



DRAFT
Zoning Bylaw Working Group

Date: October 7, 2020
Time: 8:30 AM to 9:30 AM
Location: Virtual Meeting

Minutes

Present: Pam Heidell, Charlie Kalauskas, Christian Klein, Jenny Raitt, Stephen Revilak, David Watson, Ralph Willmer, John Worden, Erin Zwirko.

Absent: Mike Byrne, Adam Chapdelaine.

Guests: Eric Halvorsen, Emily Innes, Don Seltzer.

Erin opened the meeting by reading the preamble to hosting a virtual meeting.

On the minutes from May 8, John made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Steve seconded the motion. All members in attendance approved the motion through a roll call vote.

Erin turned the meeting over to Eric Halvorsen and Emily Innes to provide an overview of the draft zoning amendments that were circulated to the ZBWG members in advance of the meeting. Emily noted that there were some minor updates to the concepts and recommendations made in May. Emily explained that there are new definitions, changes to the density and dimensional tables, use tables, parking, among other items. Eric noted that a virtual public engagement opportunity was held in July. Over 200 responses were received on the survey. The public feedback was incorporated into the zoning amendments presented.

Erin opened the meeting to comments from the ZBWG members.

Pam noted some odd wording and recommended clarifying those sections. She also recommended incorporating the Wetlands Protection Act, the Stormwater bylaw, and other relevant Conservation Commission regulations in the amendments including as part of the purpose.

Ralph noted that some of the definitions were lengthy and noted that some of the new definitions ~~contact~~ contain standards which should be moved out of the definition and into a more appropriate section of the Zoning Bylaw. He explained that this was one of the goals of the Zoning Bylaw recodification from 2018. Ralph also noted that he appreciated the flexibility built into the zoning recommendations.

John asked about the marijuana uses included in the existing Industrial zoning districts. He wanted to clarify that vertical farming was not intended to include marijuana cultivation. Emily noted that vertical farming is not intended to include marijuana cultivation.

Steve liked how the development standards are designed as a density bonus. He made a number of detailed comments, including on the applicability of the development standards, definitions for artists live work space, breweries, food production, solar readiness, and others. He noted that restaurants should be allowed in the industrial districts. He also questioned whether footnote D to the use table needed to be crossed out. This refers to no residential in mixed use, and it conflicts with the use table. Emily noted that it should be crossed out in favor of the newly proposed footnote about mixed use.

Christian asked about the screening for the abutting bikeway and noted that there is a grade change. He asked whether tasting rooms should be a separate use from a brewery, distillery, and winery, and thought that some clarification is needed so that not every use can have a tasting room. He also asked whether food trucks needed to be listed as it might be more appropriately handled by the Board of Health. Christian also asked about allowing residential as part of mixed use. He appreciated that residential cannot displace industrial uses.
[Christian also agreed that the definitions should not contain standards.](#)

Charlie thought that the zoning amendments were an improvement. He asked whether a pro forma had been completed to determine whether the zoning was realistic. Eric indicated that a pro forma was not completed as it was out of scope. Charlie was concerned with the number of requirements needed for flexible development. Erin indicated that she would discuss with Eric, Emily, and Jenny whether there is any room to complete the task that Charlie is asking about. Charlie also noted that the parking requirements relative to flex space needed some clarification of what happens when the uses flex and change the requirements.

David agreed with separating standards from definitions. He also recommended encouraging sustainability features, and noted that tasting may need more bike parking due to the proximity of the bikeway.

John commented on allowing residential in mixed use. He strongly disagreed with the concept due to the small size of the industrial sector in Arlington. He noted that these uses do not send children to school or demand much from public safety.

Don Seltzer asked about the shadow study requirement. He did not think that it would be adequate to really assess the impact of shadows on abutters.

Erin noted that Eric and Emily would provide a presentation at the ARB meeting on October 19, and encouraged members of the ZBWG to attend. Erin also requested detailed comments back from the members by October 21. Erin noted that the next meeting is scheduled for November 4, and she would be in touch about the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 AM.