



TOWN OF MEDFIELD

Office of the

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN HOUSE, 459 MAIN STREET
MEDFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 02052-2009

MEETING OF:
January 5, 2026
MINUTES

Planning Board Members Present: Teresa James, Chair; Seth Meehan, Member; Corinne Schieffer, Member; Doug Larence, Member; Seth Meehan, Member

Member Planning Board Members Absent: Paul McKechnie, Member; Sean Tiernan, Associate Member

Staff Present: Maria De La Fuente, Director of Land Use

Others Present: Ted Brovitz (Consultant)

Location: Zoom

Ms. James opened the Planning Board's first meeting of 2026 on January 5, 2026, at 7:36 PM, conducted roll call, and reviewed the agenda.

Roll call:

- Ms. James – Present
- Mr. Larence – Present
- Ms. Schieffer – Present

Mr. Meehan would join later in the evening.

Mixed-Use Overlay District Discussion

Ms. James stated that the Board was reconvening to review Version 5 of the Mixed-Use Overlay District (MUOD) draft with consultant Ted Brovitz, including revisions based on prior Board feedback. She summarized that the MUOD had been initiated several years earlier, paused during MBTA zoning work, and was now being revisited to encourage walkable mixed-use infill development downtown with clear regulations.

Mr. Brovitz stated that the document was the fifth edition and reflected multiple meetings with the Planning Board and follow-up refinements with Ms. De La Fuente. He reviewed the Purpose and Intent section, describing the bylaw as a tool to encourage additional residential and

mixed-use development, diversify housing and business opportunities, and enhance the community.

MUOD Subdistricts and Mapping

Mr. Brovitz explained that the overlay included two subdistricts: the Downtown Mixed-Use Overlay District and the Route 109 Mixed-Use Overlay District. He stated that the hatched parcels on the map were included in the MUOD and that the red dashed frontage line indicated where buildings would be required to be brought closer to the sidewalk or right-of-way to reinforce traditional downtown form. Ms. De La Fuente stated that the Planning Board had removed some area near the Spring Street and Park Street corridor because it was farther out and unlikely to be used.

Ms. James asked about a small sliver near Noon Hill and whether it represented a parcel. Ms. De La Fuente stated it was a single long parcel and explained that, based on feedback from Mr. Meehan, she adjusted the boundary approach so entire parcels were included rather than splitting parcels with overlay lines. Ms. James then raised concerns about the Park Street area, stating that parcels were narrow, buildings were already constrained by parking in front and the rail line behind, and she questioned whether the frontage requirement was practical there.

Mr. Brovitz stated that redevelopment on those parcels would likely require assembling multiple parcels and might involve parking under buildings with commercial and residential above, but he agreed it was a challenging area. He confirmed the frontage line denoted an obligation to bring buildings forward, with the possibility of Planning Board exceptions where existing buildings were already set back with parking in front. Ms. De La Fuente added that the Planning Board could waive requirements depending on the circumstances and emphasized that the intent was flexibility.

Ms. James suggested she would be in favor of removing the frontage line from Park Street if it would otherwise create impractical expectations. Mr. Larence stated that existing buildings could not be retrofitted to meet a build-to-front condition and that the requirement would only realistically apply if buildings were torn down and rebuilt. Ms. De La Fuente agreed and stated the Board would waive the requirement in most non-teardown situations.

Mr. Brovitz stated that redevelopment could also occur at a smaller scale, including attached apartment buildings or small mixed-use with offices on the ground floor and residential above. Ms. James and Ms. De La Fuente described the lots as very narrow, and the Board discussed whether the lot depths were sufficient for meaningful redevelopment.

Mr. Larence articulated that the broader goal should be to eliminate conditions where parking dominates the frontage, and instead support development where buildings front the street and parking is behind buildings, or otherwise not in front. Ms. De La Fuente agreed, stating that front parking detached building use from the street. Mr. Brovitz agreed and stated that one possible approach would be to tuck parking under structures or behind them so that, from the street, development could appear as traditional townhouse form with the parking hidden.

Ms. De La Fuente stated that if older buildings were ever torn down and rebuilt, the frontage requirement could then be enforced to shift buildings toward the road, with waivers available where impractical. She emphasized that the MUOD was optional and that property owners could proceed under the underlying Business zoning instead of the overlay if they did not want to pursue mixed-use. Mr. Brovitz stated that if owners pursued redevelopment, residential above commercial would likely be financially attractive.

Ms. James asked whether there were other comments on the updated downtown plan.

Mr. Larence raised a question about whether Brook Street should be included, describing it as predominantly residential with a few commercial uses and stating it felt like an outlier in a “downtown” overlay district. Ms. De La Fuente responded that the underlying zoning in that area was already Business Industrial, and the MUOD did not change underlying zoning; it only offered an overlay option. Mr. Larence acknowledged he was not seeking to complicate the effort and was raising the question for consistency.

Ms. James noted the Board had previously discussed whether to include Montrose and suggested that if Brook Street were removed now, it could be reconsidered later in conjunction with Montrose.

Ms. Schieffer stated she viewed Brook Street as appropriate for inclusion because the area was already Business Industrial and already included mixed conditions such as residential in front with commercial office uses behind, an office condo, and an auto body shop. She stated that since the overlay was optional and did not change underlying zoning, inclusion preserved future flexibility and aligned with goals of creating housing and revenue opportunities. Ms. Schieffer added that removing a few lots because the street was mostly residential could undermine the broader objective and noted that other small offshoots from Main Street were similarly shallow. She stated the area was pedestrian-friendly and supported keeping the Brook Street parcels within the MUOD option set.

Mr. Brovitz stated that he agreed with including Montrose, and Ms. James stated that she supported including Montrose. Mr. Brovitz stated that including the corner property could provide an incentive to redevelop it in a way that blended with the neighborhood and took advantage of views over adjacent open space.

Ms. De La Fuente asked whether the Board was comfortable leaving Brook Street in the overlay. Mr. Larence stated that he was comfortable with that.

Ms. De La Fuente then reviewed the second map, referencing the Route 109 area including Bullard’s Plaza, Rockland Trust, and the post office. She stated that she had cleaned up boundary lines and that any apparent changes in lot lines reflected the decision to include entire parcels rather than partial parcels. Ms. De La Fuente stated that the map was for reference only and would not be included in a warrant article.

Ms. De La Fuente clarified that the reference map was intended to show the relationship between the Town’s MUOD and the MBTA zoning district, explaining that the MBTA Overlat was shown

in pink and the MUOD was shown in blue, with some overlap and some differences. Mr. Brovitz asked whether there had been developer interest in the MBTA zoning district. Ms. De La Fuente replied that there had not been.

Mr. Brovitz then moved to the “Applicability” section of the draft. He explained that projects proposed under the MUOD would require a special permit and would follow the special permit review process, including consultation with Town departments coordinated through the Planning Department. Ms. De La Fuente corrected the title to “Director of Land Use and Planning”.

Mr. Brovitz explained that site plan review and the use of the design guidelines were part of the Planning Board’s review responsibilities under its rules and regulations, and that the design guidelines were intended to help shape development outcomes. He stated that the updated draft design guidelines were extensive and included guidance on building design, open space, parking placement, screening and landscaping, and streetscape improvements.

Mr. Brovitz then reviewed zoning map performance standards, including the transitional buffer zone along edges abutting residential properties in residential districts. He stated that the transitional buffer included a 10-foot landscape buffer measured from the property line where there was a residential use, with an 8-foot fence and required landscaping to provide visual separation. Mr. Brovitz also explained the associated building buffer concept, stating that a three-story building would be required to be set back at least 25 feet from adjacent residential properties.

Ms. De La Fuente clarified that the transitional buffer consisted of both the fence and landscaping together, and Mr. Brovitz confirmed. He added that the Planning Board could waive or modify the buffer where the Board determined it was not necessary or where there were no concerns between property owners.

Ms. De La Fuente then raised an inconsistency between the buffer diagram and later bylaw text regarding building height, asking whether the diagram suggested a 25-foot height limit at the setback while the text elsewhere referenced 35 feet. Mr. Brovitz stated that the diagram was somewhat misleading and that height would be governed by the setback relationship, adding that a building set back 25 feet at a height of 30 feet would not likely impact adjacent properties. Ms. De La Fuente recommended revising the diagram/text reference so the number aligned with the 35-foot maximum height in the bylaw, and Mr. Brovitz agreed.

Mr. Brovitz then introduced the pedestrian frontage zone, explaining that along Main Street and some side streets near corners, the ground floor was required to be occupied by a commercial use in order to maintain and attract businesses. He stated that residential access to upper floors could still be provided from Main Street or from behind the building. He explained that the commercial requirement applied to a depth of 60 feet, reflecting typical ground-floor commercial depth.

Mr. Brovitz then reviewed the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.5 and explained FAR as the relationship between lot size and building area. He stated that 1.5 was moderate, provided predictable parameters for scale and design, and generally aligned with the built form of downtown buildings. Ms. De La Fuente added that the Business district currently allowed a FAR

of 0.75 and stated that 1.5 would better match the existing downtown environment and allow applicants to use small lot footprints more effectively, making the overlay more attractive.

Mr. Brovitz then discussed principal buildings on a development lot and noted the importance of allowing more than one principal building on a lot to enable multi-building site designs, such as multiple smaller buildings on a large parcel that could create better streetscape form and shared open space. The Board identified that the text already allowed more than one principal building, and Mr. Brovitz stated that clarity on this point was important because limiting to a single principal building was a common barrier in other communities.

Mr. Brovitz returned to the build-to zone standards, stating that buildings along main corridors were required to be placed toward the front of the property to create a walkable district and support streetscape continuity, with parking access directed behind buildings. Ms. James asked about the meaning of a secondary street build-to zone. Mr. Brovitz explained that, on corner lots, the bylaw sought to avoid leaving corners vacant and instead required corner infill for a certain depth to support pedestrian movement down side streets and strengthen the district form.

Mr. Brovitz reviewed orientation standards requiring buildings to face Main Street, emphasized the importance of corner buildings, and described flexibility to incorporate streetscape features such as outdoor dining or terrace space where appropriate.

Mr. Brovitz stated that the maximum building height was 35 feet and described this as generally supporting three-story mixed-use buildings. He stated that rooftop amenity spaces were encouraged and that architectural standards were included to ensure new development fit the downtown context. Ms. James asked whether unenclosed rooftop structures would be excluded from building height; Mr. Brovitz confirmed that unenclosed rooftop amenities could be allowed as outdoor space.

Mr. Brovitz discussed transparency standards, stating that ground-floor transparency was important for storefront presence and pedestrian experience, while transparency was less critical on upper floors. He also described standards intended to support infill and incremental improvements to pre-existing strip development sites, including the possibility of adding buildings closer to sidewalks over time and adding residential units above existing development where feasible.

Mr. Brovitz then introduced standards for historic buildings and described a review sequence involving the Historic District Commission providing applicable input prior to Planning Board review. Ms. De La Fuente recommended adding “as applicable” to avoid triggering historic review where existing bylaws did not already require it, and to rely on existing local bylaw triggers. Mr. Meehan agreed and stated that the Historical Commission’s role included determining historic significance and that the process should align with existing procedural triggers such as demolition permits. Mr. Meehan recommended Town Counsel review the procedures for consistency and suggested notifying Historic District Commission members as part of outreach. Ms. De La Fuente stated she would notify the relevant parties and include Town Counsel.

Mr. Brovitz moved to the outdoor amenity space section, stating that outdoor amenity space was required for all developments, with a minimum of 10% of land area and up to 15% for larger assembled developments. He explained that the design guidelines provided examples ranging from streetscape improvements and sidewalk activation to privately owned but publicly oriented spaces and civic spaces dedicated to public use. Ms. James identified a figure reference error, noting that the text cited Figure 9 but should reference Figure 8, and Mr. Brovitz acknowledged the correction. Ms. James also noted that one open space type in the figure lacked a designation (civic / publicly oriented private / private), and Mr. Brovitz confirmed it should be categorized as publicly oriented private space and stated the figure should be revised accordingly.

Mr. Brovitz then described an option to pay in lieu of providing on-site outdoor amenity space, with an alternative public-benefit improvement to be negotiated, potentially off-site and open to the public. He stated that such arrangements would be negotiated primarily through the Select Board with consultation from the Planning Board.

Ms. James asked whether the bylaw should require that any in-lieu contribution be directed to improvements within the MUOD, or whether the language should allow flexibility to fund amenities elsewhere in town. Ms. De La Fuente stated that keeping the focus downtown aligned with the bylaw's purpose and suggested a fund concept for downtown improvements, but she cautioned that limiting it strictly to the overlay area could reduce future opportunities for broader public benefit. Ms. James suggested a middle approach that expressed downtown as the preference while allowing consideration of other public-benefit options.

Mr. Brovitz suggested that the bylaw could also identify specific connection projects, such as a pathway linking downtown to the Route 109 district, and stated that the concept had been sketched previously and could provide a meaningful connection between the districts.

Mr. Larence stated that he agreed with Ms. De La Fuente's point that the purpose of the bylaw was to improve downtown. He noted that the bylaw established two mixed-use overlay districts—downtown and Route 109—and said that any payment in lieu of outdoor amenity space should be applied within the mixed-use overlay districts to align with the bylaw's intent and to prevent future boards from redirecting funds away from the district improvements the bylaw was intended to achieve.

Ms. James stated that she generally looked for flexibility in bylaw language.

Mr. Meehan stated that Ms. James's point was a good catch and suggested that, even if the bylaw expressed a preference for contributions within the overlay district, the language should allow flexibility because “civic space” could be defined broadly. He said that, particularly if contributions were accumulated over time, the Town might be able to meet civic space needs even where a project did not fall neatly within the overlay boundaries.

Mr. Larence asked how the payment-in-lieu mechanism would work in practice, specifically whether a developer would fund a particular improvement directly or whether funds would be deposited into a Town-controlled account for later use. Ms. James responded that the draft did not describe a dedicated “pot” and read more as requiring a contribution to another civic space

project. Mr. Larence noted that the language referenced an “existing or planned” civic space and interpreted that as requiring an active project. Ms. James agreed and described a scenario where a developer could propose a contribution to complete a specific civic space improvement if the site could not meet the on-site outdoor amenity requirement.

Mr. Larence stated that the “existing or planned” wording could be the more limiting constraint because it required the Town to have an identified civic space project already underway. He suggested expanding the phrase to “existing, planned, or future” to allow the Town to bank funds for later civic space needs.

Ms. De La Fuente agreed and explained that, in her experience, payments in lieu typically went into a dedicated, restricted-use account tied to a defined purpose, and often to a defined geography and list of eligible improvements. She stated that the Town would need to collect the contribution early—typically prior to issuance of a building permit—because it was difficult to rely on future payments after approvals if project ownership changed. Ms. De La Fuente said she would discuss with Town Counsel whether the draft language was sufficient to establish that mechanism, and Mr. Brovitz agreed.

Ms. James compared the concept to in-lieu payments for affordable housing. Mr. Brovitz stated it was common and referenced an example from Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where a mixed-use overlay district used payment-in-lieu provisions to fund a trail through the district, providing public benefits over time where on-site amenities were not feasible.

Ms. James stated that legal counsel guidance would be needed on wording. She said she supported avoiding a strict limitation that confined improvements entirely within the overlay district because connection projects—such as trails or connectors—could fall between districts or link districts. She stated she wanted language that preserved that flexibility.

Ms. De La Fuente summarized the apparent feedback points as: Town Counsel review; revising the phrase to “existing, planned, or future” civic space; and incorporating a stated preference for contributions within the mixed-use overlay district, with Planning Board discretion. She asked whether those reflected the group’s direction.

Mr. Meehan suggested simplifying the wording while keeping the same intent. He proposed language allowing approval of a contribution toward a civic space, preferably within the Mixed-Use Overlay District, with additional language tying the preference to the location of the principal building. Mr. Brovitz asked whether the group wanted to draft revised language, and Ms. De La Fuente said she would take a first pass the next day based on Mr. Meehan’s suggestion and would copy him.

Mr. Brovitz then moved to parking standards. He stated that the bylaw generally followed Section 308, with modifications for specific building types in the MUOD. He described townhouse parking as 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit for two bedrooms or fewer and two spaces per unit for three bedrooms or more, located within 300 feet of the dwelling unit. He described mixed-use building parking as one space for a one-bedroom unit, 1.5 spaces for a two-bedroom unit, and two spaces for three or more bedrooms per unit. He stated that the requirements were

somewhat lower than general standards because mixed-use sites involved shared and overlapping parking demand.

Ms. James stated that parking was challenging and commented on the relationship between the stated requirement and practical need. Mr. Brovitz responded that the special permit process allowed the Planning Board to work with an applicant to reduce or reconfigure parking based on actual need. He added that off-site parking could be used if within a reasonable walking distance and connected by a safe pedestrian route, including sidewalks. He stated that flexibility was important in a downtown context to support investment and an active district.

Mr. Brovitz stated that recent research, including guidance he attributed to the Urban Land Institute and transportation engineering references, supported the conclusion that parking demand in mixed-use settings is often lower than historically assumed. He said the goal was to distribute parking efficiently downtown and avoid excessive requirements that consume space.

Mr. Brovitz described supplemental parking approaches referenced in the design guidelines, including tandem parking for residential units in mixed-use buildings. He stated that tandem parking reduced the parking footprint and was typically assigned to individual dwelling units, often in garage or underground configurations.

Mr. Brovitz transitioned to allowed uses and building types. He summarized the building types identified for the two districts as: multi-family buildings with four or more residential units; townhouses (attached single-family units); mixed-use buildings; and development involving non-historic buildings, including additions and retrofits. He noted the language should distinguish clearly between non-historic and historic buildings and should reference adaptive reuse/retrofits for residential or mixed-use development without duplicative wording.

As Mr. Brovitz moved into density, Ms. De La Fuente requested that any “yes” entries in the use chart be revised to state “special permit by Planning Board” (SPPB) rather than appearing to allow uses by right. She explained that readers often rely on charts and may misinterpret a “yes” as an as-of-right allowance if the special permit qualifier is only in the bylaw text. Mr. Brovitz acknowledged.

Mr. Meehan requested that the draft use the phrase “subject to applicable review” rather than naming the Historical Commission, noting that review could be by the Historical Commission or the Historic District Commission depending on circumstances. Mr. Brovitz agreed.

Mr. Brovitz then summarized base density as 12 units per acre for townhouses and 20 units per acre for multi-family and mixed-use buildings, including retrofits and historic buildings. He stated that density could increase through a density bonus tied to “eligible public benefit improvements.” He described eligible public benefit improvements as on-site or off-site infrastructure, streetscape improvements, open space, or amenities not otherwise required by the bylaw, and he explained that the bonus structure allowed the Town to negotiate for enhancements it deemed beneficial in exchange for additional density.

Ms. James asked how civic spaces would be funded and whether civic spaces would require collaboration with the Town. Mr. Brovitz confirmed. Ms. De La Fuente added that civic spaces would likely require Select Board approval and an agreement with the Town, and Mr. Brovitz stated that the bylaw addressed that later. Mr. Brovitz stated that the Planning Board would need to find that public benefit improvements were sufficient and that the Select Board would approve the improvements with input from relevant departments. He listed example improvements including publicly controlled recreation enhancements, land acquisition or donations for public access and recreation, and streetscape improvements such as sidewalks, pedestrian access, public parking, street trees, and furnishings.

Mr. Meehan stated he wanted to revisit the language regarding whether public benefit improvements needed to be within the overlay district, noting that some provisions referenced the overlay and others did not, and he suggested the Board should clarify its intent.

Ms. De La Fuente stated she had received updated design guidelines from Mr. Brovitz and would circulate them, and she suggested giving the Board approximately two weeks for review along with notes from the meeting.

Ms. Schieffer asked for clarification on the LEED-related public benefit option, asking whether it meant certifying the applicant's own project and whether it could function as a loophole given Medfield's adopted energy codes, including the "super stretch" code. She asked whether code compliance could effectively make a project LEED-certifiable with minimal additional effort. Mr. Brovitz stated he would research that issue.

Ms. James suggested creating a checklist or "cheat sheet" for applicants interested in using the MUOD, similar to materials used for subdivision applications. Ms. De La Fuente stated she could create one and that it could be internal or posted publicly. Mr. Brovitz stated he could send checklist examples from other communities.

Mr. Brovitz stated the affordable housing requirement in the draft was 15%. Ms. De La Fuente stated she had asked to reduce it from 20% and said she believed 15% was appropriate. Mr. Brovitz agreed and stated that overly high requirements could deter applicants from proposing projects that triggered them.

Sign Bylaw Updates and Legal Advertisement Timeline

Mr. Meehan confirmed that the approach would result in a combined, pass/fail article covering all included sign-related amendments. Ms. De La Fuente agreed and described the anticipated structure: one zoning article would address the mixed-use overlay district (adding a new section to the zoning bylaw), while a separate zoning article would bundle the sign-related changes—such as sign brightness language, the home occupation sign size provision, and the associated administrative cross-reference updates—into a single consolidated sign article so the provisions would mirror each other. Mr. Meehan stated he was comfortable with the bundling provided that it was clearly communicated to the Sign Advisory Board and the applicant.

Ms. De La Fuente stated that the Sign Advisory Board meeting was expected the following week, though she needed to confirm the date. She said she would provide updates after meeting with the full Sign Advisory Board and report back to the Planning Board, noting there was still time. She stated her goal was to have legal advertisements submitted by mid-February. Chair Teresa agreed and expressed appreciation for the timeline.

Meeting Minute Approval

Chair Teresa then moved the meeting forward to review the meeting minutes from December 15, 2025. She stated she had only a couple of edits, which were pronoun corrections on page 11, and Ms. De La Fuente pulled up the document live to make the edits. Chair Teresa stated those were her only edits and said everything else looked good. Mr. Larence stated he had no edits.

Motion: Mr. Meehan made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of December 15, 2025

Second: Mr. Larence seconded.

Roll call:

- Mr. Meehan: Yes
- Mr. Larence: Yes
- Ms. James: Yes
- Mr. Schieffer: Abstains (was not present on December 15)

Liaison Reports

- **Affordable Housing Trust:** Ms. De La Fuente reported that the Trust had not met in two months and had no major updates, and she stated the Trust would not meet in January.

However, Ms. De La Fuente reported that she had been asked to investigate potential Town-owned locations for group homes that could support a partnership between a service provider and the Town, including the possible disposition of municipal land. She stated she initially identified approximately 65 parcels, refined the list to about 30 after screening for wetland constraints, and then conducted deed and parcel research. She reported that the process yielded no viable parcels due to deed restrictions and other limitations, and she said she would report back that her search did not identify options. She added that the Town historically acquired land for conservation purposes—often wetland, unbuildable, or forested—rather than land suitable for development.

- **Historical Commission:** Mr. Meehan reported that the Historical Commission had received a demolition permit application for 236 South Street that day and would schedule a meeting within approximately the next ten days. He added that the Commission had previously reviewed a garage on that property and found it not historically significant.
- **Shool Building Committee:** Chair Teresa then provided an update for the School Building Committee. She reported that the Committee had presented to the Massachusetts School Building Authority and was moving forward into Module 2, and she stated the Committee's next meeting would focus on beginning the MSBA selection process,

including discussion of the request for qualifications and engagement of an Owner's Project Manager.

- **Wayfinding Committee:** Mr. Larence then provided a Wayfinding Committee update, stating that Ms. De La Fuente had sent committee edits to the consultant and that the consultant would be updating the materials. He said the committee anticipated a site walk after revisions were returned, and Ms. De La Fuente agreed, stating the committee should touch base at least one more time before finalizing. Mr. Larence stated he would confirm whether another site walk was included in the consultant's scope.

Chair Teresa then asked Ms. De La Fuente if there were additional items the Board should be aware of. Ms. De La Fuente reported receiving an inquiry from an individual asking whether the Planning Board still had an opening for an associate member and said she had forwarded the inquiry to Chair Teresa. She stated the individual was a regional planner at the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs with prior municipal experience in Acton. Ms. De La Fuente asked whether she should request a resume and letter of interest; Chair Teresa agreed and Mr. Meehan voiced support. Ms. De La Fuente stated she would request those materials the next day.

Ms. De La Fuente also reported that she had forwarded an email from the Town Clerk regarding nomination papers to Ms. Schieffer in connection with the existing vacancy.

Scheduling: Chase Bank Continued Hearing and MUOD Deadlines

Ms. De La Fuente then raised scheduling for the continued Chase Bank hearing, stating the applicant had requested moving the continued hearing from February 12 to February 2. She stated she had been planning to cancel the January 12 meeting due to a lack of agenda items and because it would be too soon for consultant feedback. Ms. De La Fuente stated she believed the Board could post an agenda indicating cancellation and continuation to the next available date, but she would confirm the process with Town Counsel and would also confirm the applicant team's availability.

The Board discussed member availability for February 2, and members indicated they could attend. Ms. De La Fuente stated she would follow up after meeting with Town Counsel.

Ms. De La Fuente then discussed the need to schedule additional MUOD work sessions to meet legal advertisement and Town Meeting deadlines. Chair Teresa asked whether it would be too much to combine the Chase continuation on February 2 with a MUOD wrap-up the same evening. The Board discussed alternative dates, including the week of January 20, to avoid back-to-back meetings. Ms. De La Fuente stated she could attend either January 20 or January 26, and members indicated availability for a Tuesday meeting. Ms. De La Fuente stated she would confirm the continuation and agenda procedure with Town Counsel and update the Board.

Chair Teresa asked whether there was anything further to address. Ms. De La Fuente stated she had taken notes on follow-up items and would provide updates later in the week.

Adjournment

Motion: Mr. Meehan moved to adjourn.

Second: Ms. Schieffer seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

- Mr. Larence: Yes
- Mr. Meehan: Yes
- Ms. Schieffer: Yes
- Ms. James: Yes

The meeting was adjourned at 9:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria De La Fuente, Director of Land Use