to the site plan and tree removal requests since the start of the public hearings at 200 Essex Street. He explained that the site plan was reviewed and changed from a double curb cut driveway to a single curb cut and driveway, and that type and number of trees identified for removal had changed with site plan revisions to reflect the current four trees now proposed. He referenced the criteria for hazardous tree designation and removal under the Town's public shade tree bylaw; and stated the landscape plan depicts the replacement of one street tree, as well as the mitigation tree and shrub plantings for the Tree Preservation Bylaw and the recently issued Order of Conditions from the Conservation Commission. Atty. Delory continued that the limitations due to wetland setbacks and septic engineering requirements confined the septic to a particular location on the property, abutting the right of way.

Atty. Delory stated one tree in the center of the driveway is dead, and therefore should be removed. He stated the previous Town Engineer chose the location of the driveway to provide the best line of sight for entry/egress to the property. Ms. Wilkins inquired about the sightline given the chosen species of tree to be planted along the front of the property (eastern red cedars) and their size; Atty. Delory stated he would let the landscape architect speak in more detail about the projected size of the trees and sightline considerations but believed with tree removal, the sightline would be unobstructed by vegetation.

Chair Charville welcomed certified arborist James MacArthur, owner of Professional Environmental Services located in Lynn, Massachusetts to address the PB. Mr. MacArthur described an overview of his arborist report, stating he was hired to review the health and hazardousness of the four street trees at 200 Essex Street. He discussed the manner in which he assessed each of the trees, and concluded three were in decline and one was dead. He noted that given the location of the trees adjacent to the high school, it would be safer to have them removed.

Ms. Wilkins asked about the tree risk assessment standards and the likelihood of failure being omitted from the report; she asked about a specific ISA form that is used to assess the likelihood of failure and if it was used during Mr. MacArthur's report. Mr. MacArthur stated the ISA form is not an universal formula for assessment; he noted that arborists use the form differently, some use the likelihood of failure scale as "low, medium, high" or issue a numerical equivalent. He noted that his approach to tree assessment is made on a case-by-case basis; he stated the likelihood of failure in two years of the two white pines under review is "extremely high," and for the Norway maple and red cedar, his assessment was "medium to high".

Ms. Wilkins asked about the other assessment indicators of tree decline including broken branches, diminished tree canopy and hollow trunk sounds; Mr. MacArthur noted he would use a rubber hammer to bang on the tree and listen to the depth of sound produced which would suggest the degree of decay. Mr. Champy noted that coring through a tree is another means of determining internal decay; Mr. MacArthur noted it can be done but often the test causes additional decay in the tree.

John Tomasz, DPW Director and Tree Warden for the Town of Lynnfield, addressed the PB and stated he had no issue with Mr. MacArthur's credentials. He continued that he agrees the two pine trees should be removed, and noted the other trees are in decline. Mr. Tomasz expressed concern about the sightlines for entry and egress, especially towards the Peabody side of Essex street. Overall, Mr.

Tomasz agreed with Mr. MacArthur's assessment of the four trees, and requested mitigation in the form of three more tree plantings at the High School. Mr. Tomasz commented that as a Tree Warden, he is it often difficult to predict with certainty a timeline for trees to fall.

Ms. Wilkins asked if the town has its own arborist to review the trees; Mr. Tomasz stated the town does not have its own arborist, but that when a tree issue is complex or deserving of an arborist, the Tree Warden will hire one on behalf of the town on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Cademartori asked about tree mitigation for the removal of the public shade trees; Atty. Delory stated if the Town requests tree mitigation to be done at the high school, his clients would be amenable to doing so. Director Cademartori stated that the mitigation from the Tree Warden per the Public Shade Tree Bylaw is distinct from the mitigation of the Scenic Road Bylaw (and the Tree Preservation Bylaw).

Director Cademartori stated that the previous Town Engineer requested the applicant change the site plan to reflect a single curb cut instead of two and asked Mr. Tomasz if he was in agreement with this new site plan; Mr. Tomasz stated the new curb cut is acceptable.

Ms. MacNulty asked Mr. Tomasz if he was concerned about the proposed mitigation for the Tree Preservation Bylaw with a row of red cedars along the front of the property; Mr. MacArthur noted that replanting of large canopy trees close to powerlines is not an ideal location. Ms. Wilkins echoed Ms. MacNulty's dissatisfaction with the row of green trees from an aesthetic perspective as it related to the Scenic Road Bylaw.

James Emmanuel, landscape architect for 200 Essex Street, addressed the PB and discussed the tree mitigation shown on the site plan. Mr. Emmanuel noted the row of trees at the front and sides of the property are a result of mitigation for the Tree Preservation Bylaw. He noted some canopy trees will remain at the front of the property but outside the right of way, and that the applicant is proposing to plant one canopy tree in the right of way. Mr. Emannuel also noted the row of red cedar will be set back further than the existing street trees reducing sightline issues but also maintaining the required distance from the septic and from powerlines, as well. Mr. Emmanuel stated the landscape plan was designed to address the mitigation requirements for the TPB, the septic limitations, and the aesthetic mix of landscaping tree species for the applicant.

Chair Charville requested audience comment; Stephen Todisco of 14 Chatham Way expressed concern regarding the process of the Scenic Road Bylaw. He expressed dissatisfaction that the arborist

review was only completed by the applicant, but not by the Town. He argued the report's classification of trees being in "decline" could be said about many of the street trees in Lynnfield and yet, the trees continue to live for years. Mr. Todisco asked about spacing of the trees on the site plan; Mr. Emmanuel stated they were drawn to scale. Mr. Todisco expressed disappointment the proposed row of red cedars could be approved in place of the existing street trees. He claimed the site plan could be re-designed to avoid the public shade tree removals.

Clerk Champy responded to Mr. Todisco and stated that the lot has a number of limitations as to the area where a home, septic, trees, and driveway can be installed. Mr. Champy stated that the PB only has jurisdiction over the right-of-way on the property and can only exercise review and approval for alternations to trees and stone walls in this area.

Chair Charville noted Mr. Tomasz's comments in support of the arborist's report made a strong case for the removal of the trees. Ms. Wilkins stated that the trees under consideration for removal are remarkable natural structures that maintain the beauty and character of Essex Street as a scenic road. She expressed additional disappointment that the proposed mitigation for the TPB adds more concern about the aesthetic of the scenic road, as the tree plantings do not restore the what is being removed. She continued that the arborists report cites reasons why the trees appear to be in decline, but does not go so far as to state the trees are an imminent threat. She expressed concern over the potential precedent being set for tree removal requests under the Scenic Road Bylaw, where the evaluation standard between a tree in decline, versus a tree that is dead, are not separately considered when determining the hazardousness of a tree. She noted that to avoid liability, the Town would likely prefer to remove the trees if put on notice that they could come down.

Chair Charville requested additional audience comment; Jane Bandini of 537 Essex Street, stated the proposed mitigation replacement of three trees at the high school is not equivalent to the beauty, canopy, and resource value of the existing four trees proposed for removal. Ms. Bandini expressed a desire to see a variety of trees planted along the front of the property; she added that telephone wire concerns could be avoided by selecting canopy trees that are shorter in height at approximately 40-50feet tall.

Mr. Tomasz stated there are likely hundreds of public shade trees that, if assessed, could be deemed "at-risk" of coming down, and that he has observed healthy trees coming down in storms, where older, more compromised trees in decline survived. Mr. Tomasz stated as Tree Warden, he

bears a responsibility to address tree concerns as they arise and prefers to err on the side of caution so that the Town is not held liable should a tree be kept when it was deemed a potential hazard by an arborist.

Chair Charville requested a motion the PB engage with a consulting arborist to conduct an evaluation of the four proposed trees for removal as a second opinion; Vice Chair Flaws stated she did not believe it was necessary to obtain a second opinion given the testimony provided by an arborist and the Tree Warden; Chair Charville concurred. Ms. MacNulty moved in favor of the motion, expressing her desire for a second opinion. Ms. MacNulty also asked the landscape architect if he did not have the requirements of the TPB if the landscaping design could change; Mr. Emmanuel stated the density of trees would likely change. Director Cademartori reminded the applicant a monetary contribution to the tree fund is an alternate form of acceptable mitigation and that tree planting mitigation can be done in or outside the right of way. Chair Charville expressed hesitation to approve any tree mitigation in the right of way that would obstruct necessary sightline distances. PB members discussed how to allow for flexibility with mitigation plantings.

Chair Charville requested additional audience comment; hearing none, Chair Charville restated Mr. Tomasz's decision on the Public Shade Tree hearing: that the Tree Warden approves the removal of the four proposed public shade trees at 200 Essex Street, on the condition that mitigation be done in the form of four additional tree plantings; Mr. Tomasz added that he plans to meet with the engineer and landscape architect to see what trees can be planted at 200 Essex Street in the right of way, and if not, to determine alternate planting locations for each of the four mitigated trees.

Chair Charville requested a motion the PB support the Tree Warden's approval regarding the proposed tree removals and mitigation requirements under the Public Shade Tree Bylaw at 200 Essex Street; Clerk Champy moved in favor and Ms. MacNulty seconded the motion. Ms. Wilkins noted her appreciation of the Tree Warden's mitigation requirements to replant four trees and hoped that two of the trees could be planted as street trees at 200 Essex Street; she addressed PB members and stated she hoped the PB would consider ways to improve the process of tree removals under the Scenic Road Bylaw; she addressed the applicant and encouraged them to consider modifying their mitigation landscaping plans under the TPB. Chair Charville asked what processes could be improved other than requiring a second arborist's report; Ms. Wilkins expressed a desire to hire a consulting arborist for the Town and funding tree maintenance for the Town's public shade trees. The motion passed 5-0.

Chair Charville requested a motion to close the public hearing on the Public Shade Tree Bylaw at 200 Essex Street; Clerk Champy moved in favor and Vice Chair Flaws seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

PB members discussed what plan could be referenced for mitigation under the Scenic Road Bylaw and the new curb cut at 200 Essex Street; Director Cademartori stated the mitigation could be assigned to the Tree Warden but the curb cut approval would need a reference to the plan at hand. Clerk Champy requested a motion the PB approve the curb cut as depicted on the site plan titled, "Landscape Plan" dated January 22, 2024 and approve the removal of the four proposed public shade trees on the condition that the applicant mitigate with tree plantings as determined by the Tree Warden. Clerk Champy amended his motion to specify that the removal of the four public shade trees was approved by the PB under the Scenic Road Bylaw. Chair Charville moved in favor of the motion, as amended, and Ms. Wilkins seconded the motion. Chair Charville requested further comment from Atty. Delory and audience members; hearing none, Chair Charville called for the vote, and the motion passed 5-0.

Chair Charville requested a motion to close the public hearing on the Scenic Road Bylaw for 200 Essex Street; Ms. MacNulty moved in favor and Vice Chair Flaws seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

3. ZBA Case 24-3 51 Merrow Road Section 8.3 Accessory Dwelling Unit

Ms. MacNulty disclosed that she is a direct abutter to the applicant at 51 Merrow Road; she noted that she did not need to recuse herself from the dais but would abstain from voting.

Director Cademartori stated the proposed accessory dwelling unit at 51 Merrow Road is an example of how bylaw regulations were circumvented; she stated that prior to the applicant's request to install an accessory dwelling unit, the applicant had pulled a building permit to add an addition to their home. After the addition was finished, they then applied for the current proposal to install an accessory dwelling unit. By applying separately, the applicant was able to install a larger accessory dwelling unit that would otherwise have not been permittable.

Director Cademartori stated that the addition meets all exterior zoning requirements. In reviewing the interior layout of the accessory unit, Director Cademartori stated the Board of Health

shared concerns about septic compliance, relative to the size of the unit as a two-story dwelling and number of bedrooms.

Clerk Champy asked if the Bylaw restricts tenants to a family member; Director Cademartori concurred. Vice Chair Flaws voiced support for improvements to the Bylaw that would improve enforcement. Ms. MacNulty stated that as an abutter, she noted the applicant did their best to make the addition as hidden as possible from the street. She also stated that the Bylaw is intended to give residents a way to provide housing to family members.

Chair Charville asked when the building permit was pulled; Director Cademartori stated it was opened in the spring 2023. Chair Charville noted that the Bylaw does not have a look-back period or a time-frame limit before a special permit request can be made.

Chair Charville asked for PB member comments and recommendations on the special permit; Vice Chair Flaws expressed her desire to see the Bylaw amended; PB members discussed how the improvements would lead to better enforcement of the bylaw.

Chair Charville requested audience comment; hearing none, Chair Charville requested a motion the PB not oppose the requested special permit for an accessory dwelling at 51 Merrow Road, with the condition that the PB note in their recommendation letter to the ZBA the following: that there was a home addition completed approximately one year ago with the intention to install an accessory dwelling, and that the PB welcomes any proposal by the ZBA to rectify this issue of circumventing the Bylaw's regulations. Ms. Wilkins moved in favor and Vice Chair Flaws seconded the motion. Ms. MacNulty recused herself from voting. The motion carried 4-0, with Ms. MacNulty abstaining.

4. ZBA Case #24-1 15 Wing Road Section 9.3.8 Special Permit Groundwater Protection Overlay District

Attorney Tim Doyle presented a Special Permit request on behalf of the applicant for 15 Wing Road to construct an addition that extends a single car garage to a two-car garage and the construction of a living space above the garage. Atty. Doyle noted that the existing conditions state the property is existing non-conforming with an imperviousness calculation of 20%. He stated that the new addition would increase imperviousness to 27%, but that with the installation of a Cul-tec roof run-off system the imperviousness calculations would be reduced to 15% bringing the property into compliance with the groundwater protection bylaw (GWP).

Atty. Doyle stated the calculations for system infiltration were based on a one-year rain event. Clerk Champy inquired if the one-year rain event would be sufficient mitigation for stormwater mitigation; Director Cademartori stated that the zoning bylaw is not specific to a calculation standard for rain events, but that regulations for site plan review include mention of 2, 10, and 100-year storm event calculations. Director Cademartori noted that a 1- year rain event is not a significant threshold; Atty. Doyle stated the engineer believes the system can be expanded as needed.

Director Cademartori stated she asked DPW Director John Tomasz as acting Town Engineer to review the plans and issue engineering recommendation(s) to the ZBA ahead of their meeting. Clerk Champy stated it is important that the homeowner understand that the system as outlined on the plan will likely be inadequate should a more significant rainfall event than the 1-year storm occur; he continued that if the homeowner understands the risk and the system is compliant, he would not oppose issuing a favorable recommendation to the ZBA.

Chair Charville asked for audience comment, hearing none, Chair Charville requested a motion the PB not oppose the special permit under Section 9.3.8 Groundwater Protection District for 15 Wing Road, subject to the ZBA receiving comments from Mr. Tomasz on the infiltration system's adequacy and subject to the ZBA reviewing calculations for rainfall exceeding a 1-year storm event. Clerk Champy moved in favor, and Vice Chair Flaws seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

5 MIN RECESS- to resume at 8:53pm

<u>5. Continued Public Hearing- 1301 Main Street – Section 10.5 Special Permit Elderly Housing – The Regency at Lynnfield by Toll Brothers, Inc.</u>

Chair Charville requested a motion the PB re-open the public hearing for a special permit under Section 10.5 Elderly Housing for 1301 Main Street/The Regency at Lynnfield proposal; Ms. Wilkins moved in favor and Clerk Champy seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

Civil engineer Scott Cameron of the Morin-Cameron Group introduced those in attendance on behalf of applicant, Toll Brothers: Jeff Bandini of McMahon Associates, Inc.; Dave Buckley and Ted Merchant of Toll Brothers, Inc., and staff engineer Jeff Powers from the Morin-Cameron group.

Chair Charville requested an update from Director Cademartori regarding the selection of the Town's peer reviewer; Director Cademartori stated the Town solicited three bids, two of which

returned proposals for consideration. Director Cademartori stated that it would be beneficial for the PB to consider if all aspects of each proposal are necessary or redundant. Chair Charville asked the names and scope of the two peer reviewer proposals; Director Cademartori stated she received proposals from TEC and Beta, and that each included a review of stormwater, transportation, roadway design, WPA performance standards, and compliance with town bylaws and zoning.

Ms. Wilkins stated that Beta's proposal appeared to include a more detailed description of meetings they would attend; Director Cademartori stated she reached out to TEC for clarification on cost estimates for meeting attendance and was told meetings were based on an hourly rate and TEC estimated approximately four four-hour meetings. Director Cademartori stated that it is beneficial to have flexibility as it relates to meeting costs. She noted TEC continues to serve as the peer reviewer for a similar elder housing project by Toll Brothers in Boxford, Mass.

Chair Charville asked for PB comment on the breadth of the peer review proposals; Ms. MacNulty stated she agreed with topics covered in the proposal. Director Cademartori stated that TEC's proposal, unlike Beta's, does not include septic and wastewater review; she noted TEC would sub-out a review for this review.

Vice Chair Flaws recommended the PB begin with the traffic discussion; she noted that her concerns were related to sightlines for entry and egress. Chair Charville noted that the increase in traffic during peak hours is important to review. Ms. MacNulty asked if for future meetings Toll Brothers can be placed earlier in the agenda; Chair Charville suggested the PB consider hosting special meetings devoted to the Toll Brothers special permit hearing to allow ample time for discussion.

Mr. Cameron stated he planned to present the traffic impact reports for the project. He added that with respect to septic discussions the project selected the Presby system for its enhanced level of wastewater treatment.

Jeffrey Bandini of McMahon Associates, Inc. presented the traffic studies conducted as part of the Toll Brother's project; Director Cademartori stated the traffic study report had been submitted in December and is on file at the PB office as well as available on the town website. Mr. Bandini reviewed the current conditions for car speed and crash data, citing the 85th percentile speed on Main Street was 39mph. Mr. Bandini reviewed Mass DOT's crash data within 250 feet of the proposed driveway installation over the past five years and stated there were no reported vehicular crashes in that area. He combined the state highway stopping sight distance criteria with the 85th percentile speed of

39mph to confirm the proposed driveway exceeds the state minimum sight distance requirements of 305 feet, with 600 feet in the southbound direction and 365 feet in the northbound direction on Main Street.

Mr. Bandini stated that based on the number of units (66), housing type (elderly housing) and peak hours for travel (weekday afternoons), the total number of vehicles expected to enter/leave the property during this time is estimated at 41 and 32 vehicles, respectively. Mr. Bandini added that there are no anticipated impacts to roadway operations; he noted however that vegetation within the sight distance triangle should be trimmed to at or below 2.5 feet high.

Ms. Wilkins asked about the details for how the estimated number of vehicles (73) entering and existing the property was calculated; Mr. Bandini noted that estimates are based on the type of housing, which for the current project was elder housing. Ms. MacNulty asked if there was any distinction based on age demographics in elder housing; Mr. Bandini stated he was unaware of distinctions based on age demographics over 55.

Chair Charville asked what the traffic controls will be at the base of the roadway; Mr. Bandini stated the applicant is proposing stop controls and additional signage. Chair Charville confirmed that other than stopping signage, the roadway of Main Street will remain largely the same; Mr. Bandini concurred.

Vice Chair Flaws asked about crash data and to what extent it will be an accurate predictor of future crashes given that there is no pre-existing roadway; Mr. Bandini stated there are no existing conditions that would warrant a crash hazard. Vice Chair Flaws suggested more traffic controls be installed on Main Street, such as a stoplight. Clerk Champy stated that based on the already high volume of traffic on Main Street, installing a stoplight may result in traffic back-ups on Main Street.

Chair Charville asked if the specific section of Main Street is a county road or a town road;

Director Cademartori stated it is a town road and the town sets the speed limit, which is 25mph. PB

members discussed the speed limit, roadway speeds, traffic controls, and demographic considerations that contribute to roadway safety. Clerk Champy recommended raised crosswalks as a consideration to reduce speed of vehicles on Main Street.

Director Cademartori suggested the applicant schedule a meeting with the Lynnfield police chief to see if there are any recommendations about traffic safety on Main Street; Clerk Champy recommended a conversation with the DPW as well. Director Cademartori stated the Town plans to

install another twenty electric speed signs, and it could be worthwhile to investigate if any are planned for Main Street.

Chair Charville emphasized turning left out of the development site onto Main Street may prove difficult if oncoming cars exceed the speed limits prescribed; he recommended mitigating speeds on Main Street would make the roadway safer for vehicles entering/exiting the property.

Chair Charville asked for audience comment; Jane Bandini asked about the 2.5 feet sight distance triangle and what vegetation would be removed; Mr. Bandini stated the sightlines would need to be completely clear of obstructions.

Ms. MacNulty asked about the Tree Preservation Bylaw; Director Cademartori stated that the tree plan is expected to be revised due to a mistake, and that the PB can review it if they so choose.

Mr. Cameron discussed utilities; he reviewed existing and future water main plans through Lynnfield Center Water District (LCWD) that expand water access to upper Main Street, Friendship Lane and south through Sagamore Golf Course to reach Vallis Way with associated hydrant placements. Mr. Cameron noted the Main Street-Lowell Street loop would assist with maintaining adequate water pressure.

Ms. MacNulty asked if the project will strive to meet a net-zero impact; Mr. Cameron stated the appliances to be installed are likely energy-star rated; he also noted that there will be no irrigation from LCWD. PB members discussed irrigation concerns and possible suggestions for water recharge systems. Mr. Cameron discussed grading, with no slopes over an 8% change in grading. Mr. Cameron stated he already met with Fire Chief Davis, who recommended additional hydrant installations.

Mr. Cameron discussed the project will include the Presby wastewater system, distinct from a traditional pipe and stone system. He reviewed the details of the system operation and cited that it is well used throughout the state especially for land that includes any sloping. Director Cademartori stated the Presby system features more nutrient removal and will offer more advanced treatment of wastewater.

Ms. MacNulty inquired about the septic capacity estimates; Mr. Cameron stated the system is sized to be Title V compliant, and that the estimates used to size the system for wastewater are generous and intended to account for fluctuation in wastewater flow.

Clerk Champy inquired about heating utilities; Mr. Merchant stated they anticipate installing propane tanks for gas heating and electric heat pumps for water heat. Chair Charville asked if there

would be one propane tank per home; Mr. Merchant stated that the tanks would likely serve multiple homes. Director Cademartori stated that setbacks for propane tanks can make installation prohibitive; she recommended placing the propane tank locations on the site plan prior to approval.

Chair Charville requested audience comment; Ms. Bandini asked if individual homeowners will be able to convert from propane to electric; Mr. Merchant stated there is no mandate requiring a homeowner use propane, and that an owner could choose to convert their home if desired. Chair Charville asked for further comment; hearing none, Chair Charville asked for further comment from PB members; hearing none, Chair Charville requested the PB issue a decision on the peer review.

Director Cademartori asked for upcoming meeting logistics; PB members discussed topic schedule and peer review planning; Chair Charville recommended a special meeting be held to discuss peer review feedback. Chair Charville recommended the next PB meeting in February 28, 2024 to discuss the financial impacts, environmental impacts, and architectural design; Mr. Cameron concurred it was best to continue the meetings. Chair Charville recommended Wednesday, March 13,th 2024 for a special meeting for peer review discussion; Director Cademartori said she would look into meeting room reservation and would confirm the date with the applicant if it could be reserved.

Vice Chair Flaws reiterated her concern about the use of propane tanks; she referenced the RiverWalk development in Concord as an example of how environmentally-friendly design can support present and future energy savings for generations to come.

Chair Charville requested a motion the PB engage TEC to provide peer review services for the Town regarding the Regency at Lynnfield project and authorize the Planning and Conservation Director and Planning Board Chair to sign any necessary agreements therein; Clerk Champy moved in favor and Ms. Wilkins seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

PB members discussed the scope of the peer review; Director Cademartori stated that the Board of Health has requested the peer review cover the septic review. Chair Charville asked PB to consider topics to omit from the peer review proposal; Clerk Champy stated the traffic study peer review could be redundant unless recommendations are made to improve roadway speeds on Main Street. Director Cademartori stated that TEC's scope includes identifying areas for improvement.

Ms. MacNulty asked about peer review for wetlands impact- specifically, the roadway that connects to Friendship Lane. Director Cademartori stated that a discussion would need to take place about alternative recommendations ahead of the peer review, but that the applicant is aware that their

Notice of Intent will need to address applicable environmental standards and protections. Chair Charville shared with audience members a description of the wetland crossing, and shared that the Lynnfield Fire Chief Davis was open to considering alternate design plans for a second egress that would be less impactful to the wetland. Mr. Cameron stated that the LCWD Superintendent John Scenna was interested in the Friendship Lane roadway construction as part of the water main construction to provide paved access for water main repairs. Mr. Cameron recommended engaging in further discussions with Mr. Scenna to determine if this was a necessary condition. Chair Charville stated he would reach out to Mr. Scenna to clarify his position. Ms. Wilkins noted that the Conservation Commission discussed the roadway at their previous meeting.

Chair Charville stated the PB intends to accept the full scope of the TEC proposal. Chair Charville requested audience comment; hearing none, Chair Charville requested a motion the PB continue the special permit public hearing for 1301 Main Street/The Regency at Lynnfield to Wednesday, February 28, 2024 at 7:00pm at the Merritt Center; Vice Chair Flaws moved in favor and Ms. Wilkins seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

6. Community Vision Plan – Draft & Feedback Survey

Chair Charville noted the draft plan had been posted by MAPC online the Tuesday prior for public review; Director Cademartori stated the feedback survey was not yet posted as MAPC wanted PB members to review and approve the format for the survey. Director Cademartori stated the office desired the form to be user-friendly and allow people to leave their open-ended feedback. Director Cademartori stated the revisions to the feedback survey are expected to be finished and the survey is expected to go live on Monday.

Ms. MacNulty recommended extending the feedback period an additional two weeks to March 1st to allow more time for review; Director Cademartori stated the survey extension would also extend their final draft presentation to the March PB meeting. PB members discussed the importance of allowing open-ended feedback; Director Cademartori stated some pointed questions are helpful but overall the survey needed to include open-ended portions. Chair Charville agreed with the March 1st extension for the survey feedback; Director Cademartori discussed press and outreach to announce the draft plan.

Chair Charville asked for further PB comments on the draft plan; Chair Charville asked for audience comment and staff comments; hearing none, Chair Charville closed the discussion.

7. Approval of Minutes – December 20th 2023 Special Meeting and Regular Meeting Minutes

Director Cademartori noted some typographical errors had been corrected since the circulation of the minutes; Ms. Berman cited clarification changes made by Chair Charville to the draft minutes. Chair Charville requested a motion the PB accept the minutes, inclusive of his changes and the typographical errors as corrected for the two sets of PB meeting minutes on December 20, 2023; Ms. MacNulty moved in favor and Ms. Wilkins seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

8. Other Items

Director Cademartori asked PB members to sign the mylar plans for the Vallis Way Modified Definitive Plan Set prior to the end of the meeting.

Administrative Items for Next Meeting

Director Cademartori stated the next PB meeting will include the continued public hearing for 1301 Main Street; ADU Bylaw revisions and noise ordinance adoptions; Amendments to Tree Bylaw Regulations. She added that conflict of interest and state ethics exams will be distributed to PB members shortly.

Ms. MacNulty asked about the playground in front of the Starbucks at Market Street; Director Cademartori stated she would inquire with Market Street management.

10. Adjournment

Chair Charville requested a motion for adjournment; Vice Chair Flaws moved in favor and Ms. Wilkins seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Sondria Berman

Land Use Administrative Assistant, Planning and Conservation