

## Meeting Summary

Location: Town Offices, Room #207

Date: 16 December 2010

Attendees: Committee members Ric Fulop, David Horton (chair), Ginna Johnson, Pam Shadley, Deborah Strod and Al Zabin, and Residents (sign-in sheet attached). Committee member Bill Dailey was not in attendance.

Authors: Ginna Johnson and Pam Shadley

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:05 pm by Chair David Horton (DH).
2. DH reviewed guidelines for the meeting and invited public comment:
  - 2.1 Bob Pressman distributed a written statement to committee members.
  - 2.2 Analia Borensztein, abutter, said she valued nature; Busa Farm should be kept open space; sad to lose.
  - 2.3 Sandra Shaw, member Lexington Recreation Committee and Community Preservation Committee read and submitted a statement to the BLUPC. Ms. Shaw said Busa Farm was purchased with the intent of addressing need for a multi-purpose field, affordable housing and community gardens and not the preservation of farmland. Ms. Shaw said she supported open democratic process but not "a popularity contest." SS said the Town should reflect the needs of the Town and guided by the history of the purchase.
  - 2.4 Fabian Borensztein, abutter, said opposition to assumption of all 3 uses led to formation of BLUPC by the Board of Selectmen (BOS). Appointment of committee is proof of different opinions.
  - 2.5 Chris Kluchman, Lexington Housing Partnership, read a statement and submitted information to the BLUPC. Ms. Kluchman said as Busa Farm was one of the larger land acquisitions, the committee should consider multiple uses; cost and benefits are not equal as the values of the Town support all uses; encourages committee to consider best parts of each proposal.
  - 2.6 Bella Tsvetkova, abutter, requested committee to look at current trends, not Town data from 2000.
3. Old business and correspondence was reviewed by DH:
  - 3.1 Meeting minutes from 21 October 2010 were approved as noted.
  - 3.2 Peter Coleman, Lexington Recreation Department sent an email saying that the Worthen Road field is not large enough for a full size field.
  - 3.3 Re: Soil contamination at Busa Farm, BOS may need to ask for interpretation and evaluate risk factor depending on recommended land use. Mr. Valente told DH that the site was suitable for all CPA uses.
  - 3.4 Reviewed correspondence with Carl Valente outlining what is requested by BOS for interim report; BOS looking for description of implication of each proposal.
  - 3.5 Reviewed code requirements (Local building codes, Commonwealth Architectural Access Board (AAB) regulations and Federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations)
  - 3.6 Town Attorney investigating if and what deed restrictions required on Busa land.
  - 3.7 Deborah Strod (DS) distributed a draft table that was offered as a potential accompaniment to the minutes of the 7 December 2010 meeting or a framing for further discussion. The table listed the criteria established by the committee and attempted to capture the sense of prior committee discussion in a ranking for each proposal on each criterion. The draft table was not discussed.
4. Committee discussion:
  - 4.1 DH: Hope for consensus recommendation from committee.

- 4.2 DS: Need to demonstrate that multiple uses can't co-exist if we are going to make that argument.
  - 4.3 Pam Shadley (PS) and Ginna Johnson (GJ): Committee members need to express opinions; "say what we think having heard presentations."
  - 4.4 Al Zabin (AZ): Decisions can't be based entirely on objective data; need to reflect system of values, including other parcels. DS: Evaluation of other parcels not in our charge. Locating farming here and there is a different proposal, but Town should evaluate; need comprehensive Town planning. GJ: Mr. Pressman's challenge is to think outside the box. PS: Consider highest and best use.
  - 4.5 GJ: Read prepared statement (attached) noting that multi-use field does not fit on site, and advocating continued use as farm with 1 to 3 affordable housing units along Lowell Street. Advocated for Town to purchase Goldinger property.
  - 4.6 AZ: Basically in agreement. Uses will have to compromise. Money tight, no immediate Town investment. "We are not going to feed the Town or support the agrarian revolution. Farm will be a community resource more than fresh vegetables." Enough land set aside for farm to be practical and set aside enough land for housing to be economically viable. Leave deed restriction issues for Town counsel.
  - 4.7 RF: Like idea of farm with improved public access and winter amenities, building that is farm-oriented. Structure would provide weather protection, Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) pick-up space. Need financial viability. Non-profit will increase likelihood of success. Without Lexington Community Farm Coalition (LCFC), I would be less comfortable with farm idea. Lucky we have LCFC passionate about making it successful.
  - 4.8 PS: Yes, farming. An opportunity not to be missed. Support housing more modest, more tailored to farm operation, will not disrupt farming. Do not think {active recreation} field fits here. Engage Town in farm, active and engaged participant; more engaged than just leasing; exciting idea.
  - 4.9 DH: Farming and passive recreation with some affordable housing; no active recreation. Could also raise crops elsewhere. All seem to be on the same page that there is not room for a full-size athletic field here.
  - 4.10 DS: In favor of farming continuing there. Provides recreation, physical activity for others. Farming in part because it involves new people and multi-generational involvement; support investment in drainage improvements for existing athletic fields; winter use is recreation. We will not feed everyone, but model a way forward. Important to take the chance.
  - 4.11 DH proposed having a "charette" next meeting to layout possible scenarios on trace. DH requested 3 proposers discuss dimensions for housing, including possible housing for a farmer with community space on the ground level, different aspects of program (if not active recreational field what other recreational uses) and how best to integrate them.
5. Next meeting dates:
    - 5.1 5 January 2011, committee meeting.
    - 5.2 10 January 2011, Interim Report to the BOS by DH.
    - 5.3 19 January 2011, committee meeting.
  6. Meeting was adjourned at 8:27 pm by Chair DH.

END OF MEETING SUMMARY