



TOWN OF SWAMPSCOTT

PLANNING BOARD

ELIHU THOMSON ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
22 MONUMENT AVENUE, SWAMPSCOTT, MA 01907

MEMBERS
ANGELA IPPOLITO, CHAIR
GEORGE POTTS, VICE CHAIR
BETH ISLER
BILL QUINN
JR YOUNG

STAFF
S. PETER KANE, DIR. OF COMM. DEV.
ANDREW LEVIN, ASSISTANT TOWN

SEPTEMBER 12, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Time: 7:00 – 9:50 pm
Location: Swampscott Senior Center, 200 Essex Street (rear)
Members Present: A. Ippolito, B. Quinn, B. Isler, G. Potts
Members Absent: JR Young
Others Present: Pete Kane (Dir. of Community Development), Neil Zolot (reporter), John D’Agostino (petitioner), Veronica Hobson (architect), Naomi Dreeben (Board of Selectman), Trisha Malphrus (Commission on Disability)

Meeting called to order at 7:10p by Chair Ippolito

MEETING MINUTES

The Board reviewed the minutes from the August 8, 2016, meeting. There were no comments from the Board members.

MOTION : by B. Isler to approve the meeting minutes, seconded by A. Ippolito. Unanimously approved.

SITE PLAN REVIEW

PETITION 16-25

15 PHILLIPS BEACH AVE

This filing is a request by JOHN and KRISTIN D’AGOSTINO for a site plan special permit and special permit (nonconforming use/structure) to demolish and replace an existing house with a new 3,209 sf two-story single family residence.

John D’Agostino (Petitioner) and Veronica Hobson (Architect) began the presentation by showing pictures of the existing site and current home. Ms. Hobson explained the current house is “Cape styled” and that the house is built on a steep grade. Ms. Hobson showed pictures of the property and how the grade grows from the front to the back of the house, leaving the basement portion visible including the current lower-level garage. Ms. Hobson and Mr. D’Agostino both explained that during the proposed demolition, only the top part of the house will be removed which is done to preserve the current fieldstone foundation. Mr. D’Agostino explained that there will be an addition of some foundation

during new construction. Mr. D’Agostino and Ms. Hobson both explained that an addition on the house will be removed and that on the opposite side of the house, a new 2-car garage will be constructed.

Ms. Hobson explained that there are some mature trees on the property that would be kept during construction, and that only some smaller trees would be removed for the addition of the new garage.

A. Ippolito asked if there would be blasting during demolition. Both Mr. D’Agostino and Ms. Hobson explained that during demolition, ledge removal on the property would be done, but that they hope the ledge will fall away easily by chipping rather than blasting.

A. Ippolito inquired if abutter notices had been sent out. P. Kane responded that notices would be sent for the ZBA hearing. Mr. D’Agostino added that he had talked with some direct neighbors of the property already, but had not spoken to the property owner behind his property.

G. Potts asked if there would be a full demolition. Mr. D’Agostino reiterated that the fieldstone foundation of the home would be preserved and only the top structure would be removed.

A. Ippolito asked if Mr. D’Agostino would be filling in the back of the property. Mr. D’agostino mentioned that there would be fill used to create terracing. This was outlined on a landscape plan that Ms. Hobson showed the Board. The Board had not previously seen this plan. The Board discussed this landscape plan, and Mr. D’Agostino and Ms. Hobson explained the driveway would stay gravel and that a future patio would also be made of pervious material. G. Potts asked if any 6-inch caliper trees or larger would be planted, to which Mr. D’Agostino replied that currently there are no plans for any.

The Board discussed the height of the residence now on the property and the new height. Currently the residence is one-and-a-half stories, due to the steep grade on the property. The new construction would be adding 8 feet, or one more story to the home, making it two-and-a-half stories.

The Board explained that a detailed landscape plan would be needed for the meeting with the Zoning Board of Appeals.

No more questions were asked and the Board found no issue with the petition.

MOTION: by G. Potts in support of the site plan special permit, seconded by B. Isler, unanimously approved.

P. Kane will draft up a letter of recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals, to be reviewed by A. Ippolito.

COMPLETE STREETS – PUBLIC PRESENTATION & DRAFT POLICY REVIEW

Peter Kane, Director of Community Development, presented and discussed with the Board and community members present the benefits of the Complete Streets model with a presentation named *“Bringing Complete Streets to*

Swampscott". The main points of the presentation revolved around the definition and reasons on why Complete Street practices are beneficial. The presentation also explained the Complete Streets process and draft policy review.

The presentation began by explaining that Complete Streets means roadways and areas accessible by everyone, regardless of age, ability, or type of travel (ie; bike, walk, car). The presentation went on to explain the tremendous potential and opportunities Complete Street practices bring. The presentation explained that currently, in many places many of the streets are unsafe and inadequate for all types of travel, and that these inadequacies affect children, people of color, the elderly, and low income areas. These inadequacies can stem from few ADA accommodation's, to streets having no sidewalks. The presentation continued with examples from in Swampscott where Complete Street practices could benefit. The presentation also showed areas in the Town that practices similar to those promoted in the Complete Streets model have recently been installed. P. Kane explained that the curb bump-outs at crosswalks, seen at Whitman and Orchard Road help reduce traffic speed, making pedestrians more visible when crossing and reduces travel distance on crosswalks. The presentation then segued into discussing different types of Complete Street practices. Some of these practices included, "sharrows", or arrows on roadways stating bikes and cars are allowed, helping bikers be more visible and slowing traffic. Other practices were highly visible painted crosswalks, wider sidewalks, separated bike lanes and protected bike lanes.

The presentation went on to discuss some of the other benefits of Complete Streets practices, such as the overall increased health of the community, increased safety, and the many economic benefits. Some of these economic benefits stemmed from slower traffic on streets and easily accessible sidewalks and transit paths in retail areas, which made retail stores in these areas more visible and easily accessible.

The process for bringing Complete Streets practices to Swampscott was outlined and its multi-step process was explained. P. Kane stated that adopting a Complete Streets policy is beneficial in that it can protect against agenda changes with new leadership. P. Kane went on to explain and discuss the multiple different state funding opportunities, such as grants or other incentives for implementing Complete Streets practices. P. Kane explained that the current draft policy for Swampscott was derived from policies by Weymouth, Lynn, and Salem (all three being nationally-ranked policies). Policies are evaluated by MassDOT on a 100-point scale, with four major point areas. These four are (1) Vision, (2) Core Commitment, (3) Best Practices, and (4) Implementation. Each area has a set amount of points that you can earn and a score of 80 points or higher is considered passing. P. Kane also mentioned there are extra credit opportunities as well that can result in a total of 8 extra points. P. Kane explained that there will be a public comment period for the next 30 days closing October 12th, at which point the policy will be sent to the Board of Selectmen and voted on at the next available meeting. P. Kane stated that it would hopefully be voted on at the BOS October 19 meeting.

P. Kane recommended the Board and community members in the audience go on [CompleteStreets.org](https://www.completestreets.org) for more information, and that the Complete Streets model was recommended through the 2025 Town Master Plan.

P. Kane then opened up the presentation for discussion and questions.

Naomi Dreeben (Board of Selectmen) asked when in the process the streets that need improvement are picked. P. Kane responded that this is decided in the mandatory prioritization plan which will be developed after the policy is adopted.

Ms. Dreeben then inquired as to what would be shown (ie; examples of which practices would be implemented on which streets) at the Board of Selectmen meeting when this policy is up for vote. P. Kane responded by explaining that the policy would not have specific practices which will be implemented on which streets. P. Kane explained that rather the policy stipulates who does the review, which boards it would go through, and a recording element to educate the public on the implementation process.

The Board then discussed how implementation of Complete Streets practices work with reducing vehicle transit lanes and adding safer public amenities. P. Kane explained that the level of service should not get below a “C level”. B. Isler then explained that level of service can get below a C level, but that the addition of Complete Street practices would never allow gridlock. B. Isler went on to explain that a small amount of congestion is good for the economy, as it can slow traffic down in retail areas, as well as make it safer for pedestrians.

Discussion was held on how the proposed rail trail would be affected by Complete Streets practices. P. Kane explained that Complete Street practices would help make streets that connect the rail trail more easily accessible and safer to travel on, by all modes of transportation. The Board discussed the positive benefits of this as well as the possibilities this creates.

The Board thanked P. Kane for his presentation and A. Ippolito mentioned it was necessary for the Board to review the policy at a later date.

DISCUSSION TOPICS

POTENTIAL ZONING OVERLAY FOR TRAIN STATION NEIGHBORHOOD

The Board then discussed their research they had undertaken for potential zoning changes for the train station neighborhood.

Smart Growth (40R) – G. Potts was assigned this topic and explained the research he had found.

G. Potts explained Smart Growth Law (MGL Chapter 40R) and how it promotes building affordable housing options in neighborhoods, preserving open space, and making neighborhoods more attractive and compact. G. Potts explained this is done with design standards being mandatory within the law for new developments and construction to follow. Smart Growth (40R) also requires less off-street parking in areas, promoting more alternative uses to driving. G. Potts mentioned that his research showed that many 40R developments occur in large and underused buildings. Discussion turned to the funding of implementing of a 40R zoning district and P. Kane explained that financial incentives come from the number of the units in a development. A. Ippolito went on to explain that there are bonus incentives involved as well for certain tasks such as educational costs created by new students. Discussion continued on potential areas within Swampscott where Smart Growth (40R) zoning would benefit. G. Potts inquired about the former Greenwood school site. P. Kane was hesitant, due to its distance from public transit and mentioned there was small likelihood to the Greenwood site becoming a 40R. The Board then discussed the 40R requirement that 20% of units must be affordable. The Board also discussed the level of flexibility in the design standards of the Smart Growth (40R) Law, and that they are subject to State review.

G. Potts then opened up his topic for questions.

Discussion around the General Glover zoning was brought up. A. Ippolito mentioned that the focus of General Glover was on compact design to allow for more green space, rather than parking. A. Ippolito continued to explain that the idea is that if development is in walkable areas with easily accessible transit, there will be less need for cars and parking. A. Ippolito discussed how important the design guidelines will be, and that they must strike a balance between development and greenspace.

The Board discussed local examples of public/private development, such as the outdoor deck at *The Landing* in Marblehead, and how it is a public space, but also used by the restaurant.

Ms. Dreeben asked about geographic boundaries of the 40R zoning area. G. Potts explained you would have to look at what is already in place (physically) and the already existing buildings in the area. B. Quinn explained that the large geographic circle on the supplemental map would include most of Essex Street and almost reach the High School. P. Kane mentioned that there are limits to 40R developments. P. Kane also explained that there can be other tools used within the train station neighborhood beyond Smart Growth (40R).

A. Ippolito asked if any more questions, to which there was none. A. Ippolito then asked B. Isler to summarize her research on Transit Oriented Development (TOD).

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)

B. Isler explained TOD encourages alternative transit instead of driving, density, and diverse land uses which would therefore help increase land value in areas. B. Isler noted that resistance to this zoning tool would most likely come from residents concerned about lower off-street parking requirements. But, B. Isler explained that it would be a waste to make parking lots instead of stores or housing. A. Ippolito then explained that the Mixed Use tool could be used and fit in both Smart Growth 40R and TOD areas. A. Ippolito then asked, in relevance to the train station neighborhood to compare 40R and TOD, discussing each's pros and cons over the other and flexibility each gives.

P. Kane explained that 40R requires heavy review from the State, while TOD has no review, and Mixed Use is locally regulated. A. Ippolito asked if Mixed Use can be done in overlay districts, to which P. Kane explained that it can be done. B. Quinn asked why use the Smart Growth 40R in areas? P. Kane explained to the Board that there are financial incentives with using 40R as well as surety to the regulations set up by the state, which adds more validity to design standards. P. Kane continued to explain that TOD has much more flexible design standards, but that critics can say they are not "real" standards.

The Board then went on to discuss the ability to promote and add commercial use in these areas. A. Ippolito mentioned that commercial development cannot be forced on developers, but that there could be the possibility of a trade off with developers. P. Kane then mentioned that Humphrey Street in areas has the potential for retail on the first floor, but could also be used as housing if needed. He mentioned that when the market does not support retail or commercial, there can be potential for housing. G. Potts asked about a potential trade-off situation where a developer could build 25% larger in residential, but must add in retail component, if this could potentially be possible? P. Kane explained that this could be possible, but that it must have Attorney General review and that you cannot force a property owner to build knowing it will be vacant.

A. Ippolito mentioned that when looking at the Housing Production Plan with regards to the direction that Swampscott housing is going, there will be a big push back from people who want typical housing, not small dense units. A. Ippolito went on to say that 40R speaks to the current needs of Swampscott, that the population is aging and that people are not buying large condos anymore, that these large and expensive housing developments are not the biggest needs. G. Potts mentioned that the biggest market at the moment he thought was two bath four bedroom homes, and P. Kane stated that there needs to be a mix of options.

P. Kane stated that there is possibility to mix Smart Growth (40R) and Transit Oriented Development in certain areas.

The Board then discussed examples of past housing developments and potential future development projects. A certain property was discussed, but P. Kane explained the topography of the area would make it very difficult to develop and build on.

The Board then went on to discuss visions for the train station neighborhood. A. Ippolito stated she would like to see and pursue a very train centric 40R area, G. Potts to this mentioned that 40R should be done on the major thoroughfares as well as Burrill Street and Essex Street. A. Ippolito said that she does not want to see more density on Rock Ave. A. Ippolito stated that she would like to see more Transit Oriented Development near Essex Street because it is near certain things already available. A. Ippolito asked about zoning and special permits, P. Kane explained that to reduce parking there needs to be a special permit.

A. Ippolito stated that Smart Growth is something that the Board must look at closely, that she does not want a blanket policy over the whole neighborhood, and that each place should be looked at specifically. A. Ippolito continued to explain that congestion at the moment is a problem but that with smaller units and easier ways to get around this can be eliminated. A. Ippolito did mention that the Board must be wary of putting too many units in an area and that parking creep is possible. A. Ippolito then mentioned that she was curious on how much time to spend on each place, and how to introduce projects and manage them.

P. Kane explained that Smart Growth is already being used in already developed areas, such as Peabody and Somerville. He went on to state that certain areas in Swampscott, such as Humphrey Street, already encourage greater density in a developed area.

A. Ippolito mentioned that she wondered how there can be an established guidance where the Town and the developer both get what they want. A. Ippolito continued to say that she would like to know how to manage the zoning so that it doesn't greatly hurt developers. G. Potts explained that zoning should not be designed for one specific developer and that zoning should not have the potential to be too dense. P. Kane explained some measures to help control zoning, such as height regulations or floor space regulations. G. Potts mentioned there are other ideas and possibilities as well.

A. Ippolito stated she would like to pursue and focus on 40R and deliberate 40R zones in particular stretches, as well as make TOD surrounding the 40R area, as shown on the supplemental map. G. Potts asked if you can make TOD more restrictive, to which P. Kane replied that you cannot tell a property owner, if multiple units, whether to make apartments or condos. The Board then discussed the affordability requirement for owner vs rental breakdown of the General Glover development. Discussion was then held on the pros and cons of affordable ownership and affordable rental properties. G. Potts mentioned that families or individuals could continue to benefit from an affordable house ownership even if they grow out of their previous financial situation. B. Isler stated that families or individuals can build

equity with their affordable housing situation, and P. Kane clarified that individuals or families can move out of low income homes if they grow out of their low-income need.

A. Ippolito proposed the idea of pursuing this project in the Spring, as it is such a large undertaking. G. Potts inquired about neighborhood involvement, to which P. Kane mentioned that there would be public input, and that after a previous article was published about proposed Smart Growth areas, pushback was heard about the potential of reduced parking. Community members believed that their on street parking would be reduced when it would only be off street parking requirements being reduced. P. Kane continued that he does want neighborhood and public input as the project moves on. Ms. Dreeben stated that she would expect resistance against reduction of off-street parking, and continued to mention that it is hard to change people's behavior (in regards to driving), to which the Board agreed. A. Ippolito mentioned that explaining Smart Growth centered transit would be important to explaining the reasoning behind reduction in off street parking requirements.

A. Ippolito asked that at the next meeting the Board discusses a timeline for the process to implement Smart Growth, TOD, and Mixed Use zoning practices. P. Kane mentioned that there might possibly be a guide book on 40R and that he would put together a rough map of the potential zoning.

B. Quinn asked what TOD would mean for existing properties. A. Ippolito and P. Kane explained that the zoning changes only affect new developments.

A. Ippolito asked P. Kane to put together goals, reasons for, strategies, and what is achieved with TOD surrounding 40R. A. Ippolito also asked P. Kane to start thinking about certain provisions at certain properties, the boundaries, and intent for each; what can and can't work.

ZONING MAP CHANGES

A. Ippolito continued her discussion about zoning district changes throughout town based on the actions in the Master Plan.

A. Ippolito began by discussing proposal to change zoning in certain areas by either "up-zoning" (ex. Changing an area from residential to business) or "down-zoning" (ex. Making an area more restrictive). A. Ippolito mentioned that several years ago there were changes made to the zoning bylaws, but that changes hadn't been made to the zoning map themselves. She continued to explain that certain areas currently in town have too much permissive zoning bylaws and that this causes some problems with development. A. Ippolito mentioned that the Board must look at what needs to be changed. She continued to explain that she wants to look at areas that need to be downzoned and areas where special permits already allow too much density. A. Ippolito then used the supplemental map she had to explain her changes. She stated that proximity to conservation areas and waterfront is very important.

A. Ippolito wanted to "down-zone" areas because they are out of sync with zoning principle, and that the new zoning should; (1) Respect and plan around the characteristics of the land, and (2) respect flood plains, land, and greenery.

A. Ippolito explained first potential area for "down-zoning" would be in the Olmsted Historical District and the nearby Counties neighborhood. A. Ippolito stated that she does not want each house to be changed but that certain areas within the Olmsted District be changed, that certain zoning designations in the area do not belong. A. Ippolito continued

that some houses in the area need to be grouped together based on their style, design, era and condition. She continued to state that she would recommend restricting ability to build beyond two-family homes. G. Potts asked if you could currently build larger than two-family homes? A. Ippolito mentioned that with special permit you could build up to eight-family homes (for properties zoned A-3). A. Ippolito mentioned that she had spent time reviewing neighborhoods with Thomas Younger (Town Administrator).

P. Kane stated that he had questions regarding the locations identified West of Paradise Road, he mentioned lots of houses are two-families already and that if they go to a A2 zoning designation they would become non-conforming. A. Ippolito stated she doesn't want to go to A2, that she doesn't want to downgrade units, but that she thinks homes of similar style should be grouped.

G. Potts mentioned that the DPW yard should be added, and that someone could potentially build multi-unit housing on the property, to which A. Ippolito and P. Kane mentioned would be positive and that the Master Plan calls for developing that property. A. Ippolito also stated she wants an open space zone. She continued to state that she doesn't agree with the current Humphrey Street designation on Blaney St. The Board, using the supplemental maps, drew potential lines for new zoning designation areas.

Conversation was then moved to looking at the zoning in the Rockland Street area. Mrs. Dreeben asked about the current zoning for the street, and P. Kane mentioned that one end was A2 and the other A3.

A. Ippolito discussed changing the zoning involving coastal conditions in the Puritan Road area. The Board also discussed other areas of curiosity with regards to zoning designation. A. Ippolito stated that any conservation of coastal area should be "down-zoned", as well as some multi-family housing areas should be "down-zoned". She also stated that any area not abutting conservation zone should be zoned as A3. A. Ippolito then went on to discuss certain areas where the zoning is confusing and should be re-thought and changed.

A. Ippolito stated that there needs to be a discussion on if, and how to re-zone. She did not want to mention specific properties but does want feedback and clear reasons why areas should be re-zoned. She also wants explained how the "re-zoning" will be done. A. Ippolito mentioned that few places need "up-zoning", and if it was to be done, it would be done through Smart Growth (40R) overlay. She also mentioned that the zoning map currently has many areas designated as A3. A. Ippolito continued to state that zoning changes should be made in neighborhoods of similar characteristics and have thought be put into making some areas a Historic District. P. Kane stated that a Preservation District could be used instead as it is less restrictive than Historic. A. Ippolito stated she wanted to look at past mistakes and move forward with better zoning practices, and get rid of cramming multiple units into small areas. She also stated that she wants to zone for density with different tools, and that in some cases no additional zoning would need to be done.

G. Potts asked what in A3 zoned areas could be more than eight units? A. Ippolito stated that there are none. G. Potts then asked why not make areas zoned A3, regulated, that no more than 3 units can be built. P. Kane mentioned this would undermine Humphrey Street, and A. Ippolito stated only eight units with a special permit.

A. Ippolito opened up her discussion to the Board.

G. Potts asked about if it's possible to make a new type of zoning, which A. Ippolito was unsure about.

P. Kane stated that it makes sense for some areas to go from A2 to A3. G. Potts thought that politically thinking, restricting 8 unit residences would be favored. P. Kane mentioned that potential for 8 unit developments were valued by developers, to which G. Potts stated that he thinks people would think negatively on 8 unit developments. A. Ippolito stated developers would not be affected by negative public thought.

P. Kane stated that the public outreach on the matter of “down-zoning” must be done very carefully as people typically think that their property rights are being taken away. Ms. Dreeben, from the audience mentioned that “down-zoning” restricts and safe-guards against over-development in places people don’t want it, as well as community members feel better that there are ways to stop development from creeping into neighborhoods.

Ms. Dreeben and A. Ippolito discussed neighborhood feelings on the subject and the idea of restricting the ability to get a special permit was discussed. Ms. Dreeben mentioned people will not understand the restrictions. A. Ippolito asked if the bylaw could limit by lot size and mentioned that the current zoning didn’t make sense. P. Kane and A. Ippolito discussed lot sizes and zoning. A. Ippolito mentioned that certain parts within A3 boundaries has problems that will do harm to neighborhoods. P. Kane explained changes in A3 were done in 2009, with regards to special permits.

A. Ippolito stated that she would like more research to be done on the topic and would work on it with P. Kane.

G. Potts asked about certain development happening and thoughts by members present on it. The Board quickly discussed the special permit changes from 2009.

LODGING ESTABLISHMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT

B. Quinn discussed his research on the establishment of a lodging overlay district, and areas one could go.

B. Quinn began by praising Zoning Bylaw Review Committee Member Gene Barden, who had recently passed away. The Planning Board all agreed Mr. Barden was a great community member and committed to the Town of Swampscott.

B. Quinn explained that prior to the 2016 Town Meeting, the Review Committee had listed all establishments where lodging could be possible, and had searched for examples of different types of lodging. He stated that they came up with four different types of establishments that could be done within current zoning districts. He mentioned that the BOS had slightly misunderstood the supplemental map he had given them during the Town Meeting Warrant review. B. Quinn stated that the bottom-line was that the BOS did not want a town-wide layout for lodging, but that they wanted an overlay district.

B. Quinn stated that the amount of proposed overlay districts around town is becoming confusing. He continued by stating that a zoned area for lodging should be by the water to help draw visitors in, and it was mentioned that P. Kane had previously stated that Atlantic Avenue should also be included. P. Kane specified that the lodging district should go near the train station, but stop before the monument and one road back from Atlantic Ave. B. Quinn stated that the land of the former Marian Court College is in the district, and that the district goes up Humphrey Street as well. P. Kane and B. Quinn discussed that some of the areas in the proposed lodging area are in residential areas, including the site of the former Marian Court College, which B. Quinn stated he wanted in the lodging zone.

B. Quinn stated that the proposed lodging zoning map presented to the Board of Selectman was almost agreed too, but ultimately not. B. Quinn explained that the idea of zoning an area for lodging will calm fears of residents as there will be restrictions and guidelines, but he mentioned that he still expects resistance from residents scared of construction of a hotel near their home. B. Quinn mentioned a previous “bed and breakfast” establishment request that was met with heavy neighborhood resistance.

B. Quinn then opened up his presentation to questions, comments, and potential ideas. A. Ippolito asked what an overlay district would do. B. Quinn stated that it would allow the plans for a lodging district to go through. A. Ippolito then asked if using Historical District guidelines could help. B. Quinn mentioned that currently any lodging establishment would need a special permit, and P. Kane stated that language would need to be added in areas Zoning bylaw to encourage lodging. P. Kane continued to state that for certain situations special rules in the bylaws would need to be made.

B. Isler asked if the lodging district would be easier to pass if it was made over a larger swath of land. B. Quinn replied that community members present at the warrant review thought the area was already too wide.

The Board then discussed the potential boundaries for the lodging area. P. Kane stated that the area within the proposed lodging boundaries should not include properties on dead-ends. A. Ippolito using the whiteboard went over certain roads and areas that would not work within the lodging district. P. Kane recommended that a final map cut out dead-end streets, which will show the community that there is being thought put into this and that it is not just a large swath of land.

B. Isler asked what a lodging zone would really mean and what one would entail? G. Potts stated that for a lodging district plan to move forward, town leaders would need to be involved, to which B. Quinn replied that he wants to get the BOS involved and to work with them moving forward. A. Ippolito stated that the Planning Board can work with multiple members of the BOS and get them involved.

B. Quinn then asked how to proceed. A. Ippolito stated that she liked the concept from B. Quinn and that the guidelines still need to be vetted, which B. Quinn then mentioned they had been. A. Ippolito then proposed having a meeting to go over response to the guidelines as well as a meeting with the Board of Selectmen. G. Potts mentioned that for the meeting with the BOS that they (the Planning Board) bring a rough version of the guidelines to be more flexible. The Board then discussed options on how to further the conversation about the lodging district with the BOS.

A. Ippolito asked if B. Quinn could send the map and guidelines to the Planning Board, and proposed a meeting with the BOS after one more Planning Board meeting.

MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

The Board then gave updates on their Master Plan topic areas that they are managing.

Angela/Pete – No updates to report.

Bill/George – No updates to report.

Beth/JR – no updates to report.

P. Kane and A. Ippolito both asked the Board members to continue talking with their teammates.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50pm by motion of A. Ippolito, seconded by B. Isler, and unanimously agreed

Andrew Levin

Assistant Town Planner