

Town of Carlisle Planning Board

MBTA Communities Subcommittee – Joint Meeting w/Planning Board & Select Board Minutes of 12/9/24 7:15 PM / Minutes Prepared by: Noelle Beland, Planning, Zoning & Land Use Assistant

Online Meeting Format: Hybrid – Zoom and Clark Room

MBTA Communities Subcommittee Voting Members Present:

- Adelaide Grady, Planning Board
- Kate Reid, Select Board
- Tony Mariano, Board of Health
- Christina Christodouloupoulos, Environmental Sustainability Committee
- Christine Johnson-Battista, Affordable Housing Trust
- Justin Harrison, Carlisle citizen

Voting Members Absent:

- Helen Jackson Young, Conservation Commission

Planning Board Members:

- Sara Smith
- Adelaide Grady
- Bill Guild
- Chris Geggis
- Court Herschelman
- Eric Adams
- Joe Gushue

Select Board Members:

- Travis Snell
- Barney Arnold
- Scott Triola
- Kate Reid

Staff Present:

- Julie Mercier, Town Planner
- Noelle Beland, Planning, Zoning and Land Use Assistant
- Ryan McLane, Town Administrator

Members of The Public:

- Amelia Fournier, 745 East Street
- Andrea Urban, 20 Pine Brook Road
- Anne Fitzgerald, 834 North Road
- Betsy Fell, Carlisle Mosquito
- Bob Zielinski, Carlisle Mosquito
- Caleb Cochrane, 683 East Street
- Carren Panico, Carlisle Mosquito
- Cindy Craft, 75 Patch Meadow Lane
- Edward & Beverly Humm, 776 East Street

- Eric Balles, 105 Nowell Farme Road
- Gordon & Lee Means, 94 East Meadow Lane
- James & Sharon Hart, 766 North Road
- Jamie Caplette, 43 Fern Lane
- Jerry & Carol Ostrowski, 85 Patch Meadow Lane
- Jim Boudreau, 193 Cross Street
- Karen Smith, 815 North Road
- Katharine Boylan, 135 Kimball Road
- Laura Harrison, 847 North Road
- Lauren & James Catacchio, 85 Old East Street
- Linda & Robert Fabrizio, 58 Patch Meadow Road
- Madeleine Blake, 127 Carleton Road
- Maeve Lobo & Ashvin Dsouza, 49 Old Quarry Drive
- Marc Bernstein, 43 Peter Hans Road
- Marge & Edgar Berube, 784 North Road
- Mark & Kathleen Redman, 85 Patch Meadow Lane
- Martha Blue, 29 Buttrick Lane
- Mary & Stephen Keele, 800 Curve Street
- Michael Hanauer, 200 Long Ridge Road
- Randy Brown, 778 East Street
- Raymond & Mary Helen Modeen, 48 Berry Corner Road
- Susan Provenzano, 80 Mill Pond Lane
- Valerie Thaddeus, 779 North Road
- Wille Guillermo, 801 North Road

Subcommittee Chair Grady called the MBTA Communities Subcommittee to order at 7:15 PM. Select Board Chair Snell called the Select Board to order at 7:15 PM.

Report to Planning Board

Chair Grady walked through the materials submitted to the Planning Board and suggested Ms. Smith allow discussion between the Planning Board, Select Board and MBTA Communities Subcommittee after the debrief.

Starting with the background information, Chair Grady read from the report submitted. The Planning Board established the Town's MBTA Communities Subcommittee in March 2024 to make a good faith effort to explore the feasibility of compliance with the MBTA Communities legislation (MGL Ch. 40A Section 3A) and guidelines, which is a strategy identified within the Housing Production Plan (most recently updated in August 2023).

The Subcommittee's exploration was to include but not be limited to the following analyses: potential sites, areas, corridors, and neighborhoods; site constraints (environmental, legal, etc.) and available mapping; various zoning bylaw options;

applicability of methodology used in other similar towns; compliance modeling in consultation with assigned Technical Assistance providers designated by various state agencies (EOHLC, CHAPA and MHP, among others); feedback received from residents and stakeholders.

The Subcommittee was to assist the Town Planner as needed with the following: scoping for the grant-funded Subsurface Hydrogeology Study, education and outreach to the community, presentations of recommendations to the Planning Board, and assistance with Town Meeting preparation and presentations.

Chair Grady noted that the memo from the Subcommittee is not submitted in the form of recommendations, it is submitted in the form of an update and a report. The primary strategy that was investigated for compliance with the legislation and guidelines represents their good faith effort over the course of weekly meetings for the past 8 months. She explained that the Subcommittee analyzed various types of constraints and gathered and responded to feedback from residents and stakeholders. The Subcommittee also closely considered other impacts and aspects that could affect feasibility that aren't regulatory but are related to priorities, goals and values of the Town, such as ecological impacts. She noted that certain things need to be considered further. She stated that the Subcommittee did not conduct detailed itemized responses to all feedback from the public, but that all feedback from the survey, the Open Houses, and direct submissions from members of the community in the form of letters, memos and emails, as well as in the minutes of our Subcommittee meetings, were included in the Planning Board packet.

Chair Grady explained that what the Subcommittee primarily investigated over the course of these last many months is the concept of a 2-acre multi-family conservation cluster. She noted that 2-acres is the primary zoning unit within the Town. Considering the nitrogen loading constraints associated with private septic and private well, which limits the number of bedrooms that can be built on an acre to 4 per acre, the 8 bedrooms that would be allowed under Title 5 would be arranged in multi-family clusters of the minimum scale allowed by the MBTA Communities legislation and guidelines. She explained that the legislation and guidelines define multi-family as either one structure with 3 or more units, or 2 structures each with 2 or more units. The smallest possible way to comply with the language is either one building with 3 units or two buildings with 2 units in the same 2-acre parcel.

Chair Grady outlined the variety of considerations that the Subcommittee looked at for determining potential locations for this zoning. Chair Grady said they started primarily with subsurface geological conditions out of the concern for ensuring that new development would have as little impact as possible on groundwater. The Subcommittee spent a great deal of time engaging with the Health Agent, as well as with the Board of Health's member on the Subcommittee, Tony Mariano, trying to identify areas in Town where proper septic systems could be sited. She commented that the proposed strategy would rely on standard septic systems, which are common, tested, and have proven and reliable efficacy. Chair

Grady noted that the Subcommittee also sought to avoid floodplain areas that are both known and documented, as well as areas that are known to be flood prone. The Subcommittee also intended to avoid areas with sensitive wildlife habitats and corridors with the goal of reducing the extent of negative impacts on wildlife habitat areas.

Chair Grady went on to explain that the Subcommittee tried to prioritize areas with existing structures, particularly because that could enable adaptive reuse either now or in the future, with the goal of minimizing land disturbance. The Subcommittee also looked closely - to the extent that we had information - at areas with drinking water deficiencies, whether in the form of quality or quantity. For the most part that information is private, but the Subcommittee welcomed feedback from residents to learn where water availability was particularly challenged. The Subcommittee also focused on vehicular access and tried to avoid areas where roads are narrow and have known safety issues, and instead focus on major routes through Town. In the spirit of the name of the legislation, the Subcommittee also considered orienting this zoning towards routes to MBTA stations, such as North Billerica, South Acton, Concord, West Concord and Bedford bus routes. We also sought to avoid historic districts and structures with the goal of prioritizing Carlisle's history and character.

Chair Grady clarified that the Subcommittee decided not to make any recommendations specifically for where the proposed overlay zoning should go. She noted that it requires detailed consideration of the kinds of criteria the Subcommittee was looking at, as well as other criteria that the Planning Board might be interested in.

Chair Grady explained the intent of the primary strategy, which is to create an overlay that could go on top of the base, meaning that a single-family home on a 2-acre parcel with a zoning overlay over it is still compliant with base zoning. However, the property owner could elect to exercise the overlay and develop, redevelop, or expand their property based on that overlay. It would allow for the reuse of existing structures as well as new construction. Property owners could carve up an existing single-family home into 3 or 4 units, with a total of 8 bedrooms on 2 acres pursuant to Title 5 and would have to go through the Board of Health and maybe also the Conservation Commission depending on wetlands. She clarified that this zoning does not remove the jurisdiction of other boards and commissions in Town. She noted that a property owner would still have the right to tear down and rebuild a single-family home if desired. The overlay doesn't preclude the ability for a property owner to exercise the rights of the underlying zoning.

Chair Grady explained that the language of the zoning would enable it to have as few unintended consequences as possible. That can be handled through dimensional requirements, which can limit scale height, lot coverage, open space requirements, etc. The Subcommittee believes that consideration should be made to ensure protection of habitat, particularly making zoning requirements that are substantially more robust than what exists currently for the underlying single-family zoning. This was a top priority of the

Subcommittee's work, and the Subcommittee believes that the zoning language can be crafted in such a way that will enable this priority.

Chair Grady commented that the Subcommittee believes that clustering of the units makes sense because it enables more preservation of natural areas. She described that clustering means if it's 2 structures with 2 units each, keeping them close together, and limiting the amount of area of the property that is cleared for the development. The Subcommittee also wants the zoning to include requirements and considerations for water availability, such as recharge rates and water quality impacts on abutters. Whether that be in the form of real time evaluation or post development evaluation, the Subcommittee believes very strongly that the zoning should require a Site Plan Review by the Planning Board. To be clear the Planning Board would review and ensure that the proposed plan is compliant with the zoning. This would enable the Planning Board to create an approval that has conditions that are specific to the unique characteristics of the site itself. She explained that the Site Plan Review process is not discretionary, and if a proposal complies with zoning, the Planning Board cannot deny it, but they can add reasonable conditions to the approval.

Chair Grady concluded by noting that the Subcommittee focused on this strategy because they believed it was aligned with Master Plan and Housing Production Plan goals. The Subcommittee conducted a survey early in their work and by Carlisle standards they got an average response. They found that the primary strategy was aligned with the survey results and would minimize the scale of buildings in keeping with Carlisle's character. She pointed out that the strategy would enable Title 5 compliant conventional septic systems that are well known and well understood, and that ensure that septic flowage is treated properly and minimizes the risk of nitrogen contamination to groundwater.

Joint Discussion - Planning Board, Select Board, Subcommittee

Before discussing alternative strategies not pursued, Chair Grady asked if there were any questions and comments from members of the other boards.

Ms. Christodouloupoulos clarified a prior comment from Chair Grady regarding ecological impacts, noting that the information on the website does not reflect everything that has been discussed. Mr. Harrison said he also wanted to clarify that this strategy is not the only way Carlisle could comply with the mandate, and urged the Select Board to create another committee to look at other options and explore what other towns are doing in response.

Select Board member Triola asked for a reminder of the timeline for compliance, and when this would be presented at Town Meeting. He also asked if there was an update on the Supreme Judicial Court case against the Town of Milton. Chair Grady explained the Subcommittee initially wanted to present this at Spring Town Meeting, in case it failed to allow for it to be presented at Fall Town Meeting. She went on to say there is more work left to do, and suggested presenting it at Fall Town Meeting with multiple options for compliance with a series of pros or cons. Whether we comply will be decided by the vote at

Town Meeting, and the Town has until December of 2025 to comply. Planning Board Chair Smith said we will know more about what happens with other towns soon.

Mr. Harrison reiterated his comment about looking at other strategies and suggested that if the Town only focuses on the Subcommittee's primary strategy the Town will lose time, and people will be asked to vote on something that they do not have a full perspective on. Mr. Harrison also opined that the deadline imposed by the State is not the end of days, and the Town could comply in the future.

Planning Board member Adams asked for an articulation of the consequences of noncompliance. Planning Board Chair Smith replied, saying it is not known for sure specifically, but the Town risks losing funding provided by the State, and she noted that on Mass.gov it states communities that fail to comply with the law also risk liability under Federal and State Fair Housing laws.

Planning Board member Herschelman thanked the Subcommittee and Ms. Mercier for the work that they have done. He expressed that he feels they should provide all available information to the public. Finding out how much the Town could lose in funding is very important. Chair Grady mentioned that information about loss of funding will be made clear. Ms. Reid said that she received a memo that MBTA Communities compliance is helpful for the Department of Energy Resources (DOER) Climate Leaders Program, which the Select Board just applied for in coordination with the Environmental Sustainability Committee. She added that the Town could be eligible for up to 1 million dollars for various projects pursuant to this grant program over the next several years. Select Board member Triola said the State will pull every lever they can, and it will play out in court. He opined that the early towns would take the brunt, but that Carlisle is in a lucky position to see what happens to other towns. He commented that the Town cannot make the right decision without exploring the options. Chair Grady said we have an out-of-the-box, minimally-compliant strategy that we can consider.

Mr. Harrison said he was told by Representative Cataldo's office that Chapter 70 and Chapter 90 funding will not be impacted. Select Board member Triola added that Chapter 90 funding Carlisle receives is almost \$500,000 per year. Ms. Reid said the Attorney General's office opened a brand-new Housing Department to ensure compliance with this law. She added that despite the information from Representative Cataldo's office, the Governor did make a statement regarding potential loss of critical State funding for roads, bridges and schools. Planning Board member Guild asked if there has been any effort of towns banding together to fight this mandate. Select Board member Triola said that multiple towns have signed onto the Milton case. He commented that over 100 towns have complied, and that most towns are complying, and the State is going to try to get the remaining towns to comply as well.

Planning Board member Guild asked if the concept of a larger conservation cluster was still on the table. Chair Grady explained the idea was considered, but not fully developed

because of timeline constraints.

Planning Board member Herschelman asked about the discussion of potential conflict of interest and voting. He asked about the timeframe for Town Meeting. The group discussed they would not be taking any votes today, instead working towards preparing something to present at the next Town Meeting. Ms. Reid reminded the group that the warrant for Spring Town Meeting closes on February 11th. Ms. Mercier explained that putting this on the warrant is just a placeholder and zoning language does not have to be final at that time. The Planning Board would still have to have their public hearing process, and they can edit it or take it off the warrant if needed.

Planning Board member Adams asked if the Subcommittee had considered the long-term financial benefits to the Town that come with compliance. Chair Grady said this was out of the scope of the Subcommittee and would require a third-party analysis. Planning Board member Adams said it is important to think about the benefits. Select Board member Triola added that it is important to understand the cost of non-compliance on municipal services, as well as the ancillary benefit of new housing, and to have this analysis buttoned up before Town Meeting. Ms. Reid commented that this is zoning, not construction, and that actual development will be incremental over time, so the financial impacts may be hard to capture.

Planning Board member Herschelman noted the Board of Health members present, referred to the hydrogeological study, and the known well contamination issues in Town. He asked how the Town can get comfortable enough to propose something that won't affect the water supply or cause problems. He asked how it would be possible to get our arms around this when there is so much that we don't know. Mr. Mariano noted that from a septic standpoint, the primary strategy doesn't change anything that already exists. Carlisle has flow rates that are extremely conservative. The change the Town needs to consider is how water usage would increase. Three kitchens on 2-acres would be a lot more water usage than a traditional single-family house and could tax water availability. Mr. Mariano commented that he doesn't know if the Town will ever be comfortable because groundwater is such a complex system – it's not just one big bathtub, it varies from neighbor to neighbor. No matter what you tie into you have different constraints all over Town. He referred to the grant money being used to compile data on septic and well records to help the Town understand how things work. He noted that the information is being gathered with the goal of having a consultant analyze the water table range for impacts on water availability. He concluded by noting that there are water rights on the Federal Wildlife Refuge Land, but putting in infrastructure is expensive.

Chair Grady suggested adding limits within zoning to minimize water usage, such as restrictions on irrigation. She added that older fixtures are not as efficient (low flow) as code requires newer systems to be today.

Planning Board Chair Smith asked if what Mr. Mariano stated meant dispersing density is a

better strategy for preserving water availability. Mr. Mariano responded, saying it was an educated guess that spreading out would minimize impacts on water availability, but that higher density would require piped sewage treatment. Ms. Christodouloupoulos opined that this is one of the benefits of zoning smaller areas versus many parcels in just one area.

Planning Board member Guild said the Board of Health currently allows you to build a house without a well, but you cannot move in without a well. He asked if the Board of Health could require well approval up front. Mr. Mariano said the Board of Health is about to start updating their well regulations and they will investigate it.

Planning Board member Adams said in his time on various boards he does not recall hearing complaints about water supply. Mr. Mariano said the Subcommittee initially looked at this from a septic standpoint, but as they went further into this process, they realized water availability was just as important. Planning Board member Adams asked if supply is a concentrated problem or sporadic, stating that septic and well are inextricably linked. An 8-bedroom septic is great but it needs water supply to push effluent through the system. Mr. Mariano responded that the Board of Health only reviews private water supply wells, for which no monitoring or reporting is required. He opined that it should be so the Town can understand the water supply. He noted that homeowners take care of their own wells, and some people even have holding tanks because the water supply is sporadic. It is important for us to investigate our water supply as a Town. The Board of Health isn't getting requests to deepen wells often. Ms. Christodouloupoulos mentioned that limiting impervious surfaces has additional benefits as well.

Planning Board Chair Smith asked if this information also lends itself to other zoning language like limiting lot coverage and permeable surfaces. Mr. Mariano opined that while it is related, large lots offer a lot of space for runoff to infiltrate.

Alternative Strategies Considered but Not Pursued

Chair Grady read from the Alternative Strategies document that was provided to the Planning Board. She noted that some of the strategies could be considered further but the Subcommittee did not focus much energy on them.

A. Town-Owned Land (i.e., Banta Davis, Conant)

What: Zone an area of Banta Davis or Conant land for MBTA Communities compliant residential density unadjusted for nitrogen loading.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: For the purpose of compliance with the MBTA Communities legislation, Town-owned land can be considered if the Town and the State deem the land "developable." It is not clear what this entails. Moreover, there are many competing uses for the Banta Davis land, and the Conant land is restricted by ledge, wetlands, trails, existing Town buildings/parking, and a monument to a revered Town resident. Both the Banta Davis and Conant lands have been considered for multi-family housing in the past; none of the prior housing proposals on these properties have been successfully permitted. The

operational excess capacity at the school wastewater treatment plant is not available for residential or other use.

B. Town-Owned Buildings (i.e., Highland, Bog House)

What: Zone for housing at the Highland Building and Bog House.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: While there has been interest expressed in repurposing these structures for housing, there are competing uses for the Highland Building, and though repurposing the Bog House for housing is under discussion, myriad complexities exist and more consideration is needed before zoning is proposed.

C. Town Center / Mixed-Use

What: Zone the Town Center for MBTA Communities compliant residential density unadjusted for nitrogen loading and/or zone the Town Center pursuant to the Mixed-Use provisions in the MBTA Communities Guidelines.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: The Town Center is within the Residence A 1-acre zoning district and Historic District. Many of the lots are much smaller than 1 acre and are tight from a septic- and well-siting standpoint, and there are known water issues. There is no municipal infrastructure currently in place to support MBTA Communities compliant residential density in the Town Center, and the operational excess capacity at the school wastewater treatment plant is not available for residential or other use. The Town Center does not meet the criteria outlined for Mixed-Use in the Guidelines and would likely be rejected by the State.

D. Large Development on Edge of Town

What: Zone for MBTA Communities compliant residential density unadjusted for nitrogen loading in a large-scale building or buildings on the edge of Town.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: The Subcommittee weighed this option but did not explore it in detail because the survey response does not support zoning for large-scale buildings. However, survey respondents did express interest in zoning on the edges of Town. The Subcommittee is taking the cautious approach that whatever is zoned for may eventually happen, and that it may be possible for a developer to tie into a neighboring town's water or sewer. A strategy that involves zoning for large-scale buildings requires a great deal more consideration.

Planning Board member Guild asked for clarification on zoning for 95 units in one place versus spreading it throughout Town. He asked what latitude the zoning has to control what the large development would look like, and if they can specify it meets certain requirements. He mentioned that there could be multiple well-done buildings. Chair Grady responded that they can specify requirements, but the building would still be large. She noted that the square footage required for 95 units would be a total of 50,000 square feet or more; in contrast, Assurance Technology is approximately 7,500 square feet. Mr. Adams clarified that if the zoning does not adjust for Nitrogen loading, a developer would have to

use a wastewater treatment plant, which would mean that groundwater would not be contaminated. Chair Grady responded in the affirmative.

Planning Board member Herschelman noted that the Town has received a plan for an example of 95 units on one property that shows a public water supply. Chair Grady clarified that the public water supply shown is wells and not a piped system. Ms. Christodouloupoulos said that 95 units in one place would have a serious traffic impact. Chair Grady said the Subcommittee feels the primary strategy considered allows for the most control by the town.

E. Churches (i.e., St. Irene’s Parish, Congregational Church)

What: Zone for MBTA Communities compliant residential density unadjusted for nitrogen loading over existing churches in Town.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: This was not considered or discussed in detail by the Subcommittee. The State may view this approach as spot zoning and may not allow this approach. The Subcommittee is taking the cautious approach that whatever is zoned for may eventually happen. A strategy that involves zoning for large-scale buildings requires a great deal more consideration.

F. Vacant Land

What: Zone for MBTA Communities compliant residential density unadjusted for nitrogen loading on vacant land.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: The survey response does not support zoning over vacant land. The Subcommittee prefers to pursue a strategy that has as minimal an environmental impact on Carlisle as possible. This approach conflicts with Master Plan goals and Select Board goals of protection of natural resources. However, the Subcommittee did consider a form of Multi-family Conservation Cluster Subdivision overlay that could be applicable to parcels otherwise able to be developed pursuant to Subdivision Control Law and/or the Approval Not Required process to help enable maximum meaningful habitat preservation and minimized ecological impacts.

G. Commercial Areas

What: Zone for MBTA Communities compliant residential density unadjusted for nitrogen loading within the existing commercial areas in Town.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: Most of the existing commercial uses in Carlisle are in the Town Center, which was ruled out for the reasons noted in C above. Aside from the Central Business District, the other commercial zoning districts in Town are along Bedford Road, are not contiguous, and do not contain enough land area to satisfy the mandate.

H. Existing Development Overlay

What: Zone the 2-acre multi-family conservation cluster strategy over existing

developments such as Kay's Walk, Garrison Place, Benfield, etc.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: Though popular among some residents, zoning exclusively over areas that were recently developed with higher density developments is not a genuine strategy for the potential creation of housing units. The Subcommittee has not had the opportunity to fully consider this approach.

I. Low Value Properties

What: Zone the 2-acre multi-family conservation cluster strategy over parcels valued at \$800,000 or less.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: While there may be some overlap between low-value properties and the areas under consideration, the Subcommittee does not want to rely on re-zoning low-value properties as the sole strategy due to the impact it could have on the current existing lower-case "a" achievable/affordable housing stock in Town. Additionally, this approach raises spot zoning concerns.

J. Willing Property Owners

What: Survey the community for property owners willing to be re-zoned for the 2-acre multi-family conservation cluster strategy, and then create zoning over those parcels.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: Simply because a property owner is willing to have their property re-zoned does not mean that it makes sense from a groundwater, ecological, historical, road capacity, etc. perspective. The Subcommittee has taken a holistic look at the Town from a variety of angles and is interested in zoning that is viable for the Town in the long term. This approach also raises spot zoning concerns.

K. Do Nothing

What: Put forward no proposals at Town Meeting.

Reason(s) Not Pursued: Though many residents have expressed opposition to the mandate, the Subcommittee was charged to explore the feasibility of compliance and has identified feasible options. The decision to do nothing should be left to Town Meeting.

Planning Board member Herschelman asked if the Planning Board should consider the Do-Nothing approach, specifically the consequences that go along with it. He opined that it is important for people to know what a "no" vote means. Chair Grady said this is always an option.

Mr. Mariano suggested the Planning Board consider a new subcommittee with different membership representing different expertise such as that held by the Board of Assessors and Finance Committee, etc. Chair Grady agreed with Mr. Mariano and noted that exploring financial impacts was not in the charge for the original Subcommittee.

Mr. Snell thanked the Subcommittee for their extensive work as volunteers. Chair Grady expressed her gratitude for the Subcommittee, which was great, and everyone put in earnest effort towards a real sense of the best way to do this. Ms. Christodouloupoulos gave kudos to Ms. Mercier for her work and support.

Ms. Smith asked if the Planning Board should form a new subcommittee. Chair Grady said the existing Subcommittee still has minutes to approve. Ms. Mercier explained that the Planning Board could vote to disband the Subcommittee after the Subcommittee has one final administrative meeting solely for the purpose of approving minutes. The final minutes of the meeting would then be approved by the Planning Board or a designated Subcommittee member.

Planning Board member Adams asked if it's safe to assume that the State doesn't allow leeway from compliance based on public health concerns. Chair Grady said her take is that other regulations supersede, and leeway would not be allowed. Planning Board member Adams commented that other than an overlay on a peripheral property that could tie into a neighboring town's infrastructure, the Town does not have data to prove there won't be issues to public health. Ms. Reid said the State doesn't care if you can do it or not, the Town could always bring in water. Chair Grady commented that the State just wants towns to have multi-family zoning on the books.

Planning Board member Herschelman said he does not think the Town should put zoning on the books just to comply. He opined that the Town must be cautious and assume what we zone for will be developed. Ms. Reid said the Subcommittee proceeded with that very caution which led to the primary strategy they considered.

Planning Board member Herschelman said the Planning Board needs to figure out their next steps by their next meeting on January 13th. Chair Grady, speaking for herself not for the Subcommittee, suggested asking the Town Planner for a new charge for a new Subcommittee and a proposed schedule for how to move forward with something at Town Meeting. Ms. Mercier asked if this should be a Subcommittee of the Planning Board. Chair Grady reconsidered and said a new Subcommittee would be a lot more administrative work for Ms. Mercier, when she could be gathering information from subject matter experts.

Planning Board member Herschelman asked how the public will stay involved. Ms. Reid said public involvement will be at Planning Board meetings. Chair Grady said all meetings are public, and the Planning Board may have to meet more often. Planning Board Chair Smith suggested the Planning Board could conduct open houses as well.

Select Board member Triola suggested leveraging the work of other towns of similar size to see what their strategies have been. Ms. Mercier said she used to meet regularly with planners of other towns but has not had the bandwidth to do that recently. She said there are a lot of resources available. Chair Grady referred to a meeting with HLC at which they were told other adjacent small towns have similar strategies to Carlisle, with a focus on

putting land in open space protection. She suggested the Planning Board could charge Ms. Mercier with a list of tasks. Ms. Reid clarified that the Planning Board cannot specify who Ms. Mercier should consult to carry out the tasks.

Ms. Christodouloupoulos expressed concerns that things discussed in meetings have not been included, such as BioMap considerations. Chair Grady suggested people direct written submissions to Ms. Mercier which would then be submitted to the Planning Board. Ms. Mercier said she can meet with people as well, but clarified that she cannot make any decisions.

Planning Board member Adams asked if they were taking public comments. Planning Board Chair Smith replied in the negative. Ms. Beland said that any public comments could be sent to her via email to nbeland@carlislema.gov.

Planning Board member Gushue asked if the Subcommittee should have another meeting to finish their administrative business.

Planning Board member Herschelman made a motion to have the Town Planner make recommendations on a schedule for spring or fall Town Meeting, for the Planning Board to consider at the next Planning Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Geggis and approved 7-0-0 by roll call vote.

Mr. Geggis made a motion to disband the Subcommittee after their last administrative meeting. The motion was seconded by Chair Grady and approved 7-0-0 by roll call vote.

The Select Board adjourned at 9:02 PM.

Ms. Johnson-Battista made a motion to adjourn the Subcommittee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mariano and approved 6-0-0. The Subcommittee adjourned at 9:03 PM.

These minutes were approved on 12/17/24.

Materials Reviewed

- Agenda for 12/9/24
- MBTA Communities Subcommittee Memos to Planning Board dated 12/5/24 and 12/9/24