

**Arlington Redevelopment Board**  
**Monday, August 5, 2024, at 7:30 PM**  
**Community Center, Main Hall**  
**27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476**  
**Meeting Minutes**

This meeting was recorded by ACMI.

**PRESENT:** Rachel Zsemary (Chair), Eugene Benson, Shaina Korman-Houston, Kin Lau, Stephen Revilak

**STAFF:** Sarah Suarez, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development

---

The Chair called the meeting of the Board to order.

The Chair opened with **Agenda Item 1 – Review Meeting Minutes.**

July 15, 2024, minutes – The Board members made one edit to the minutes. The Chair requested a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 2 – Public Hearing: Docket #3810, 149 Pleasant Street.**

Ms. Suarez explained that the application is for a proposal to demolish an existing single-family house located on a corner lot at 149 Pleasant Street and to construct a new three-family residential building, in the R4 Townhouse District. The project is before the Board because the property is located on Pleasant Street. The applicant already went before the Arlington Historic District Commission (AHDC), which issued a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant is proposing to relocate the existing driveway and curb cut on Pleasant Street and add a second driveway and curb cut on Gray Street in order to provide parking for a total of six vehicles. The applicant is seeking relief from several bylaws, including allowing two separate driveways, allowing parking within the front yard setback from Gray Street, and relief from the usable open space requirements due to the significant slope on the property. The proposal is consistent with other houses in the area. The existing single-family house needs significant repair.

The applicant was represented by architect Martha Penzenik, builder James Mackie, and engineer Matt Hamor. Ms. Penzenik noted that a three-family house is an allowable use in an R4 District via special permit. They propose two side-by-side units on the upper floor and one accessible unit on the ground floor. As the property is in the Pleasant Street Historic District, the design is made to look like a single-family house in the Italian Renaissance Revival style, popular between 1890 and 1930. Several houses in the neighborhood are in this style. The design has been deemed an asset to the Town by AHDC. They are also requesting relief regarding the number of driveways and location of parking spaces. They would like to have two driveways, a lower one from Pleasant Street and an upper one from Gray Street, in order to reduce the number of vehicles at any one place on the property. The lower driveway serves the ground-floor accessible unit; it has a turnaround so that cars can pull directly out of the driveway onto Pleasant Street rather than having to back into traffic. They are also requesting relief regarding usable open-space requirements, which their proposal does not meet (nor does the existing house). She noted that the memorandum from DPCD included a question about the distance between the driveway and the intersection between Pleasant and Gray. The driveway edge on Pleasant Street is 26 feet 4 inches from the intersection, and the driveway edge on Gray Street is 57 feet 7 inches from the intersection. Both are in excess of the required 20-foot minimum. The other issue raised in the memorandum has to do with the vegetated buffer between this property and its neighbor on Gray Street. She said that there is no room for a buffer other than a fence between the driveway and the Gray Street neighbor. There is, however, vegetation along other sections.

Mr. Lau noted that at that location, Gray Street is very steep. He asked if water running along the curb of Gray Street would run into the upper driveway. Mr. Hamer replied that there would be a gutter line and a trench drain at the bottom of the driveway, so water running down Gray Street would not collect in the driveway. There will be a small berm in the driveway, but it is not large enough to cause an average-sized car to bottom out.

Mr. Lau asked what the plans are for mechanical space, specifically for heating and cooling. Ms. Penzenik replied that the ground level plans include a utility closet serving that unit. The upper level plans do not designate such space. Mr. Mackie said that they will use either closet or attic space to include air handlers, and the condensers will be outside. On the upper level, they will be under the wood deck. Mr. Lau said that if they will be outside, he would like to see them on the plans.

Mr. Lau asked if the building was all electric. Mr. Mackie replied that it would include gas, but no chimneys would be required.

Mr. Lau said that he thinks it would look nicer if the frieze board is bigger. Ms. Penzenik replied that the size of the frieze board is typical of that period of house. Mr. Lau also asked how the transition would be made between the stucco and the brick veneer foundation. Mr. Mackie replied that there the frame will slightly overhang the foundation.

Ms. Korman-Houston noted that Arlington is participating in the Fossil Fuel Free program, which affects new construction, and she asked that the builder look at the code and make sure that what they're proposing meets those requirements. Mr. Mackie said that the systems haven't been designed yet, but the HERS raters will calculate and design accordingly. He also noted that when they apply for construction permits, the Inspection Services Department (ISD) will let them know exactly what is allowed.

Ms. Korman-Houston noted that solar may be required according to the bylaw. Ms. Penzenik said that the type of roof that is common in the neighborhood is not amenable to solar, and AHDC does not like solar.

Ms. Korman-Houston asked how the applicant came to the decision to include two driveways. Ms. Penzenik said that because of the accessible unit on the ground floor and the difficulty of access to and from Pleasant Street, it seemed logical for safety reasons to create two separate access points. Because it is a corner lot, they were able to create the two driveways on two different streets, so they thought it was a reasonable request. Ms. Korman-Houston asked if they considered any configurations that would require only one curb cut and driveway. Ms. Penzenik said that she did, but given the configuration of the site, it would be difficult to have all the parking on Pleasant Street. It would be easier to access the upper two units from Gray Street, since they are more than a full floor above Pleasant Street. It would also be more dangerous to have all the cars accessing the site having to back onto Pleasant Street, and it would be unattractive to have multiple cars parked in one large driveway.

Ms. Korman-Houston asked about usable open space. Ms. Penzenik said that the site is too steep to include usable open space of a grade less than 8%. She doesn't think the requirements make sense in a town as hilly as Arlington. Ms. Korman-Houston asked how the applicant envisions the landscaping of the yard. Ms. Penzenik said that the flattest area is on Pleasant Street, to the right of the existing house, an area which already includes trees. She thinks that future residents will find a way enjoy the property, even without meeting the usable open space requirements. Mr. Mackie said that the current open space will stay the same, but it doesn't meet the criteria because it's too steep.

Mr. Benson said that he appreciates that the proposal is for multi-family housing. He asked if the applicants have spoken with the Tree Warden. It appears that the driveway will require the removal of a street tree, which is potentially a problem because of the state law about the removal of street trees. The plan also proposes removing trees in the setback, but under Arlington's bylaws, trees in the setback cannot be removed without the approval of the Tree Warden. He also said that he thinks that they will be required to plant a new tree on Gray Street, due to the bylaw requiring a street tree every 25 linear feet. They will need to present the Tree Warden a plan for trees, which the Board would like to see as well.

Mr. Benson noted that they are proposing six parking spaces, but only three are required. He asked if they could make the plan work with one driveway or no parking in the setback, if they were only going to include three spaces. He said that it's one thing for the Board to consider making exceptions to enable applicants to meet minimum parking requirements, but it's another thing to make exceptions for plans that go beyond what's required. Ms. Penzenik said that she objects to the limit of one parking space per unit, because people don't live that way. Mr. Benson said that they can clearly fit three parking spaces into one driveway, because they are already planning four parking spaces into the upper driveway. Ms. Penzenik said that they cannot use the upper driveway for all three units, because the lower unit is accessible, so it must have parking on the same level. Mr. Benson asked if they are required to include an accessible unit, and Ms. Penzenik said that they are. Mr. Benson noted that none of the parking spaces on the plan are

labeled as accessible, and she replied that the spaces outside the accessible unit are the accessible spaces. The Chair said that accessible parking spaces need to be noted on the plan, including dimensions; they cannot be assumed based on their proximity to an accessible unit. Mr. Hamer also noted that the upper driveway includes space for four cars, but only in two sets of tandem spaces, so that it would not work for three separate units. Widening that driveway to accommodate the width of three cars would require a staggered curb cut due to the slope of the site, and it would be a wider curb cut than Arlington generally allows.

Mr. Benson asked why they can't put a vegetated buffer between the upper parking area and the neighbors on Gray Street. Ms. Penzenik said that it is a small space, only about one foot, which needs to include space to walk around the parking and access the back of the house. The slope of the site also makes it difficult. Mr. Benson asked if the upper driveway could be shifted down slightly to allow for a vegetated buffer. Mr. Hamer said that there will be a retaining wall at the edge of the driveway. There will also be a wall wrapping around the parking area. At the request of AHDC, it will be a poured concrete wall with a stone veneer. There will be a trench drain at the end of the driveway, with water piped into a dry well.

Mr. Benson noted that the LEED checklist was not completed, and that they also need to include a LEED narrative that indicates how the LEED objectives will be incorporated into the project.

Mr. Benson also noted that roof solar panels are required by the bylaw. The bylaw includes several possible exemptions. The applicant is required to file a separate document that either explains the solar system they plan to include or explains which exemption(s) are allowed in this case and why. Mr. Revilak said that the solar exemption in Section 6.4.2.C, for buildings in historic districts where AHDC has denied the inclusion of solar panels, could apply in this case. He asked if they discussed the appropriateness of solar with AHDC. Ms. Penzenik said no, because AHDC has routinely denied solar panels for buildings in historic districts. The Chair said that if they want to use that exemption, they need to get a letter from AHDC.

Mr. Revilak said that he thinks that they will need to plant multiple street trees along both frontages. Some current trees would be included in the total required, but he would like to see plans that include all the current street trees and indicate where new ones will be planted.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment:

- Bertrand Halperin, 11 Gray Street – He and his wife are the Gray Street abutters to the 149 Pleasant Street property. Their primary concern is with the upper driveway, which is very close to their property. He thought that there were setbacks requiring a certain distance from a property line to a driveway. They are concerned about the fact that there is no space for plants. They are unsure if there will be a fence on top of the wall.
- Anton Rapetov, 438 Mass Ave, #220 – He appreciates the application. He would prefer electric heating and less parking, but their proposal is definitely an improvement over what is currently there.
- Susan Stamps, speaking on behalf of the Tree Committee – It looks like two of the three pine trees are slated for removal, and they would like the builder to try to save them. In order to remove a street tree, there must be a tree hearing. Such removals are rarely approved, so it's generally better for the developer to figure out a way to avoid removing a street tree. Street trees are considered public assets, and the Town does not generally support destroying them for an individual project. Personally, she also noted that the Town has recently been through a lot of discussion about trying to live with fewer cars, with more focus on walking and public transportation. She thinks that three units at this desirable location would have no trouble finding buyers, even with only one parking space per unit.
- Helena Halperin, 11 Gray Street – They are concerned about the roots of all their plants near the property line, which may be damaged by a large paved area immediately abutting their property. They are glad that the property will be developed to allow for denser residential use, and they are not concerned about having more people or a higher structure next to them. Whatever is built there will be an improvement. They are only concerned about the excessive parking and the wall right next to their property and how it will affect vegetation and drainage.

The Chair closed public comment.

Mr. Revilak noted that this project would normally go before the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and is only in front of the Redevelopment Board because of its location on Pleasant Street. The Board has established something of a precedent in such cases; when reviewing projects that are only before them by virtue of location and not scope or use, they try to treat them similarly to the way the ZBA does. Section 6.1.10.A of the bylaw does not allow parking spaces in the front setback. Because this is a corner lot, it has two front setbacks. Parking must be in a garage, which this property does not have, in the foundation, which is not an option in this case, or along a driveway in the side or rear yard. The bylaw makes a distinction between required spaces and places where residents are allowed to park. So in this case, any spaces in the front setback would not count toward the minimum, and the three required spaces would need to be in the side or rear yard. The Chair asked if Mr. Revilak would suggest moving the structure plan west, so that they could create a parking plan on the east side. He replied that he is unsure how far the structure could move west and still have a 20-foot setback from Gray Street.

Mr. Revilak said that with respect to usable open space, if this project were going before the ZBA, it would require a variance. Due to the slope that exists on the site, there's a good chance that the ZBA would grant a variance. He also noted that parking does not count as usable open space.

Mr. Benson said that if they locate the three required parking spaces in a single location in the rear or side yard, they could have a driveway leading to those spaces and potentially also park in that driveway. He said that he does not think that the Board can say yes to this plan, because they should not allow required parking in the front setback without applicants having to go through the variance process.

Mr. Benson noted that the Board has agreed to relief regarding usable open space in other cases if the proposal hasn't made things worse than the status quo, so he thinks the Board might be able to agree to the proposed limited open space.

Mr. Benson said that before the Board agrees to anything, the applicants need to talk to the Tree Warden about the trees and to the Director of ISD about the question of gas versus electricity.

Mr. Revilak said that the bylaw does not define the size of a vegetated buffer, and the ZBA has approved buffers as small as twelve inches wide.

Mr. Lau said that if the applicants are not allowed to put parking in the front setback, they will have to build parking in the rear, which will result in destroying any landscaping plans they have, including removing more trees. He noted that even if the proposed parking is allowed, they will need to move it slightly in order to preserve the street tree.

Ms. Korman-Houston asked if it would be possible for the lower driveway off Pleasant Street to have head-in parking that allows for more spaces, which might make it possible to have only one driveway. Mr. Mackie said that AHDC requested that an additional driveway be added on Gray Street for safety reasons.

The Chair said that she would like to know if meeting the requirements that Mr. Revilak referred to would result in paving over more of the site. She has concerns about the driveway directly abutting the lot line with the neighbors on Gray Street. If the Board allows the upper driveway, she would like the applicant to look into moving the driveway slightly further away from the lot line. Mr. Hamer said that he believes that the current design does include a 12-inch buffer, and he can provide a plan with a cross-section more clearly showing that. Mr. Benson asked that the plan also show what they intend to plant as a vegetated buffer.

The Chair said that she would like to see a plan that consolidates the parking into a single driveway. Mr. Benson said that he is not necessarily opposed to two driveways. He does not like having the required parking being in the setbacks. He would like to see the three required parking spaces located not in the setbacks, and then driveways leading to those spaces could go through the setbacks and could be used for additional parking.

The Chair summarized what the Board wants from the applicant:

- Applicant must provide an updated LEED checklist and narrative.
- Applicant must provide a cross-section plan of the retaining wall, showing that is a minimum of 12 inches, preferably 18 inches, off the rear lot line.

- Applicant must provide a plan with specific identification of required parking locations not within the setback, with accessible space shown, including its dimensions.
- Applicant must meet with Tree Warden to review requirements for any removal of trees, as well as the exact location of trees in the public way and plans to either preserve those trees or go through the process to be allowed to relocate them.
- Applicant must confirm with the Director of ISD whether they will be subject to the Fossil Fuel Free bylaw, determine what types of mechanical systems will be used and where they will be located, and present updated plans showing that information.
- Applicant must either present a plan for including solar or show that they are exempt from that requirement. If they are claiming exemption based on denial by AHDC, they must show that they have presented a plan for solar to AHDC and been denied.
- Applicant must show where trash and recycling bins will be kept on the site.

The Chair said that the Board likes the project, and they want to help the applicant meet the bylaw requirements and be able to build the project.

Mr. Revilak said that he cannot see how the Pleasant Street driveway could avoid having a designated parking space in the front setback. Two driveways on a corner lot would generally be required to go into the side and rear yards, which would mean placing the lower driveway to the right of the house, but that area has trees they hope to save and has a too steep a grade for a driveway. He said were this project before the ZBA, they would have a reasonable case for a variance due to the slope. The Redevelopment Board cannot grant a variance, but they can provide relief in support of the project's efforts to meet the Environmental Design Review and Special Permit criteria. The Chair said that the Board would like to see an option for including the three required parking spaces in a single driveway. Mr. Mackie noted that AHDC requested that they include two separate driveways. The Chair said that the Board would follow up with AHDC, but she noted that the Redevelopment Board considers issues beyond the aesthetic and historic concerns of AHDC.

The Chair proposed continuing the hearing to the Board's meeting on Monday, October 7, 2024, and the applicant agreed. She asked for a motion to continue the hearing for Docket #3810, 149 Pleasant Street, to October 7, 2024. Mr. Lau so motioned, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

### The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 3 – Economic Development Presentation.**

Katie Luczai, Economic Development Coordinator, introduced herself and gave an overview of economic development in Arlington, as the Town starts the work of updating the Master Plan and forming the Arlington Heights Business District.

- Arlington has about 1,700 registered businesses. The top industry in Arlington is health care and social services.
- In the most recent Envision Arlington survey, respondents said that the most valuable attraction in Arlington is the Minuteman Bikeway, along with Spy Pond, the Reservoir, and the Regent and Capitol Theaters. Residents value open space, walkability, and local businesses.
- Arlington has approximately 75 food establishments and has made a strong recovery from the pandemic, bringing in more meals receipts than ever before. Arlington has one hotel, which has also recovered well from the pandemic.
- Ms. Luczai is working on enforcing the vacant storefronts bylaw, in particular requiring the removal of nonconforming signage and accruing fees. One of the best outcomes of bylaw enforcement is creating connections with property owners and gathering information.
- She also reviews all sign permits. One challenge is multi-tenant spaces that have hit the maximum allowable signage. Another is the Town's ban on neon signs, which puts Arlington businesses at a disadvantage.
- In 2021, Town Meeting adopted bylaw amendments that allowed by right housing for artists in the Industrial District, subject to conditions set forth by the Arlington Commission for Arts and Culture (ACAC). However, due to staff turnover, those guidelines were never finalized. Ms. Luczai has begun working on this issue with ACAC.

- ACAC received a Transformative Growth Grant to bring new murals to Arlington, which has already funded one project, and 2-3 more will be installed by the end of November. The biggest challenge has been finding property owners willing to let their walls be used for murals.
- The 2019 Arlington Heights Action Plan led to a plan for rezoning to create an Arlington Heights Business District. Ms. Luczai is working with Claire Ricker, Director of DPCD, on community engagement. A proposed use table has been drafted based on feedback from the engagement sessions.
- Ms. Luczai has also been working on Arlington 250, the Minuteman Wayfinding Project, and an update of the Small Business Resource Guide.

Mr. Revilak noted that when Beth Locke, President of the Arlington Chamber of Commerce, met with the Board over a year ago, she said that a lot of businesses would like to be in Arlington, but many of Arlington's commercial spaces are unappealing or are inappropriate for many types of businesses. He asked if Ms. Luczai agreed with that assessment. She replied that she does. She regularly gets calls from businesses who would like to move into Arlington but have difficulty finding an appropriate space. Overall, Arlington's commercial spaces are generally 2,000 square feet or less, which is too small for many businesses. Much of the space is also generally quite old, so it often requires significant up-front costs, which can be daunting for many small businesses.

Mr. Revilak noted that Arlington has a number of large residential districts which are not very walkable because they are too far from areas with businesses that people might want to walk to. He likes the idea of allowing small-scale businesses like coffee shops or beauty supply shops in residential districts. He asked Ms. Luczai if she thought that would be viable in Arlington. She replied that it would be, and she would love to see more home occupations. That issue would need to be explored with the Director of ISD, because the inspectional requirements for businesses can be barriers to people trying to run businesses out of their homes.

Mr. Benson asked what types of businesses are interested in coming to Arlington, and what types of commercial spaces they are looking for that Arlington doesn't have. Ms. Luczai said that she gets a lot of interest from fitness centers and child-care centers, as well as retail. She gets less interest from people wanting office or restaurant space. Most businesses want spaces of 3,000-5,000 square feet. One challenge is that many property owners of larger buildings want a single tenant to take the whole building, but that often doesn't work for smaller businesses. Mr. Benson asked if Ms. Luczai ever hears from businesses wanting to put industrial businesses in the Industrial District. She said that she does not. Arlington is not well suited for industrial businesses, because it is not located on major highways. Overall, industrial use is going down.

Mr. Benson noted that some neon is allowed in the zoning bylaw, and he asked what they could change in the zoning bylaw regarding neon to attract businesses. Ms. Luczai said that she would recommend that the Board keep an open mind regarding signs with a variety of types of lighting.

Mr. Lau asked if any consideration has been given to giving any sort of tax break or other assistance to businesses that would need to spend money up front to open in spaces that are older or otherwise require work. Ms. Luczai said that the state has a program called Vacant Storefronts Districts that will give tenants up to \$10,000 in tax credits to get started. Mr. Lau said that he is aware of the state's program, but he would like to see the Town give tax breaks as well. The Chair suggested that the Board discuss it with the Select Board.

Mr. Lau asked Ms. Luczai about her role in getting signage for closed businesses removed. She said that the new Vacant Storefronts bylaw, which was passed by 2024 Annual Town Meeting and is awaiting approval by the Attorney General, would allow her to tell property owners that they are required to remove all nonconforming signage, which would include signs for businesses that are no longer present.

The Chair said that as the Board works on the zoning for the Arlington Heights Business District, they should think about whether there are ways to incentivize the creation of commercial spaces with larger square footage through the zoning.

Mr. Revilak said that the Town has had a successful parking benefits district program in Arlington Center, and he would like to talk to the Select Board about whether that would make sense in Arlington Heights and/or Capitol Square. Ms. Luczai said that she included a question about that in the annual survey, and residents overwhelmingly said that they did not want parking meters in the Heights or in Capitol Square. Mr. Revilak said that he thinks that it's possible to explain to

people how meters can actually help make parking easier, because it encourages people not to take up high value spaces for extended periods of time. Ms. Luczai added that being able to use the money from parking meters to care for planters has helped beautify the Center, and she often hears from business owners in East Arlington that the flower beds and planters are neglected. The Arlington Heights business owners have gotten together and privately funded taking care of the planters and other beautification efforts.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 4 – Alewife Redevelopment Discussion.**

Ms. Suarez explained that the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) has issued a Notice of Intent proposing to enter into a partnership with a private developer to redevelop the Alewife MBTA station and garage.

Mr. Revilak said that as an East Arlington resident, he is excited about this process. The City of Cambridge has done quite a bit of work on the Alewife area. They developed an Alewife District Master Plan that proposes to add more businesses, more residences, and more green space in that area. He thinks it makes a lot of sense for the MBTA to enter into a public-private partnership to redevelop the station and garage.

Mr. Benson said that he asked for this issue to be included on the agenda because he wants the Board to talk about what role, if any, the Board should play in this process. The redevelopment plans potentially include the entire railyard, as well as the station and garage. He thinks that the redevelopment plan could be detrimental to Arlington. It could result in an increase in the discharge from Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs) into Alewife Brook, as well as flooding. It could also increase traffic at intersections along the border of Arlington and Cambridge that are already over capacity. He thinks that the Town needs to connect with the MBTA early in this process and be included in the planning process. The Notice of Intent says that they might create a stakeholder group. He thinks that they need to do so, and that the Town of Arlington needs to be one of the stakeholders. He would like to discuss this issue with the Select Board at the upcoming joint meeting. The Chair said that she would contact Jim Feeney, Town Manager, to create an outreach strategy for connecting with the MBTA.

Ms. Korman-Houston said that she thinks that the Town could ask that plans to mitigate existing problems of flooding and pollution be included in the redevelopment process. Mr. Benson noted that the redevelopment will likely bring significant tax dollars to Cambridge, and Arlington should ask that Cambridge use some of that money to do work on sewers and other infrastructure along the border that would mitigate pollution and flooding issues. Cambridge also created an artificial wetland in the area, and they could use some of the available space to create another one, which would help with stormwater issues.

Mr. Lau said that we need a concerted effort from the Town to stay focused on this process and to make sure that Arlington is involved throughout the process.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 5 – Open Forum.**

The Chair opened the floor to public comment:

- Kristin Anderson, 12 Upland Road West, member of Save the Alewife Brook – Last year, 27 million gallons of untreated sewage was dumped into Alewife Brook; in 2021, it was 51 million gallons. This is a densely populated area, including multiple environmental justice neighborhoods. Last year, the brook flooded over its bank five times, sending untreated sewage into the DCR state park and the Alewife Greenway. Climate change threatens to exacerbate the problem. Several months ago, Save the Alewife Brook and the Mystic River Watershed Association called for an end to new sewer hookups to the CSOs until the problem is solved. Since then, the state is considering building a 22-story building just feet away from Cambridge's worst CSO, which is also very close to the parking garage planned to be redeveloped. She expressed concern that the sewage from new buildings in the Alewife area will end up in the parks, yards, and homes of Arlington residents, unless there is an end to new sewer hookups pending a solution. Cambridge, Somerville, and the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) are in the process of creating a new long-term plan for Alewife CSOs. She would like the Board to support an end to untreated sewage pollution in East Arlington.

- Beth Melofchik, 20 Russell Street, Town Meeting member – She came to support Kristin Anderson and Save the Alewife Brook. She is angry that the pollution has been allowed to continue. She asks that the Board not support the Alewife redevelopment plan without an end to new connections to the CSOs until the untreated sewage is rerouted away from Alewife Brook and East Arlington. She would like to see the brook returned to a natural state.

Seeing no one else who wished to speak, the Chair closed public comment.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 6 – New Business.**

Mr. Revilak said that the governor will sign the housing bond bill on August 6. One change is that Massachusetts will now allow ADUs by right in single-family districts, without a requirement for owner occupancy in either the main dwelling or the accessory unit. That will put Arlington's bylaws in conflict with state law, so the Board will need to look into changing the bylaw to come into compliance.

The Chair asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lau so moved, and Mr. Benson seconded. The Board voted and approved unanimously.

Meeting **Adjourned at 10:08 pm.**