



TOWN OF WESTON

Planning Board Meeting March 31, 2021
Document Prepared by Susan Peghiny

Approved 7/28/21

Video Recording: <https://weston.vod.castus.tv/vod/?video=45626a30-733b-4231-831a-ad6555c401a6&nav=programs%2FPlanning%20Board%20-%20Weston%20MA>

Meeting called to order at 7:04 PM. Chair Alicia Primer read Governor Baker’s Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law.

Planning Board Members	Present	Staff Members	Present
Alicia Primer (AP) - Chair	Yes	Imaikalani Aiu (IA) – Town Planner	Yes
Leslie Glynn (LG)	No	Dave Conway (DC) - Consulting Civil Engineer	Yes
Steve Oppenheimer (SO)	Yes	Kim Turner (KT) - Consulting Landscape Architect	Yes
Sue Zacharias (SZ)	Yes	Jonathan Witten (JW) – Town Counsel	
Alex Selvig (AS)	Yes		

Italics indicate formal action taken.

1.0 Public Comments

No public comments.

2.0 Continued Public Hearings

1 Stoneridge Lane – Flexible Subdivision (269-275 Winter) Site Plan Approval – New 4,904sf RGFA House

Representation: Karen Sebastian, Landscape Consultant

Overview: Ms. Primer, Ms. Turner, Mr. Aiu and Ms. Sebastian visited the site last week and met with the neighbor, and they agreed to additional remediation of landscape impact. Ms. Sebastian reviewed the approved landscaping and explained that they agreed to plant 5 new evergreen trees in the area next to the house to provide additional screening to the neighbor. Ms. Sebastian and Ms. Turner will visit the site during construction to place the trees to maximize screening.

Documents:

- [Rendering of House with Screening from Stoneridge Lane](#)
- [Landscape Plan for 1 Stone Ridge Lane - 3/26/21 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Civil Plans for 1 Stone Ridge Lane - 2/24/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Support Letter from 15 Nonesuch- 2/15/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Support Letter 5 Stone Ridge - 2/8/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Support Letter 7 Stone Ridge - 2/8/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Pre-Submission Plans for 1 Stone Ridge Lane - 1/26/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Abutter Letter from 285 Winter Street w/ Response - 2/12/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Site Sections for 1 Stone Ridge - 1/29/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Pre-Submission Plans for 1 Stone Ridge Lane - 1/26/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Architectural Plans for 1 Stone Ridge - 12/3/2020 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Lighting Fixtures](#)
- [Stormwater Report for 1 Stone Ridge \(PDF\)](#)
- [Winter Street Design Narrative \(PDF\)](#)

Discussion:

Ms. Zacharias asked the size of the additional trees that will be planted. Ms. Sebastian said they would be caliper 10-12”.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Motion:

Mr. Selvig moved to close the Public Hearing on 1 Stoneridge Lane – Flexible Subdivision (269-275 Winter) Site Plan Approval – New 4,904sf RGFA House. Ms. Zacharias seconded and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.

The decision for this item will be at the end of this meeting.

3.0 Public Hearings

3.1 123 Newton Street – Scenic Road RoW Work – Rebuild stone wall within Newton St Right of way

Representation: Fahad Gilani, owner of 123 Newton Street.

Overview: Ms. Primer asked if the new location of the generator was reflected in the plan. Mr. Gilani explained that this site was picked because of the opinion of their electrician and developer. Ms. Primer pointed out that the generator location is not on the agenda, so the PB could talk only about the stone wall.

Mr. Aiu said the Board had asked for larger stones to better integrate with other walls nearby. He showed several photographs of the new stones which included a tape measure.

Documents:

- [Generator Relocation and Planting Plan for 123 Newton Street](#)
- [Photo 1 of Rebuilt Wall at 123 Newton](#)
- [Photo 2 of Rebuilt Wall at 123 Newton](#)
- [Photo 3 of Rebuilt Wall at 123 Newton](#)
- [Photo of Generator at 123 Newton](#)
- [Photo of Stones for Wall at 123 Newton 1](#)
- [Photo of Stones for Wall at 123 Newton 2](#)
- [Photo of Stones for Wall at 123 Newton 3](#)
- [Photo of Stones for Wall at 123 Newton 4](#)
- [Photo of Stones for Wall at 123 Newton w/ measuring tape 1](#)
- [Photo of Stones for Wall at 123 Newton w/ measuring tape 2](#)
- [Photo of Stones for Wall at 123 Newton w/ measuring tape 3](#)
- [Scenic Road Wall Permit](#)
- [Specification for Generator Sound Barrier at 123 Newton](#)
- [Specifications for Generator at 123 Newton St](#)

Discussion:

Ms. Primer asked if there would be mortar, and Mr. Gilani confirmed there would not.

Mr. Selvig asked if they should allow a new wall in the right of way. The Board discussed whether or not the wall should be moved back. Mr. Aiu said that they usually allow the rebuilding of removed walls (as this one was, without a permit) especially since it will provide continuity with other walls.

The generator issue will be put onto the April 14, 2021 agenda. The Board further discussed how to work with the homeowner. It was agreed to ask the Building Inspector to look at the location to see if would be acceptable.

Public Comments:

Gordon Whitman, neighbor, asked if the existing wall would come down. Mr. Gilani confirmed it would.

Motion:

Mr. Selvig moved to continue the Public Hearing for 123 Newton Street. Ms. Zacharias seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.

3.2 18 Columbine Road – RGFA Site Plan Approval – Finish Attic Above Garage on Existing 3,478sf RGFA House

Overview: Mr. Aiu provided an update of the situation, explaining that there had been additional testimony from the neighbors. He spoke with the Town Engineer and Storm Water Engineer who said they had only received 3 complaints, so they did not consider it a neighborhood-wide or town-wide issue.

Mr. Conway explained that the letter from GPR seemed to confirm that it's a shallow concentrated flow that needs to be broken up and had a dry-well recommendation. He agrees that the issue is shallow concentrated flow that could be coming from both properties. The proposal is to provide remediation as proposed.

Documents:

- [Certificate of Action for 18 Columbine](#)
- [Nolan Letter - 2/9/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [00 2021 0206 Ferndale Rd Watershed Study](#)
- [Landscape Plan for 18 Columbine - 2/5/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Site Plan for 18 Columbine - 1/29/2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Architectural Plans for 18 Columbine Road - 12/23/2020 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Irrigation System exception request - 12/14/2020 \(PDF\)](#)
- [RGFA Comparison for 18 Columbine Road - 12/14/2020 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Diachronic Mapping of 18 Columbine Road \(PDF\)](#)

Discussion:

Mr. Selvig asked about a stone dry-well/sump pump, and there was discussion about this. Mr. Conway said it's hard to know exactly what will work when, but he thinks the current proposal is appropriate and proportionate.

Ms. Zacharias asked if a temporary berm can be placed until the new landscaping is installed. Ms. Conway said this is the first thing that happens before the Board signs the building permit. Mr. Aiu suggested they go a little higher in their erosion control efforts during construction.

Ms. Zacharias said if this house had gone through Site Plan Review the Board would never have allowed for the property to be clear-cut.

Public Comment:

Eric Goldberg, attorney for the homeowners, said he concern for his clients is that they will be asked to do more and more. He believes the owners came back to the Board with a substantial plan to address the issues. He does not believe the additional requested mitigating measure are supported by engineering studies showing that they will be effective. He believes that past Public Hearings have illustrated that other properties in the neighborhood share responsibility.

Walter Foster, attorney for John & Heidi McNeil who live at 15 Ferndale, and that they believe there should be more done than just the landscaping and the GPR letter spells out the reasons why.

Vito Colonna, Sullivan & Connors Engineering, said they had done the original and as-built designs. He feels the proposed model that GPR concurred with accurately reflects the situation. He agrees that many sites contribute to this problem, so it's not just an 18 Columbine issue and reviewed some of the changes that were made in that area that might have added to this problem. There was a discussion about different some issues that may be involved.

Mr. Selvig asked for Mr. Colonna's view on GPR's proposed mitigation.

- Regrade to make a more something flow path: he feels cannot be implemented on their property line.
- Remove rip rap and remove vegetation: this is difficult because this is split between 2 properties. Dry well: there isn't really room at the location.

Mr. Colonna feels establishing micro-pools and adding vegetation will help and reviewed the plans with the Board, and discussion followed.

Davide Parmele, 18 Columbine Road owner, reiterated that the fill that diverts the water flow occurred when significant changes were made in 2018 at 25 Columbine. This is why he feels this a multi-property issue and is concerned that they could do all the requested mitigation and it might not change things.

Dan Santangelo, local builder, expressed some concerns about GPR's report since they did not do a full study, and pointed out that no contractor would work on multiple properties because of liability. He feels it's a Town problem and thinks there are multiple properties contributing to the problem.

Barry O'Laughlin, 19 Ferndale, said there is video showing large pooling on her property and a channel along the driveway after a rainstorm. She is frustrated with the issue.

Mr. Foster said that if a drywell is chosen, his clients would be open having these extended onto their property to help solve the problem.

Mr. Colonna asked that the Board reconsider the recommended actions (micro-pools, more vegetation, etc.) and having Mr. Conway re-evaluate later.

Mr. Oppenheimer said the Board does not have the jurisdiction to order a drywell at the McNeil's' property.

Heidi McNeil said they had looked into a drywell previously and were told the location needed was very difficult, and it was not a good solution. She feels there is evidence that the swale is a problem.

Mr. Oppenheimer agrees that the creation of the swale is likely the biggest problem, however the Board cannot solve this problem because only half is on the Parmeles' property. The neighbors need to solve that themselves. He feels that everything that can be done has been done, and more work could only be done with the cooperation of the neighbors.

Ms. Zacharias agreed with Mr. Oppenheimer and suggested they approve it with the changes made and time-specific review of the problem.

Mr. Selvig agreed with Ms. Zacharias.

Andy Pettinato, 26 Columbine, said they have contacted Jason Lavoie who will do their as-built. She said the water problem started before 18 Columbine was built but when the property was cleared. The Penninatos did their work because they had no more buffer, and did things to handle water. They are doing a formal report/study to see if the rocks they put down to support the trees contribute to the problem and are willing to remove it if necessary.

Motion:

Mr. Oppenheimer moved to close the Public Hearing. Ms. Zacharias seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.

Decision: A decision will be presented at the next meeting.

4.0 Old Business

4.1 104 Meadowbrook Road – RGFA Site Plan Approval Amendment – Add Pool and Pool House to Existing 9,688sf RGFA House

Representation: Jason Lavoie, Project Engineer; Karen Sebastian, Landscape Consultant.

Overview: Mr. Lavoie reviewed that their focus from the last meeting is the front yard. He explained that the courtyard is about 2 sq feet less impervious material, the driveway has been moved about 3' south, and the lower courtyard is identical to the original design. Some more trees were added for screening.

Ms. Sebastian reviewed the details of the changes to the landscaping plan which added buffering to the street.

Documents:

- [Letter from Jay Lavoie Project Engineer 3-30-21](#)
- [Letter from Jonathan Klandrud Project Manager 3-30-21](#)
- [Letter from Ken Stevens Developer 3-30-21](#)
- [Site Plans for Pool House 104 Meadowbrook \(PDF\)](#)
- [Architectural Plan for Pool House 104 Meadowbrook \(PDF\)](#)
- [As Built Survey Plan 104 Meadowbrook](#)
- [Certificate of Action for Pool and Pool House at 104 Meadowbrook](#)
- [Landscape Plans for Pool House 104 Meadowbrook \(PDF\)](#)
- [RGFA Change Memo for Pool House 104 Meadowbrook \(PDF\)](#)
- [Stormwater Report for Pool House 104 Meadowbrook](#)

Discussion:

Ms. Zacharias asked if any native plants are included. Ms. Sebastian said the Chokeberries and many others that are native and showed the planting list.

Ms. Turner and Mr. Conway are both satisfied with the plan and construction.

Mr. Selvig briefly left the meeting.

Public Comment:

Denise Frias, 1 Skating Pond Road, stated support for builder.

Decision: A decision will be presented at the next meeting.

4.2 8 Lawrence - Site Plan Approval Amendment – Remediation for Removal of Three Trees

Overview: Ms. Turner said they proposal tonight was to plant 3 evergreen trees and 3 deciduous trees and plant them more naturally than originally planned.

Documents:

Discussion:

There was no discussion.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Motion:

Ms. Zacharias moved to approve the amendment to the planting plan for 8 Lawrence. Mr. Oppenheimer seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.

5.0 Continued Public Hearings & New Business

5.1 9,11,15 and 20 Riverside Road – Zoning Bylaw and Map Amendment – Rezone from Business and Commercial Districts to proposed Office and Research B District

Representation: Kevin Sheehan, Greatland Realty Partners; TeriFord, Greatland Director of Development; Todd Dunland, Gensler Architects; Lourenco Dantas, VHB Civil/Traffic Engineer; Drew Stengler, OJB Landscape Architects; Kristen Murphy, Acentech Senior Acoustics Consultant; Glenn Schuyler, RWGI Air Quality Consultant; James Ward, Nutter, McClellan & Fish, Zoning Counsel.

Overview: Mr. Sheehan gave a brief overview of the property, reiterated their goals, and said the presentation would focus on questions about:

- Lab Use: Ms. Ford reviewed the current zoning situation of the site, and their proposal for a new zone to include both and explained the differences in the proposed vs existing zoning. She also showed images of what lab use actually looks like. She addressed issues of levels of lab use, rodent-only use, hazardous materials use, etc.
- Building Views: Mr. Dundon displayed visuals of what the additional roof mechanicals would look like, compared to the closest residential building. He noted that the face of the first building is about 400' from the closest house, and the drop to the residential building is about 8'. He showed wintertime photos of the existing views, and a view of what the building would look like with the additional mechanicals without additional screening (draft idea for this was shown).
- Noise Impacts: Ms. Murphy explained will do pre-construction measurements to determine the current noise level across the property lines. She showed a plan of the location of the devices, as well as how the measurements would be done. These results would be used during design to make adjustments as needed. She showed an image of the solid-wall structure around the mechanicals to block sound and sight as well as sound attenuators, and generators that would be used and how they would be handled.
- Air Quality: Mr. Schuyler said his study area is exhaust from equipment, especially fume hoods, and showed the location of the exhausts on the buildings. His initial estimate of emissions & dilutions appears to be within normal air quality standards. With labs a particular standard is difficult to identify because labs use different chemicals on different days. Their goal is to have someone in the community exposed to less than the amount of exposure of a person working at the fume hood. To ensure this, part of the tenant agreement would be for them to agree to keep the neighborhood impacts within required level.
- Traffic Analysis: Mr. Dantas said they have submitted a traffic study to the town for review. He explained that the new development will generate about the same number of trips as previous usage. They are committed to a number of strategies to discourage car usage such as shuttle service to Riverside, bicycle amenities, on-side transportation coordinator, preferred parking for van & carpools, and employee-sponsored program such as flextime, pre-tax van & transit subsidies, etc.

Greatland is working with the neighborhood with \$1,00,000 for improvements including adding sidewalks & crosswalks, cut-through deterrence, intersection improvements, left-turn lane for Turnpike access, etc. He also reviewed local improvements that could be connected to this project.

- Sustainability Strategy: Mr. Stengler reviewed their preliminary sustainability plans, especially reducing impervious surfaces, and water conservation. Ms. Sheehan pointed out that they would really like to create a loop around the property for outdoor access.

Documents:

- [Acoustical Peer Review](#)
- [Applicant's Presentation 3-17-21](#)

- [Applicant's Presentation 3-31-21](#)
- [Applicant's Presentation 4-14-21](#)
- [Article 31- ZBL Amendment Office and Research and Development District B](#)
- [Draft Development Agreement](#)
- [Exhibit A Park Road Improvements](#)
- [Exhibit B Land Swap Plan](#)
- [Exhibit C Additional Improvements](#)
- [Liberty Mutual housing option memo by neighborhood\(3.11.21\)](#)
- [Proposed Zoning Map Change](#)
- [Riverside Campus Redevelopment Traffic Impact Assessment - 2021-03-11](#)
- [Riverside Campus TIA Peer Review](#)
- [Riverside Lab Conversion Air Quality Opinion Letter](#)
- [Riverside Lab Conversion- Estimated Tax Revenues](#)
- [Riverside Rd Traffic Scoping Info Memo with figures](#)
- [Traffic Impact Analysis Appendix - Residential Add - 2021-04-02](#)
- [Traffic Peer Review Presentation](#)
- [Warrant Article to Amend Zoning Bylaw by Adding Office & Research District B](#)
- [Warrant Article to Amend Zoning Bylaw by Adding Office & Research District B Ramsayer](#)
- [Weston Riverside Community Noise Information](#)
- [Weston Riverside Community Noise Information Revision 2 4-13-21](#)

Mr. Selvig returned to the meeting.

Discussion:

Ms. Primer felt the traffic increase of 15% is significant. Mr. Dantas explained that most of the traffic is at peak hours, and they do not expect any difference at these times. On a *daily* basis, there may be more off-peak uses by labs (technicians work different times of the day based on research, etc.).

Ms. Primer asked how the un-dated Mass DOT improvements would impact their project since they are not scheduled. Mr. Dantas reviewed the status of the proposed DOT improvements.

Mr. Oppenheimer felt the presentation was about the proposal of the project, and not about the Zoning Bylaw Amendment itself, and he feels they should be discussing the Zoning Bylaw Amendment, not this particular proposal.

Mr. Ward said they attempted to creating a Zoning Bylaw Amendment that addressed the concerns about smoke, odor, vibration, noise, etc. He said the proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment could certainly contain language about other concerns, such as Bio levels.

Mr. Oppenheimer said he wanted to see the actual wording, and Mr. Aiu said he would send it out.

Ms. Primer asked where other Bio 2 labs exist near Weston.

Mr. Oppenheimer said he would like to see the Zoning Bylaws of other towns for labs. Mr. Ward said he would send Waltham's law. The board asked to see other towns such as Lexington, Wellesley, etc.

Mr. Selvig asked if there would be an increase of large trucks and asked how many there would be. Ms. Ford said lab use generally uses smaller box trucks. He also said he wasn't comfortable with the developer's attorney drafting a Zoning Bylaw Amendment. Mr. Aiu said the proposed bylaw amendment was sent to Town Counsel for review, but no response has been received yet.

Mr. Sheehan reviewed what benefits the developers think Weston will receive with this development. He estimates that the tax benefits to Weston would be over \$1,000,000 per year (above what is being paid now).

Ms. Primer asked how State sound requirements compare to Weston requirements. Ms. Murphy said she had not seen a sound limit in Weston, and Mr. Primer said there are, and she should talk to Mr. Aiu.

Ms. Primer expressed concern about the height of the buildings and there was discussion of additional set-back requirements. She is also concerned about air quality concerns and that there needs to be more in-depth conversation about this especially since this neighborhood likely experiences air quality issues because of where it is located. Mr. Aiu suggested that this issue could be spelled out more clearly.

Public Comment:

Yusuf Rhaban, 9 Blake Road, asked that the following be including in the bylaw:

- This being only a Bio Level 2 or lower.
- The height for the mechanicals
- On-going monitoring of air quality metrics (especially when there are tenant changes).

He also asked how the developers can know the traffic since they don't know who the tenants will be.

Ms. Primer said all of this could probably be addressed in the bylaw.

Mr. Rhaban said all of these studies do not include any new residential dwellings, and he feels there can be no approval to the bylaw without considering the residential proposals.

Mr. Dantas clarified that the *allowed* office uses today and *what exists today* only reflect a partial build-out of what as-of-right allows. If someone came in and built it out as-of-right, it would generate more traffic than existing use and proposed re-development.

Michael Shuman, 1 Blake Road, said he is very concerned about the fumes. He feels the measurement of at the fume head is a poor standard.

Ed Winchman, neighbor, said he is concerned about the river absorbing some of these fumes as they sink and asked that this be considered.

Tom Gold, neighbor, said he feels that splitting the lab proposal from the residential proposal is problematic. He feels that they should be considered as one entity. Ms. Primer explained why they were split.

Todd Finard, 11 Tamarack Road, asked what goals are for the pedestrian components of the traffic plan (sidewalks, etc). Mr. Dantas said they had come to them from the neighborhood especially since promises had been previously made by Liberty Mutual but not kept.

Walter Sussman, 92 Orchard Avenue, said he does not see how the town can separate these projects, especially because of traffic.

Paul DiBona, 16 Tamarack, asked that if new dwellings are built they must also be considered in the air quality, noise, etc. proposals.

Motion:

Mr. Oppenheimer moved to continue the Public Hearing to April 14, 2021. Mr. Selvig seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.

5.2 Multiple Dwelling TOD District Amendment and Rezone – Zoning Bylaw Amendment Information

Overview: Mr. Aiu gave an outline of the proposed multiple dwelling proposal and explained that there are several reasons why this triggered this proposal (see the [Slide Presentation on Transit Oriented Multiple Dwelling Overlay](#)):

- There are several 40B applications in process.
- Many needs outlined in the housing production plan still exist.
- New Housing Choice Legislation (requires by-right multi-family zone within ½ mile of a transit station).
- Individual site characteristics

He explained that there are 2 possible places to put this, one on each end of the property with only one used for the housing site, depending on which one is better for this use and displayed the [Proposed Zoning Amendment Map](#).

He outlined the bylaw features:

- Overlay District
- 20 units per acre which would require Site Plan Approval, conformance to dimensional standards, and 10% affordable housing. This is the 'by-right' zoning specified in the New Housing Choice Legislation.
- 50 units per acre max which would require Special Permit & Site Plan Approval, additional affordable housing.
- Any Density which does not conform to dimensional standards or include affordable housing would require a Special Permit.

He displayed and explained the Dimensional Standards (heights, setbacks, etc.) proposed and other criteria (Site Plan Approval, additional affordable housing requirements, lower parking requirement and minimum of 1 per unit and max of 1.5 spots per unit).

The Public Hearing has been posted for April 28, 2021.

Documents:

- [Article 30 - Transit Oriented Multiple Dwelling Zoning Bylaw Amendment](#)
- [Article 31 Proposed Zoning Map Amendment](#)
- [Residential Feasibility Study by Greatland](#)
- [Slide Presentation on Transit Oriented Multiple Dwelling Overlay](#)
- [Testimony from Hugh Kelly](#)

- [Testimony from Kelly Murphy](#)

Discussion: Mr. Sheehan said they are willing to help the Town understand how the development would impact the area.

Public Comment:

Mr. Rhaban said he feels there should be non-bias ed studies as well as the ones Mr. Sheehan offered to do. Ms. Primer said this proposal is more crucial to the town than it is to Greatland.

Mr. Murphy asked if these zoning proposals could be included at Town Meeting, and Ms. Primer said it could.

Mr. Winchman, 40 Orchard Avenue, said he feels there are a lot of actions that need to be done before this can go to Town Meeting.

Judy Nitsch, 17 Blake Road, asked about sewage disposal. She feels the site cannot handle a proposal of this size.

Marcie Loeber, 36 Tamarack Road, felt that traffic is a big issue and needs to be looked at.

The Board discussed not rushing these proposals to try to present at Town Meeting, and there was general agreement that this schedule was not possible and further discussion about how to proceed.

6.0 Decisions

6.1 75 Doublet Hill Road – RGFA Site Plan Approval Amendment – Addition to Existing 14,896sf RGFA House

Mr. Oppenheimer moved to approve the decision for 75 Doublet Hill Road – RGFA Site Plan Approval Amendment as edited by Steve Oppenheimer. Ms. Zacharias seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.

6.2 1 Stoneridge Lane – Flexible Subdivision (269-275 Winter) Site Plan Approval – New 4,904sf RGFA House

Ms. Zacharias moved to approve 1 Stoneridge Lane – Flexible Subdivision with changes that were discussed tonight. Mr. Selvig seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.

7.0 Other Business

7.1 Town Planner Report

- Mr. Aiu reviewed the upcoming site plan visits.
- He reported that he will get the Pollinator Group back to together, and has met on RoW trees.
- The HPP update will come before the Board in June.
- Private tree protection – the working group needs to reconvene to draft a bylaw.
- Historic Heritage Public Hearing has been moved to the first week of June.

8.0 Adjournment

Ms. Zacharias moved to adjourn, Mr. Oppenheimer seconded. The motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Peghiny
Recording Secretary