

**Vision 21 Implementation Committee**  
**Minutes – May 17, 2004**

Approved July 15, 2004

Members Present: Jenny Fallon, Victoria Haase, Matt Hausmann, Bill Hofmann, Meg O'Brien, Sara Oaklander, Jennifer Page, Paul Solomon, Diane Stafford

Members Absent: Joe Greene, Tim Higgins, Barry Winston

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 AM by the Chair, Jennifer Page.
2. **Review of Agenda.** Approved Jennifer's suggested agenda, all of which involved discussion of the draft response to the Selectmen's request for the Committee's comments on the O'Neill 40B proposal.
3. **O'Neill 40B Proposal Discussion.** The majority of the discussion was captured directly into the document which contains the committee's comments on the proposal. These meeting minutes will therefore reflect the areas discussed rather than the actual wording which was accepted.

- School Impacts. Jennifer shared that the number of children will be less than expected as families tend not to live in such developments (per a number of authorities). But others pointed out that these developments tend not to be in communities with the quality of the Belmont Public Schools.
- It was suggested that we not use the marginal impact numbers.
- If there were significantly more children than originally thought, then there can be some impact.
- Even with less numbers, there is a possibility of impact, especially in certain grade levels. That is, the distribution of the students could possibly be an issue.
- Jenny suggested to Paul that he ensure that the School Committee has been asked to respond.
- Community Impacts. A discussion occurred whether renters actually vote less. It was pointed out that this is not true of the Hill Estates. It was agreed to alter the language to reflect this notion.
- Fiscal. A few changes are required.
- Take out the cost per pupil.
- Bill asked about impact from utilities.
- Bill asked about impact from police and fire departments.
- Impact on Infrastructure. No major discussion.
- Comprehensive. No major discussion.
- Discussion of Recommendations.
- Density. One change was discussed: to take out last sentence.
- Access to the "T". No changes.
- Curbs and sidewalks. No changes.
- Unit sizes. Changes discussed and captured in the recommendation document.
- Condos. Changes discussed and captured in the recommendation document.

- Priority for Belmont residents. Changes discussed and captured in the recommendation document.

4. **Should we compare this proposal to the office development proposal?** This question was discussed and it was agreed that we should say that our preference is office development.

5. The meeting adjourned at 9:10 AM. We will next convene on June 3.

Respectfully submitted,

Matt Hausmann