



TOWN OF WAKEFIELD

MBTA Communities Fourth Meeting

June 6, 2023

7:00 pm

Via Zoom

Attendance: Erin Kokinda (Town of Wakefield), Jim Hogan (Planning Board), Matt Lowry (Planning Board), Greg McIntosh (ZBA), Robin Greenberg (Environmental Sustainability Committee), Julie Smith-Galvin (Town Council) Matt Bown (Resident), Ezra Glenn (PPRI Consulting)

Absent: Matt Lowry (Planning Board), Matt Bown (Resident)

Item 1- Call to Order: Jim Hogan makes a call to order at 7:02 PM

Jim Hogan thanks everyone for attending and welcoming them to meeting #4.

Item 2- 7:03 PM- Motion to accept minutes from May 16, 2023

7:03 PM- Motion to accept May 16, 2023 minutes- Julie Smith Galvin, second Greg McIntosh, Roll call vote. 5-0 to accept minutes.

Item 3- 7:04 PM- MBTA Communities Working Group Discussion

Jim starts the discussion and hands it over to Erin Kokinda, as she highlights the new two districts that were added due to our conversation at the last meeting. Jim wants us to review what we need to be in MBTA compliance. Erin mentions that the group has decided to concentrate on the Wakefield Station area, we need to decide as a group if we are fine with the five districts. Ezra, goes through the things required for us to move forward and highlights the compliance model with the five districts and dimensional regulations. Ezra mentions that we have already played with the dimensional regulations in the compliance model based on our conversations. Erin and Ezra run through the dimensional regulations we have done in each district in the compliance model. We used the mixed-use, multi-family, and general residence districts as our starting point. Height, setbacks, and parking are the most important information for the compliance model input.

Jim: Parking- Two bedrooms or less is 1.5 parking, three bedrooms and more is 2 parking per dwelling unit. Can we use this as a starting point for this MBTA Communities? This is currently what we have for our mixed-use, multi-family district. Ezra: The parking shouldn't change the compliance model too much but something we should discuss. The last thing we need is the lot area per dwelling unit (we currently have 1,000 SF).

7:28- Review the proposed districts on the map. Confirmed that this map is correct. Erin mentions that we need to remove the Main Street portion of the green area as we are trying to protect the commercial area. Ezra will remove the area from the South of the mustard color area. Ezra reviews the rest of the map on the necessary changes and discusses our figures with the parcel information in the compliance model. Conversation on lot lines and street lines regarding what is included with the parcels. Julie mentions the Crescent Street area and between Main Street and Crescent Street. Greg discusses the 750SF lot dwelling units per unit with our mixed-use, multi-

family district. Robin raises concerns about a large parcel near our train station and whether it should be part of this district. Brings up conversations about allowing the 3-4 units per right on a larger lot or still having lots like this go through the special permit process with our mixed-use, multi-family overlay. Discuss the other districts and where we want to draw the lines of where we want them to be. We discuss the districts that are east of Main Street and how they will be supported by the bus line and be near the downtown commercial district. Discuss the area between Main Street and Pleasant Street and what areas should be included and not included due to commercial areas and off-sets of the parcels. Albion Street area- removing some of the parcels there as it doesn't make sense to the zone. More discussion on the mustard color district area and what should be included and not and maintaining zoning on both districts of the street. Erin and Ezra will go back and make appropriate changes.

Dimensional Requirements for compliance model finalization: Lot size- 4,000 SF is the assumption. Most of these lots within our districts are 4,000 SF, and only a few are not compliant. The group decides to be consistent with multi-family, mixed-use, and general residence districts for the lot size and other dimensional regulations. Reviews the parking requirements and discuss what is practical based on our proposal. Also, the whole point of these districts is to create housing around transit so we should think about lowering the parking. As part of the bylaw, the group thinks that 1.5 parking spaces work. Setbacks- the group decides to go back to 15, 10, and 20, which matches the general residence dimensional regulations instead of the blanket 30, 30, and 30 that Ezra and Erin put in.

Ezra- You can still have a site plan review and a variance/special permit for people who want to add more height, etc.

8:18- Jim opens the conversation to other districts within the Town that would allow multi-family housing that would not be part of the MBTA compliance. Greg- asks what our mandate is and what our authority is to be able to create these new districts. Is this our role and stepping out of our bounds? Are we here to just look at MBTA Communities or multi-family in general? Robin- Lexington used this process to increase their housing. Greg- it may have been a different process and make sure we aren't overstepping our bounds. Robin- Greenwood may make sense because it is near the transit station and is part of our conversation. Jim- this conversation started as to how we could comply with the state for the MBTA Communities, and this is what we were mandated to do. But there was a strong indication that Greenwood be part of that. To do the bare minimum for compliance was not agreed on. Greg- just want to ensure we are following the process we were asked to do. Julie- I think there is a lot of talk around Town about multi-family housing and creative housing (multigenerational, affordability, etc.), I am comfortable with Greenwood due to the MBTA station. Erin/Ezra- how we package this together for Town Meeting and the state may be different so we don't need to change the MBTA Communities, the overlay for the MBTA Communities should stand on its own. So it isn't all or nothing. Jim- we submit it all at once at Town Meeting or in two separate sections? Greg- the districts would essentially (dimensional regulations) be the same but the Wakefield Station would just be submitted to the state or do we want to get more creative with the other districts? Julie/Erin/Greg- discussion on Affordable Housing Trust and then the Housing Choice Community. Master Plan, etc... Do we bring this back to our respective boards and ask if this is within our mandate to create other multi-family districts? Jim- when we started this process, we discussed the Greenwood area and why we didn't proceed due to the lot sizes, and other things that didn't fit within the compliance model. But it is consistent with a policy perspective. Greg- is thinking maybe there is something more creative we can do. Erin- I could bring these comments back to the Town Council at a July meeting and get

their feedback and direction if this is something that the group should look more into and beyond the MBTA Communities. Ezra- Create an overlay that works for the MBTA Communities, and possibly use it in other parts of Town but could change it to be more creative (affordability, mixed-use, etc.) Jim- We can sit down and look at these other districts and is the timeline different? Maybe it is this group or another group that looks at this? Let's bring it back to our appropriate boards and ask if it is appropriate for us to take on.

Jim 8:41- Reviewing and discussion of the Zoning Bylaw for this overlay district. The state has an example that we can base our draft bylaw on. Does anyone want to use this bylaw as a starting point? Robin- why can't we use our current mixed-use/multi-family bylaw? Greg- should we go through the bylaw review committee? Jim- The Bylaw Review Committee is a little behind our timeline. Ezra- With the state bylaw, it might make it easier for the state compliance and with the state. It should be a stand-alone piece as it will make it easier if you need to change anything to this district, it will make it easier. Greg- it is easier if we use the state, as it will be easier for the state to review and it will be a stand-alone. Ezra- You are more than welcome to make any changes you need. Jim- I would advocate that we flag this and we discuss it at the next meeting. Robin- asks for clarification for the process, Planning Board- Town Council- etc.

Item 4: Schedule Moving Forward- 8:51- Jim discusses our community engagement plan moving forward to get us to Town Meeting in Spring 2024. What groups to reach out to and boards to present to? Formal meetings and informal meetings. The group provides feedback. What does the vote need to be at Town Meeting? Simple majority or 2/3? Review what the regulations say. Jim will start reaching out to the appropriate boards on what our plan is for outreach. Also asks that people go back to their relevant board.

Item 5: Items not anticipated- nothing.

9:00 PM- Motion to adjourn meeting- Julie Smith Galvin, second Greg McIntosh. Roll call vote- 5-0.