



Medford City Council
Medford, Massachusetts

The Fourteenth Regular Meeting, August 5, 2025

City Council

Isaac B. "Zac" Bears
Anna Callahan
Kit Collins
Emily Lazzaro
Matt Leming
George A. Scarpelli
Justin Tseng

CALL TO ORDER

President Isaac "Zac" Bears called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. on August 5, 2025 in the City Council Chamber on the second floor of Medford City Hall, 85 George P. Hassett Drive, Medford, Massachusetts, and via Zoom.

ROLL CALL

Present: Councilor Callahan; Vice President Collins; Councilor Lazzaro; Councilor Leming; Councilor Scarpelli; Councilor Tseng; President Bears
Absent: Councilor Callahan, Inside the Rail: City Clerk Adam Hurtubise

ANNOUNCEMENTS, ACCOLADES, REMEMBRANCES, REPORTS, AND RECORDS

Records

The Records of the Meeting of July 15, 2025 were passed to Councilor Leming,

Councilor Leming moved to approve (Councilor Lazzaro second)—approved on a roll call vote of six in favor and one absent (Callahan).

Reports of Committees

19-070 - Offered by President Bears

Committee of the Whole, July 15, 2025, Report.

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
MEETING REPORT
TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2025 @ 6:00 P.M.**

Attendees: Council President Isaac "Zac" Bears; Council Vice President Kit Collins; Councillor Anna Callahan; Councillor Emily Lazzaro; Councillor Matt Leming; Councillor George Scarpelli; Councillor Justin Tseng; City Clerk Adam Hurtubise; other participants as noted in the body of this report.

President Bears called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. on July 15, 2025 in the City Council Chambers on the second floor of Medford City Hall, and via Zoom. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed Tree Committee Ordinance (Paper **19-070**).

President Bears thanked participants for attending. Councillor Callahan said that in the last meeting, we sent the ordinance out to DPW and Planning. She said the DPW Commissioner had already sent her some edits. She said she met with Trees Medford which was instrumental in drafting the ordinance. She reviewed the details of the ordinance. She also discussed the timeline. She outlined the duties of the Tree Committee. She said the ordinance only covers public trees, not private trees.

Councillor Scarpelli asked a clarifying question about public trees. Councillor Lazzaro said this will help us to focus where we need more trees. She said she is excited to see this moving forward.

Councillor Leming asked about youth membership of the committee. He asked if the City currently has the mechanisms in place to reach out to students to make sure those appointments get filled. Councillor Callahan discussed some of the advisory, education and outreach items she discussed with Director Hunt. She said that there are some discrepancies with the length of term of the appointments of members.

Councillor Scarpelli said that he would like to see Medford residents only on the committee. Councillor Leming said he sympathizes with Councillor Scarpelli's comment but he said he also wants people who have a demonstrated expertise with trees. Councillor Callahan suggested some changes.

Councillor Tseng arrived at 6:25 p.m.

Tom Lincoln, 27 Gleason Street, said this is one of three tree ordinances. He asked if the others would be brought back here soon. He said he is curious about the tree inventory. He asked if there is a tree inventory. He said that years ago the DPW didn't have a stump grinder. He said he looks forward to a more substantive tree ordinance.

Sarah Gerould, 29 Burbank Road said all three ordinances might contribute to the activities of the committee. She said she would like flexibility in being able to add these responsibilities to the tree committee if that arises. She said it is possible that one or two members of the committee might be students at Tufts. She said if somebody is doing a good job we shouldn't tell them they can't be on this committee.

Jeremy Martin, 65 Burget Avenue, thanked Trees Medford and Councillor Callahan. He said that this is a way to hold the City accountable for our urban canopy. Councillor Callahan said that the changes that were made were not changes that lessened the impact of the committee. She said there was no desire to take anything away from the Tree Warden. She said that the ordinance fits more closely with what we need. She said she is excited for the committee to come into being. She said we have an incredibly small forestry division.

Councillor Callahan moved to change the last sentence in appointments Letter A to say "if possible, two youth members shall be between the ages of 15 and 22 at the time of their appointment, with Medford residency not required for youth members." She also moved to add a bullet point about removal to say that tree committee members may only be removed for cause by a two-thirds vote of the committee. She also moved to change language on appointments to reflect one-third for one year, one-third for two years, and one-third for three years. President Bears treated this as one motion. Councillor Leming seconded the motion.

Councillor Leming suggested adding a line saying that if a member moves away with less than a certain number of months on their term, they can serve out the remainder of their term remotely at their choice.

Councillor Tseng said he doesn't oppose Councillor Leming's idea but that it is a little bit convoluted. Councillor Tseng suggested allowing people enrolled in Medford educational institutions. Councillor Leming said he is fine with Medford residents or attendees of educational institutions based in Medford.

Councillor Callahan updated her motion with the language suggested by Councillor Leming.

The new language from Councillor Callahan:

- a. The Committee shall consist of **between five and ten Medford residents**; one appointment made by City Council and all additional appointments made by the Mayor, subject to confirmation by the Medford City Council. **If possible**, two youth members shall be between the ages of fifteen and twenty-two at the time of their appointment. **Residency is not required for youth members as long as they are enrolled in an institution based in Medford.**
- b. (good as is)
- c. Upon formation of the Medford Tree Committee, **one third of the members** shall be appointed for a term of three years, **one-third of the members** shall be appointed for a term of two years, and **one third of the member** shall be appointed for a term of one year.
- d. **Tree Committee members may be removed only for cause by a 2/3 vote of the Commission, including for unexcused absences that exceed 25 percent of the number of meetings of the committee held within a 12-month period.**

On the amendment: approved on a roll call vote of seven in favor and zero opposed.

Councillor Callahan moved to approve the ordinance as amended and to refer to the City Council (Councillor Leming second)—approved on a roll call vote of seven in favor and zero opposed.

Councillor Callahan moved to adjourn at 6:52 p.m. (Councillor Leming second)—approved on a roll call vote of seven in favor and zero opposed.

President Bears adjourned the meeting at 6:52 p.m.

Councilor Lazzaro moved to approve the committee report (Vice President Collins second)—approved on a roll call vote of six in favor and one absent (Callahan).

24-033 - Offered by Vice President Collins

Planning and Permitting Committee, July 16, 2025, Report.

PLANNING AND PERMITTING COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2025 @ 6:00 P.M.

Attendees: Kit Collins, Council Vice President; Council President Isaac "Zac" Bears; Councillor Anna Callahan; Councillor Matt Leming; Councillor George Scarpelli; City Clerk Adam Hurtubise; Alicia Hunt, Director of Planning, Development, and Sustainability; Senior Planner Danielle Evans; Emily Innes, Innes Associates; Grant Perry, Innes Associates; other participants as noted in the body of this report.

Vice Chair Leming called the meeting to order on July 16, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. in the Medford City Council Chambers and via Zoom. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss zoning updates with the Innes Associates team (Paper **24-033**).

Vice Chair Leming thanked participants for attending. He said we would not be talking about parking today.

Vice Chair Leming said that Council President Bears would be speaking.

Council President Bears spoke about a shared path forward in this zoning process. He spoke about the duties of local elected officials when it comes to zoning. He outlined a way to continue navigating the zoning process for the rest of this year and into next year. He spoke about the duty to make difficult choices and difficult decisions.

Councillor Scarpelli arrived at 6:11 p.m.

Ms. Innes said she wanted to discuss the Tufts institutional zoning. She walked through the outline of tonight's meeting and also road-mapped some upcoming meetings. She also discussed the Dover Amendment. Some uses are as-of-right, but the City can place conditions on those uses under the Dover Amendment. She said the Dover Amendment does not require a community to adapt zoning law to specific educational uses but it is a best practice to do this. She said the Dover Amendment is designed to encourage a degree of accommodation. She detailed the existing zoning rules in the Tufts area.

Mr. Perry compared zoning in Amherst to some of Medford's zoning in the Tufts area. He talked about parking outside of the educational district. He also discussed zoning in educational districts in Worcester. He said Fitchburg also has educational zoning. He said Northampton uses a zoning overlay district for Smith College. He discussed the zoning approval process in Boston and Salem. He said Tufts already has to submit an Institutional Master Plan for its Boston campus. Mr. Perry also discussed zoning in Waltham. He highlighted zoning in Dartmouth as well.

Ms. Innes said she wanted to call out some early considerations for a special Tufts district. She talked about height limits and density along abutting properties. She said we could require a full institutional master plan or use the site plan review process.

Councillor Callahan asked if we can simply require an Institutional Master Plan from Tufts. Ms. Innes said she would need to check with legal counsel on that. She said she has not heard of that being a condition before. Councillor Callahan said she didn't see Somerville on the list. She said she assumes that Somerville is not doing an Institutional Master Plan. Ms. Innes said we deliberately took Somerville off the list.

President Bears said we can't institute an Institutional Master Plan right now. He said we've been filing a petition with Somerville for years to get an Institutional Master Plan. He said we've done it at least three times since he has been on the Council. He said we essentially file the same petition.

Vice Chair Leming said that Harvard was essentially completely exempted from the Dover Amendment.

Vice President Collins thanked Vice Chair Leming for chairing the meeting and thanked the Innes Associates team. She asked what non educational uses we want to allow in an educational district. She said she anticipates continued resistance from Tufts regarding Institutional Master Plans.

Vice Chair Leming asked if there are other legal options available. Ms. Innes said Attorney Silverstein is on the team for this and other reasons. She said her review is based on being a planner but that we would check with him on the legal side.

President Bears said he would like to know what a framework would look like that would allow us to meet the requirements and also hold Tufts accountable in a more robust way. Ms. Innes walked through the process between the areas and the sub-areas and additional steps that would be needed for the process. She said there might be some sort of site plan review process.

Vice President Collins said that the Innes Associates plan makes sense for our consideration. She said she would be curious to see the close research and expertise, but that the approaches used in Worcester seem especially relevant.

Ms. Evans said we did meet with the planners in Somerville and they hadn't touched that section of their zoning in decades beside eliminating parking requirements. She said they haven't had a lot of development pressure from Tufts. She said she is concerned with the steady encroachment of Tufts buying market-rate housing and converting those units to student housing.

David Zabner, 107 Bowdoin Street, asked to see the map of the Tufts zoning. Ms. Innes said that this is not a proposal; it's the first initial diagram. She said we can move things over by a street if necessary. Mr. Zabner said he loved what he heard from Councillor Collins. He said it is important that as many Tufts students as possible live on the Tufts campus. He said hopefully that will decrease the pressure on rents in the city.

Judith Weinstock, 144 Burget Avenue, asked for a better definition of non-educational uses. She said she hopes that non-contiguous properties get consideration for inclusion in these maps as well.

Ms. Innes said she appreciated the comments. She said we are mapping all Tufts-owned properties.

Paige Baldini, 37 Winter Street, asked how fire and public safety have been involved in this process. She said people deserve answers before zoning moves forward.

Dina Caligero said she is a direct abutter to Tufts University. She said the houses on her street had been purchased by developers and then flipped for Tufts housing. She said she lives right across the street from Elliot Pearson School. She said she would like to see the current requirements for zoning from Somerville and Worcester.

Vice President Collins said she appreciates how this fits into the proposal for other corridors.

Elisabeth Bayle, 34 Emery Street, asked for the presentations to be available on the zoning page and also asked that the presentations be available before the meeting. Vice President Collins provided a link to the presentation. Ms. Bayle said the Somerville ordinance is better than what we have now. She asked that we not make it any worse than Somerville's ordinance is now.

Vice Chair Leming said we post the agendas on the website, we save these recordings, and we also simulcast our meetings on the Council YouTube Channel and on Medford Community Media.

Andrew Castagnetti, 23 Cushing Street, apologized for missing the first part of President Bears's remarks. President Bears answered Mr. Castagnetti's clarifying questions. Mr. Castagnetti said he has concluded that the Council is tired of seeing him. He said he is also tired. He said these zoning changes are a horrendous assault on We the People. He said we have enough concessions in this city as it is. He said we need to stop the bleeding and save the city or else we can never go back to old Medford. He said he is waiting for the mayor to step up and take control of this disaster.

Kaitlin Robinson, 31 Everett Street, said she is looking at comparisons with other cities. She said she is hoping that we will not place parking minimums. Ms. Innes detailed the state requirements around ADUs and parking.

Ms. Weinstock said that if you look at setback requirements along Boston Avenue, take into consideration the downslope of the hill and the rail tracks. She said she is also looking for clarification on non-institutional uses. Ms. Innes said that ground floor residential that is not university-specific could be an option. Mr. Perry said that case law shows that educational use is a pretty difficult term to define.

Councillor Scarpelli departed at 7:37 p.m.

Councillor Callahan clarified between first floor retail and first floor residential. Ms. Innes said she meant to say first floor retail, not residential.

Vice Chair Leming thanked everyone for coming out tonight. Vice President Collins also thanked participants. She said she is looking forward to next steps.

Vice President Collins moved to keep the paper in committee and to adjourn at 7:41 p.m. (Councillor Callahan second)—approved on a roll call vote of four in favor, zero opposed, and Councillor Scarpelli absent.

Vice Chair Leming adjourned the meeting at 7:41 p.m.

Vice President Collins moved to approve the committee report (Councilor Leming second)—approved on a roll call vote of five in favor, one opposed (Scarpelli), and one absent (Callahan).

PETITIONS, PRESENTATIONS, AND SIMILAR PAPERS

25-121 - Petition for a Common Victualler's License - CB Scoops

Councilor Scarpelli moved to table (Councilor Leming second)—approved on a roll call vote of six in favor and one absent (Callahan).

Vice President Collins moved to suspend the rules to take papers 25-127, 25-128, 25-125, and 25-126 out of order (Councilor Leming second)—approved on a roll call vote of six in favor and one absent (Callahan).

COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

25-127 – Submitted by Election Commission

Medford Call For Election September 2025

Addressing the Council:

- Henry Milorin, Chair, Board of Election Commissioners
- James Blatchford, Elections Manager

Vice President Collins moved to approve (Councilor Lazzaro second)—approved on a roll call vote of six in favor and one absent (Callahan).

25-128 – Submitted by Election Commission

Medford Election Warrant September 2025

Vice President Collins moved to approve (Councilor Lazzaro second)—approved on a roll call vote of six in favor and one absent (Callahan).

MOTIONS, ORDERS, AND RESOLUTIONS

25-125 - Offered by Isaac Bears, Council President

MBTA Bus Stop Improvements Presentation

Addressing the Council:

- Bin Zou, MBTA
- Katie Moulton, MBTA

Vice President Collins moved to approve (Councilor Leming second)—approved on a roll call vote of five in favor, one opposed (Scarpelli), and one absent (Callahan).

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR

25-126 **Submitted by Mayor Breanna Lungo-Koehn**

Medford Community Garden Commission Appointment - Mark L. Lalli

Addressing the Council:

- Mark Lalli

Councilor Leming moved to approve (Councilor Lazzaro second)—approved on a roll call vote of six in favor and one absent (Callahan).

MOTIONS, ORDERS, AND RESOLUTIONS

25-103 - Offered by Vice President Collins

Vice President Collins moved to table (Councilor Leming second)—approved on a roll call vote of six in favor and one absent (Callahan).

MEMORANDUM

To	Members of the Planning and Permitting Committee Alicia Hunt, Director of Planning, Development & Sustainability Danielle Evans, Senior Planner Jonathan Silverstein, Blatman, Bobrowski, Haverty & Silverstein, LLC
From	Paula Ramos Martinez, Chief Resilience Officer
Date	June 11, 2025.
Project	23146 – Medford – Zoning
Subject	Other Corridors
Cc:	Emily Keys Innes, AICP, LEED AP ND, President

This memorandum contains draft text for the following proposed zoning changes:

Amend Section 94-2.1. Division into districts	page 2
Amend Section 94-3.2 Table of Use Regulations (Table A) Dimensional Standards	page 3
Amend Section 94-4.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements (Table B)	page 11
Amend Section 94-12.0 Definitions (progress update)	page 12
Additional sections to be reviewed per conversation with the check-in April 28	Page 13

Add the following row to the table of zoning districts, as shown below:

Full Name	Classification	Abbreviation
Main Street Neighborhood Corridor District	Residential, Office, and Commercial	MSNCD
Broadway Neighborhood Corridor District	Residential, Office, and Commercial	BNCD
Boston Avenue Corridor Neighborhood District	Residential, Office, and Commercial	BANCD
Harvard Street Neighborhood Corridor District	Residential, Office, and Commercial	HSNCD
West Medford Neighborhood Corridor District	Residential, Office, and Commercial	WMNCD

[the remainder of this page is blank]

Amend Section 94-3.2 c (Table A) by incorporating the following table into the existing table and renumbering as appropriate:

	Neighborhood Corridors						
	UR-1	UR-2	MX-1B	MX-2A	MX-2B	PC ⁵	LC
A. RESIDENTIAL USES							
1. Detached one-unit dwelling	N	N	N	N	N	2 per Dwelling Unit	NA
2. Attached one-unit dwelling (Rowhouse)	Y	Y	N	N	N	1.5 per Dwelling Unit ⁴	NA
3. Detached two-unit dwelling (Duplex)	Y	N	N	N	N	1.5 per Dwelling Unit ⁴	NA
4. Three-unit dwelling, Detached.	Y	Y	N	N	N	1.5 per Dwelling Unit ⁴	NA
5. Multiplex (4-6 units)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1.5 per Dwelling Unit ⁴	NA
6. Multiple dwelling (>6 units)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	1.5 per Dwelling Unit ⁴	NA
7. Dormitory, fraternity or sorority house	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 4 beds	1/15, 000 s.f.
8. Lodging or boarding house	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	1 per Guestroom	1/15, 000 s.f.
9. Senior housing facility	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	1 per 2 Units	1/15, 000 s.f.
10. Co-housing.	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	1.5 per Dwelling Unit ⁴	NA
11. Congregate Housing.	Y	Y	N	N	N	1.5 per Dwelling Unit ⁴	NA

	Neighborhood Corridors						
	UR-1	UR-2	MX-1B	MX-2A	MX-2B	PC ⁵	LC
12. Townhouse	Y	Y	N	N	N	1.5 per Dwelling Unit ⁴	NA
13. Historic Conversion	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1.5 per Dwelling Unit ⁴	NA
B. COMMUNITY USES							
1. Museum	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15, 000 s.f.
2. Community center or adult recreational center, nonprofit	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15, 000 s.f.
3. Use of land or structures for religious purposes on land owned or leased by a religious sect or denomination	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per 140 s.f.	NA
4. Use of land or structures for educational purposes on land owned or leased by the Commonwealth or any of its agencies, subdivisions or bodies politic or by a religious sect or denomination or by a nonprofit educational corporation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15, 000 s.f.
5. Child care center or school aged child care program	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15, 000 s.f.
6. Public fire station	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per 2 employees	1/50, 000 s.f.
7. Public library	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15, 000 s.f.
8. Other municipal uses	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA
9. Essential services	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	NA	NA
10. Hospital, nonprofit	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 4 beds	1/15, 000 s.f.
11. Other Institution	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15, 000 s.f.
C. OPEN RECREATIONAL AND AGRICULTURAL USES							
1. Private open recreational uses, available to the public	CDB	CDB	Y	Y	Y	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15, 000 s.f.
2. Public open recreational uses	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per 750 s.f.	NA
3. Exempt agriculture	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA
4. Production of crops, horticulture and floriculture	Y	Y	N	N	N	NA	1/15, 000 s.f.

	Neighborhood Corridors						
	UR-1	UR-2	MX-1B	MX-2A	MX-2B	PC ⁵	LC
5. Keeping and raising of livestock, including animal stable or kennel	N	N	N	N	N	NA	1/15,000 s.f.
D. COMMERCIAL USES							
1. Private entertainment or recreation facility excluding adult uses	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
2. Public entertainment or recreation facility	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
3. Private nonprofit members only recreational club or lodge	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
4. Trade, professional, or other school operated for profit	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
5. Hotel	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per Guestroom	1/15,000 s.f.
6. Mortuary, undertaking or funeral establishment	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 140 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
7. Adult use	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
8. Brewery or taproom ¹	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
9. Artisanal Fabrication.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
10. Artistic/Creative Production.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
11. Work-Only Artists' Studio.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
12. Co-working Space.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
13. Retail Store or Shop for Sale of Custom Work or Articles Made on the Premises.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
E. OFFICE USES							
1. Business, professional, or government office	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
2. Bank and other financial institution	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
3. Neighborhood Medical Office	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
4. Medical Office	N	N	CDB	CDB	CDB	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.

	Neighborhood Corridors						
	UR-1	UR-2	MX-1B	MX-2A	MX-2B	PC ⁵	LC
5. Clinic	N	N	CDB	CDB	CDB	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
F. RETAIL AND SERVICE USES							
1. Retail sales ²	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
2. Convenience retail ²	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 500 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
3. Neighborhood retail	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 750 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
4. Drive through retail sales and consumer service	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
5. Consumer service establishment	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/50,000 s.f.
6. Body art establishment	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 850 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
7. Adult Use Marijuana Establishment — Cultivation	N	N	ZBA	ZBA	ZBA	1 per 350 s.f.	1/50,000 s.f.
8. Adult Use Marijuana Establishment — Manufacture and processing	N	N	ZBA	ZBA	ZBA	1 per 350 s.f.	1/50,000 s.f.
9. Adult Use Marijuana Establishment — Retail	N	N	ZBA	ZBA	ZBA	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
10. Adult Use Marijuana Establishment — Independent laboratory	N	N	ZBA	ZBA	ZBA	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
11. Doggy Daycare	N	N	Y	Y	Y		
G. EATING, DRINKING, AND ENTERTAINMENT ESTABLISHMENTS							
1. Eating place, without drive through	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/50,000 s.f.
2. Eating place, with drive through	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
3. Neighborhood Café	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/50,000 s.f.
H. MOTOR VEHICLE RELATED USES							
1. Motor vehicle light service station	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 350 s.f.	1/50,000 s.f.
2. Motor vehicle repair establishment	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 350 s.f.	1/50,000 s.f.
3. Motor vehicle sales or rental of new vehicles only,	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 1,040 s.f.	1/50,000 s.f.

	Neighborhood Corridors						
	UR-1	UR-2	MX-1B	MX-2A	MX-2B	PC ⁵	LC
accessory storage entirely within enclosed structure							
4. Outdoor motor vehicle sales and storage accessory to H.3	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA
5. Motor vehicle sales and storage, outdoors	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA
6. Class II used motor vehicle sales	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA
7. Motor vehicle wash within enclosed structure	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 350 s.f.	1/50, 000 s.f.
I. MISCELLANEOUS COMMERCIAL USES							
1. Parking area or garage not accessory to permitted principal use:							
Residential	CDB	CDB	N	N	N	NA	NA
Nonresidential	NA	NA	N	N	N	NA	NA
2. Parking area or garage accessory to a principal use which is on the same lot as a conforming principal use	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA
3. Parking area or garage accessory to a principal use which is within 500 feet of a conforming principal use but not necessarily in the same district	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA
4. Parking area or garage accessory to a principal use which is on the same lot as a nonconforming principal use	CDB	CDB	N	N	N	NA	NA
5. Parking area or garage accessory to a principal use which is within 500 feet of a conforming principal use in the same MUZ district ³	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA
6. Open Storage	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 1,400 s.f.	1/15, 000 s.f.
7. Moving of land	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA
8. Radio and television tower	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA
9. Solar energy system	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA
J. WHOLESALE, TRANSPORTATION, INDUSTRIAL USES							
1. Fuel and ice sales	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 1,400 s.f.	1/50, 000 s.f.
2. Motor freight terminal	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA
3. Printing and publishing	N	N	N	N	N	H	B
4. Railroad right-of-way	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA

	Neighborhood Corridors						
	UR-1	UR-2	MX-1B	MX-2A	MX-2B	PC ⁵	LC
5. Manufacturing	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 2 employees	1/50,000 s.f.
6. Research and testing laboratory	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 2 employees	1/50,000 s.f.
7. Plumbing or carpentry shop, and other similar service or repair shops	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
8. Wholesale bakery or food processing plant	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 2 employees	1/15,000 s.f.
9. Wholesale laundry, cleaner, dyer or similar use	N	N	N	N	N	H	1/50,000 s.f.
10. Warehouse, Wholesale establishment	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 1,400 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
11. Mini or self-storage warehouse	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 1,400 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
12. Distillery or winery.	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
13. Food Production Facility	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 2 employees	1/50,000 s.f.
14. Life Science Facility	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 2 employees	1/50,000 s.f.
15. Light Manufacturing	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 2 employees	1/50,000 s.f.
16. Maker Space	N	N	Y	Y	Y	1 per 2 employees	1/50,000 s.f.
17. Shared-use Kitchen	N	N	CDB	CDB	CDB	1 per 1,000 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
K. ACCESSORY USES							
1. Accessory Dwelling Units (see §94-8.2)							
Protected Use ADUs	N	N	N	N	N	Per §94-8.2	NA
Local ADU	Y ^{*1}	Y ^{*1}	N	N	N	Per §94-8.2	NA
Local ADU-Special Permit	Y ^{*1}	Y ^{*1}	N	N	N	Per §94-8.2	NA
Local ADU-Historic Structure	Y ^{*1}	Y ^{*1}	N	N	N	Per §94-8.2	NA
2. Home occupation (see § 94-3.4)						1 per 350 s.f.	NA
As of right	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
By special permit	CDB	CDB	Y	Y	Y	1 per 350 s.f.	NA

	Neighborhood Corridors						
	UR-1	UR-2	MX-1B	MX-2A	MX-2B	PC ⁵	LC
3. Accessory child care center or school aged child care program	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
4. Family day care home	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per 2 employees	NA
5. Family day care home, large	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	1 per 2 employees	NA
6. Adult day care home	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	CDB	1 per 2 employees	NA
7. Renting of one or two rooms without separate cooking facilities to lodgers within a dwelling unit to one or two total lodgers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 per Guestroom	NA
8. Noncommercial greenhouse, tool shed, or similar accessory structure	Y	Y	N	N	N	NA	NA
9. Swimming pool	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA
10. Scientific research and development, as provided at section 94-3.3.3.1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA
11. Keno	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA
12. Open storage	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA
13. Heavy repair operations	N	N	N	N	N	1 per 1,400 s.f.	1/15,000 s.f.
L. OTHER PRINCIPAL USES							
1. Mixed-Use, Community	N	N	Y	Y	Y		
2. Mixed-Use Development	N	N	Y	Y	Y		

*1 Only applicable for 1, 2 and 3 Dwelling Units

Amend Section 94-4.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements (Table B) by incorporating the following table:

Dimensions	Neighborhood Corridors				
	UR-1	UR-2	MX-1B	MX-2A	MX-2B
Lot Area sf (Min)	4,000	4,000	3,000	3,000	5,000
Frontage (Min)	40	40	30	40	40
Façade Build Out (Min)	60%	60%	80%	80%	80%
Active Ground Floor (Min)			75%	75%	75%
Residential Density (Units per lot) (Min-Max)	2-6 units	2-N/A	-	-	-
Historical Conversion (Max) *1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Height					
Max Base Height. (Stories)	3	3	4	5	7
Max Incentive Height (Stories)	N/A	1	1	2	2
Setbacks (ft)					
Front (Min/Max)	10	5	0/20	0/20	0/20
Side	5	5	-	-	-
Rear	10	10	0	0	0
Stormwater and Landscaping					
Building Coverage (Max)	60%	60%	80%	80%	80%

Dimensions	Neighborhood Corridors				
	UR-1	UR-2	MX-1B	MX-2A	MX-2B
Green Score	-	25* ²	25	25	25
Open Space, Permeable (Min)	-	-	20%	20%	20%
Pervious Surface (Min)	25%	25%	-	-	-
Open Space Landscape (Min)	15%	15%	-	-	-

*¹ Maximum permissible number of units is determined by dividing the Gross Floor Area of the existing principal structure by 900 sf. Each unit within the existing building must have a minimum area of 400 sf. Additions and expansions to the existing building shall not increase the number of units allowed. Historic Conversion in mixed-use districts could be converted into a mixed-use building.

*² The Green Score only applies to the construction of any new principal building or major renovation that:

a) Is located within the FEMA National Flood Hazard Layers.

b) Requires Site Plan Review.

In those cases, Pervious Surface requirement does not apply.

The intent is to revise the sections below to apply to all future districts and then point the Mystic Avenue Corridor, the Salem Street Neighborhood Corridor, Medford Square, and West Medford Square to the correct sections in the final round of edits.

94-9.X.3 Dimensional Requirements and Waivers.

94-9.X.4 Development Incentives

94-9.X.5 Design Guidelines and Applicability of Development Standards

94-9.X.6 Development Standards

94-9.X.5 Affordability Requirements

Section 94-9.X Neighborhood Corridors

94-9.X.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Neighborhood Corridors is to allow a mix of uses, including residential, multifamily, and commercial, to meet the following needs for the neighborhood corridors:

1. Wider variety of uses and building types to support jobs and economic development near established residential neighborhoods, providing options for living within walking distance of jobs, goods, and services.
2. Mixed-use, multifamily, and commercial uses at a density appropriate to the historic walkable, economic centers.
3. Design standards to buffer abutting neighborhoods from the higher intensity of uses and reinforce the identity of the neighborhood corridors as local and regional destinations.

94-9.X.2 Applicability

The MSNCD, BNCD, BANCD, HSNCD and WMNCD replace the existing zoning districts and is shown on the Zoning Map, City of Medford, Massachusetts, as amended. An applicant may develop within these districts in accordance with the provisions of Section 94-9.X and other relevant sections of the Zoning Ordinance.

1. The MSNCD is comprised of the following subdistricts:

- a. **Urban Residential 1.** The Urban Residential 1 Subdistrict allows buildings of 2-6 units within a corridor, square, or neighborhood hub district. This district's intent is to transition from a higher level of development intensity along corridors or within squares to the lower level of adjacent Neighborhood Districts.
- b. **Urban Residential 2.** The Urban Residential 2 Subdistrict allows buildings of min 3 units within a corridor, square, or neighborhood hub district. This district's intent is

to transition from a higher level of development intensity along corridors or within squares to the lower level of adjacent Neighborhood Districts.

- c. **Mixed-use 1B.** The Mixed-Use 1B Subdistrict allows a mix of residential and commercial uses at a lower scale of building size and massing.
 - d. **Mixed-use 2A.** The Mixed-Use 2A Subdistrict allows a mix of residential and commercial uses at a medium scale of building size and massing. The MX- 2A subdistrict has a lower height limit than the MX-2B district.
2. The BNCD is comprised of the following subdistricts:
- a. **Urban Residential 2.** The Urban Residential 2 Subdistrict allows buildings of min 3 units within a corridor, square, or neighborhood hub district. This district's intent is to transition from a higher level of development intensity along corridors or within squares to the lower level of adjacent Neighborhood Districts.
 - b. **Mixed-use 1B.** The Mixed-Use 1B Subdistrict allows a mix of residential and commercial uses at a lower scale of building size and massing.
 - c. **Mixed-use 2A.** The Mixed-Use 2A Subdistrict allows a mix of residential and commercial uses at a medium scale of building size and massing. The MX- 2A subdistrict has a lower height limit than the MX-2B district.
3. The BANCD is comprised of the following subdistricts:
- d. **Urban Residential 1.** The Urban Residential 1 Subdistrict allows buildings of 2-6 units within a corridor, square, or neighborhood hub district. This district's intent is to transition from a higher level of development intensity along corridors or within squares to the lower level of adjacent Neighborhood Districts.
 - e. **Urban Residential 2.** The Urban Residential 2 Subdistrict allows buildings of min 3 units within a corridor, square, or neighborhood hub district. This district's intent is to transition from a higher level of development intensity along corridors or within squares to the lower level of adjacent Neighborhood Districts.
 - f. **Mixed-use 1B.** The Mixed-Use 1B Subdistrict allows a mix of residential and commercial uses at a lower scale of building size and massing.
 - g. **Mixed-use 2A.** The Mixed-Use 2A Subdistrict allows a mix of residential and commercial uses at a medium scale of building size and massing. The MX- 2A subdistrict has a lower height limit than the MX-2B district.
 - h. **Mixed-use 2B.** The Mixed-Use 2B Subdistrict allows a mix of residential and commercial uses at a larger scale of building size and massing.
4. The HSNCD is comprised of the following subdistricts:
- a. **Urban Residential 2.** The Urban Residential 2 Subdistrict allows buildings of min 3 units within a corridor, square, or neighborhood hub district. This district's intent is to transition from a higher level of development intensity along corridors or within squares to the lower level of adjacent Neighborhood Districts.
 - b. **Mixed-use 2A.** The Mixed-Use 2A Subdistrict allows a mix of residential and commercial uses at a medium scale of building size and massing. The MX- 2A subdistrict has a lower height limit than the MX-2B district.
5. The WMNCD is comprised of the following subdistricts:

- c. **Urban Residential 1.** The Urban Residential 1 Subdistrict allows buildings of 2-6 units within a corridor, square, or neighborhood hub district. This district's intent is to transition from a higher level of development intensity along corridors or within squares to the lower level of adjacent Neighborhood Districts.
- d. **Urban Residential 2.** The Urban Residential 2 Subdistrict allows buildings of min 3 units within a corridor, square, or neighborhood hub district. This district's intent is to transition from a higher level of development intensity along corridors or within squares to the lower level of adjacent Neighborhood Districts.
- e. **Mixed-use 1B.** The Mixed-Use 1B Subdistrict allows a mix of residential and commercial uses at a lower scale of building size and massing.

94-9.X.3 Dimensional Requirements and Waivers.

The following waivers are available to the Site Plan Review or Special Permit Authority for projects within the MSNCD, BNCD, BANCD, HSNCD and WMNCD.

- f. **Front Setbacks.** The building façade must be set back from the lot line at a distance sufficient to create a 12-foot sidewalk in conjunction with an existing City sidewalk. A maximum setback of 20 feet is allowed for the purpose of creating an active public plaza.
- g. **Side and Rear Setbacks.** If the proposed development is adjacent to an existing lot with a residential use of fewer than 5 units, the applicant shall provide a landscaped buffer of at least 10 feet wide. The property owner shall maintain the buffer and landscaping.
- h. **Height Stepback Requirements.** For any lot within the MX-1B, MX-2A, or MX-2B district that abuts a NR-3, GR, or APT-1 district, a height setback is required along the lot line abutting the residential district. The height stepback is calculated by a 45-degree angle beginning at the third floor and extending to the highest floor of the building in the MX-1B, MX-2A, or MX-2B district. The fourth floor and above shall not break the plane of that 45-degree angle.
- i. **Multi-Building Lots.** In the Neighborhood Corridor Districts, lots may have more than one principal building.
- j. **Ground Floor Active Frontage.** Active uses are required on the ground floor of any building with its principal façade parallel to Boston Avenue, Main Street, Broadway, Harvard St, and High Street in WMNCD are subject to the Active Frontage percentages set forth in Section 94-4.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements (Table B). Active uses are defined as arts-related uses, retail (including retail accessory to an artisanal, maker, or manufacturing use), restaurant, personal services, publicly-accessible spaces, residential lobbies and common amenities, and other uses that encourage high levels of pedestrian activity and create a perception of safety.
- k. **Transition to adjacent residential districts.** Buildings adjacent to a residential zoning district should step down to the base height required by the subdistrict of the MSNCD, BNCD, BANCD, HSNCD and WMNCD in which the project is located for any buildings between twenty and thirty feet of the rear or side setback abutting a parcel within that residential zoning district. If the side or rear setback is adjacent to an active public way, no stepback is required.
- l. **Setbacks for Infill Lots.** If the adjacent buildings are set back at a distance that exceeds the minimum front yard requirements, infill buildings shall meet the requirements of Section 94-4.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements. Otherwise, infill buildings may match the setback line of either adjacent building or an average of the setback of the two buildings to provide consistency along the street.
- m. **Drop-off zone.** The required setback distances may be waived to allow for a cut-out along the curb for loading and short-term parking for deliveries or drop-off/pick-up

zones. Such a cut-out must be coordinated with City staff. The required setback distances may also be waived to allow a development to meet the requirements of Chapter 91.

- n. **Height Waiver 1.** The limitation on the height of buildings shall not apply to chimneys, ventilators, towers, silos, spires, or other ornamental features of buildings, which features are in no way used for living purposes and do not constitute more than 25% of the ground floor area of the building.
- o. **Height Waiver 2.** The minimum height requirement may be waived by a Special Permit from the Community Development Board for projects that are consistent with the purpose of the district and the goals of the Medford Comprehensive Plan.
- p. **Stepback Waiver.** If a building is subject to a front stepback and rear or side stepbacks, the Community Development Board may waive the strict dimensional requirement of any of the stepbacks, provided that priority is given to retaining the stepback(s) in 94-9.X.3.c Height Stepback Requirements.
- q. **Energy-Efficiency.** The Site Plan Review Authority or Special Permit Granting Authority may waive the height and setbacks in 94-9.X.6 Development Standards to accommodate the installation of solar photovoltaic, solar thermal, living, and other eco-roofs, energy storage, and air-source heat pump equipment. Such installations shall not create a significant detriment to abutters in terms of noise or shadow and must be appropriately integrated into the architecture of the building and the layout of the site. The installations shall not provide additional habitable space within the development.

94-9.X.4 Development Incentives

Table of Development Incentive Bonuses.

Incentive 1: Affordability			Incentive 1A: Deeper Affordability:			
# of Lots or Units in Proposed Project	Required Minimum/Total Percentage of Affordable Units at 80% AMI	For One Additional Floor		For Two Additional Floors		Minimum Percentage of Affordable Units at 65% AMI
		Minimum Percentage of Affordable Units at 80% AMI	Minimum Percentage of Affordable Units at 65% AMI	Minimum Percentage of Affordable Units at 80% AMI	Minimum Percentage of Affordable Units at 65% AMI	
1	10-24	10%	8%	2%	5%	5%
2	25-49	13%	8%	5%	6%	7%
3	50 +	15%	10%	5%	8%	7%
Incentive 1B: More Affordable Units:						
# of Lots or Units in Proposed Project	Required Minimum Percentage of Affordable Units at 80% AMI	For One Additional Floor		For Two Additional Floors		Total Percentage of Affordable Units at 80% AMI
		Additional Percentage of Affordable Units at 80% AMI	Total Percentage of Affordable Units at 80% AMI	Additional Percentage of Affordable Units at 80% AMI	Total Percentage of Affordable Units at 80% AMI	
1	10-24	10%	3%	13%	5%	15%
2	25-49	13%	3%	16%	5%	18%
3	50 +	15%	3%	18%	5%	20%
Incentive 2: Community Amenities (privately maintained)						
Indoor pedestrian seating or outdoor pedestrian plaza of at least 300 square feet and accessible to the public during business hours.				1 additional half-story		
One of the following neighborhood open spaces: Pocket Park Garden Playground Skate Park				1 additional half-story		

Table of Development Incentive Bonuses.	
Fountain / Water element (maintenance and repair for the life of the associated building)	1 additional half-story
Low-Income Shared Community Solar	Incentive to be confirmed.
Public parking	Incentive to be confirmed.
Incentive 3: Community Amenities (publicly maintained)	
Streetscape Improvements along a public street	1 additional half-story
Incentive 4: Vibrant Neighborhoods	
Parking is concealed below grade or within a building structure.	1 additional half-story
The development project provides a minimum of 50% or the ground floor at rents no less than 15% below market for a minimum tenancy of three years to qualified nonresidential tenants (nonprofits or local businesses under 10 employees)	1 additional story
Incentive 5: Environmental Resilience	
The development project meets the Ideal Green Score	1 additional story
The building(s) is/are certified as Net Zero Emissions Building	1 additional story
The development project is certifiable as LEED Platinum or equivalent standard	1 additional story

In exchange for incorporating certain provisions that further the City's goals for affordability, economic development, environmental sustainability, and climate resiliency, Applicants may receive Development Incentive Bonuses that allow for additional stories beyond the base number of stories that are allowed as of right under Section 94-4.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements. However, the total number of stories is limited to the maximum number of stories allowed in each subdistrict, as shown in Section 94-4.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements. Additional stories must comply with any setback, stepback, or other dimensional requirements and the development and design standards in 94-9.X.3 Dimensional Requirements and Waivers and 94-9.X.6 Development Standards.

94-9.X.5 Design Guidelines and Applicability of Development Standards

- Design Guidelines.** The Community Development Board may adopt and amend, by simple majority vote, Design Standards which shall be applicable to all rehabilitation, redevelopment, or new construction submitted under this Neighborhood Corridor Districts. Such Design Guidelines may address the scale and proportions of building, the alignment, width, and grade of streets and sidewalks, the type and location of infrastructure, the location of building and garage entrances, off-street parking, the protection of significant natural site features, the location and design of on-site open spaces, exterior signs, and buffering in relation to adjacent properties. Design Guidelines may contain graphics illustrating a particular standard or definition to make such standard or definition clear and understandable.
- Applicability of Development Standards.** Sections 94-9.X.6 Development Standards shall apply to all projects submitted under this MSNCD, BNCD, BANCD, HSNCD and WMNCD. These standards, along with any Design Guidelines adopted under paragraph 1, above, are components of the Site Plan Review and Special Permit processes as defined in this Zoning Ordinance.

94-9.X.6 Development Standards

1. Site Standards.

- Connections.** Sidewalks shall provide direct connections among building entrances, the public sidewalk (if applicable), bicycle storage, and parking.

- b. **Sidewalk Width.** Along the streets named in Section 94-9.X.3.f, for any lot abutting a public sidewalk that is less than twelve (12) feet in width, the frontage area must be paved to provide a sidewalk that is at least twelve (12) feet in total width.
- c. **Sidewalk Materials.** Sidewalks shall be continuous across driveways, using the same materials and grade and level as the sidewalk on either side of the driveway.
- d. **Vehicular access.** Where feasible, curb cuts shall be minimized, and shared driveways encouraged. Curb cuts for one-way access shall be no more than twelve (12) feet in width, while curb cuts for two-way traffic shall be no more than twenty (20) feet in width. Designated drop-off and pick-up areas for deliveries and ride-sharing companies should be incorporated to reduce conflicts associated with double-parking and blocking of bicycle lanes, crosswalks, and bus stops. These areas should be clearly marked with signs and conveniently located near entrances to buildings and major destinations.
- e. **Circulation.** Parking and circulation on the site shall be organized to reduce the amount of impervious surface. Where possible, parking and loading areas shall be connected to minimize curb cuts onto public rights-of-way.
- f. **Open Space.** Open Space shall be contiguous and connected to the pedestrian network. Isolated pockets of space that cannot be accessed for maintenance are prohibited. Open Space may be either private or public. Public open space shall be in the front or side setback. A minimum third of the requested open space, permeable, shall be landscaped.
- g. **Screening for Surface Parking.** Surface parking adjacent to a public sidewalk shall be screened by a landscaped buffer of sufficient width to allow the healthy establishment of trees, shrubs, and perennials, but no less than [6 (six)] feet. The buffer may include a fence or wall of no more than three feet in height unless there is a significant grade change between the parking and the sidewalk. Chain-link and vinyl fences are prohibited.
- h. **Parking Materials.** The parking surface may be concrete, asphalt, decomposed granite, bricks, or pavers, including pervious materials but not including grass or soil not contained within a paver or other structure.
- i. **Plantings.** Plantings shall include species that are native or adapted to the region. Plants on the Massachusetts Prohibited Plant List, as may be amended, shall be prohibited.
- j. **Lighting.** Light levels shall meet or exceed the minimum design guidelines defined by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) and shall provide the illumination necessary for safety and convenience while preventing glare and overspill onto adjoining properties and reducing the amount of skylight.
- k. **Mechanicals.** Mechanical equipment at ground level shall be screened by a combination of fencing and plantings. Rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened if visible from a public right-of-way.
- l. **Dumpsters.** Dumpsters shall be screened by a combination of fencing and plantings. Dumpsters or other trash and recycling collection points located within the building are preferred.
- m. **Stormwater management.** Strategies that demonstrate the compliance of the construction activities and the proposed project with the most current versions of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection Stormwater Management Standards, the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook, Massachusetts Erosion Sediment and Control Guidelines, and the City of Medford's Stormwater Management Rules and Regulations. The applicant shall also provide an Operations and Management Plan for both the construction activities and ongoing post-construction maintenance and reporting requirements.

2. General Building Standards.

- a. **Position relative to the principal street.** The primary building shall have its principal façade and entrance facing the principal street.
- b. **Daylight Minimum.** TBD
- c. **Entries.** Where feasible, entries shall be clearly defined and linked to a paved pedestrian network that includes the public sidewalk.
- d. **Multiple buildings on a lot.**
 - a. **Location of Mixed Uses.** For a mixed-use development, uses may be mixed within the buildings or in separate buildings.
 - b. **Orientation.** The orientation of multiple buildings on a lot should reinforce the relationships among the buildings. All building façade(s) shall be treated with the same care and attention in terms of entries, fenestration, and materials.
 - c. **Position relative to the street.** Building(s) adjacent to a public street shall have a pedestrian entry facing that public street.

3. Mixed-use development.

- a. **Access.** In a mixed-use building, access to and egress from the residential component shall be clearly differentiated from access to other uses. Such differentiation may occur by using separate entrances or egresses from the building or within a lobby space shared among different uses.
 - b. **Connections.** Paved pedestrian access from the residential component shall be provided to residential parking and amenities and to the public sidewalk, as applicable. Paved surfaces may include pervious paving materials.
 - c. **Material Storage.** Materials for non-residential uses shall be stored inside or under cover and shall not be accessible to residents of the development.
 - d. **Shared Outdoor Space.** Multi-family housing and mixed-use development shall have common outdoor space that all residents can access. Such space may be in any combination of ground floor, courtyard, rooftop, or terrace. All outdoor space shall count towards the project's minimum Open Space requirement.
4. **Corner Lots.** A building on a corner lot shall indicate a primary entrance either along one of the street-facing façades or on the primary corner as an entrance serving both streets.
 - a. **Connections.** Such entries shall be connected by a paved surface to the public sidewalk, if applicable.
 - b. **Façade Design.** All façades visible from a public right-of-way shall be treated with similar care and attention in terms of entries, fenestration, and materials.
 - c. **Fire Exits.** Fire exits serving more than one story shall not be located on either of the street-facing façades.
 5. **Parking.** Parking shall be subordinate in design and location to the principal building façade.
 - a. **Surface parking.** Surface parking shall be located to the rear or side of the principal building. Parking shall not be in the setback between the building and any lot line adjacent to the public right-of-way.

- b. **Integrated garages.** The principal pedestrian entry into the building shall be more prominent in design and placement than the vehicular entry into the garage.
 - c. **Parking structures.** Above-grade parking structures (stand-alone or within a residential, commercial, or mixed-use building) shall be subordinate in design and placement to the primary uses. Ground-floor parking levels shall be wrapped with active uses such as commercial/retail, community spaces, or residential amenity spaces. Exposed facades of upper parking levels shall incorporate design treatments such as public art installations, vertical planting, or other architectural features for visual interest and to disguise the parking uses within. Vehicular openings shall have doors.
 - d. **Electrical Vehicle (EV) Charging Spaces.** One EV charging space is required for every twenty (20) parking spaces, rounded up to the next highest number of EV stations.
 - e. **Bicycle parking.** For a multi-family development or a mixed-use development, a minimum of 50% of the required bicycle spaces shall be covered or integrated into the structure of the building(s). E-bike storage is only permitted in an area that is separated from the dwelling units by a fire-rated structure.
6. **Waivers.** Upon the request of the Applicant, the Site Plan Review Authority may waive the requirements of 94-9.X.6 Development Standards in the interests of design flexibility and overall project quality and upon a finding of consistency of such variation with the overall purpose and objectives of the Neighborhood Corridor Districts.

94-9.X.5 Affordability Requirements

Development in the Neighborhood Corridor Districts is subject to the requirements of Section 94-8.1 Inclusionary Housing.

This paper was tabled until the next meeting (see vote above).

25-105 - Offered by President Bears

Proposed Medford Values-Aligned Local Investments Ordinance

CHAPTER 2 – ADMINISTRATION

ARTICLE IV. - OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

DIVISION 5. - CITY TREASURER AND COLLECTOR

Sec. 2-696. - Purpose and Intent.

The City of Medford will strive to invest its funds in ways that promote the wellbeing of our communities and our environment, favoring investment of its funds in entities that support the needs of peacetime in daily life and meet the city's goals of conducting local government in an "accountable, transparent, innovative, stable, ethical, representative, and responsible" way.

This ordinance shall be known as the Values-Aligned Local Investments Ordinance.

Sec. 2-697. - Prohibiting Certain Local Investments.

(A) No public funds under the care and custody of the Treasurer-Collector of the city shall be invested or remain invested in the stocks, securities or other financial instruments of any company which derives more than 15% of its revenue from the combustion, distribution, extraction, manufacture or sale of fossil fuels, which shall include coal, oil and gas, or fossil fuel products.

(B) No public funds under the care and custody of the Treasurer-Collector of the city shall be invested or remain invested in the stocks, securities or other financial instruments of any company which derives more than 15% of its revenue from the operation, maintenance, servicing or supply of jails, prisons, or detention facilities.

(C) No public funds under the care and custody of the Treasurer-Collector of the city, as specified in Sec. 2-682, shall be invested or remain invested in the stocks, securities, or other financial instruments of any company which derives any of its revenue from the manufacture or sale of weapons of any kind, including defense contractors.

(D) No public funds under the care and custody of the Treasurer-Collector of the city, as specified in Sec. 2-682, shall be invested or remain invested in the stocks, securities or other financial instruments of any company that is directly, knowingly and over time contributing to severe violations of human rights and international humanitarian law as determined by international legal and humanitarian bodies and conventions, including, but not limited to, complicity in killings, physical abuse, displacement or other rights violations, confinement, forced labor, human rights violations based on racial, gender or LGBTQ+ identity, war crimes, crimes against humanity, apartheid, genocide, ethnic cleansing, illegal occupation, and complicity with such actions by governments or other parties.

(E) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in paragraphs (A) through (D), inclusive, the Treasurer-Collector continues to have authorization to invest the funds of the Medford Retirement System as the Medford Retirement Board directs, consistent with the provisions of M G.L. c. 32, § 23 and 840 CMR 16. 00 through 19. 00, et seq.

Sec. 2-698. - Effective Date of Prohibition of Certain Local Investments.

- A. Upon enactment of this ordinance, the Treasurer-Collector of the city shall review the investment portfolio of the city and identify any investments that may be deemed to violate the provisions established in this ordinance. The Treasurer-Collector shall divest public funds under their care from investments defined in Sec. 2-697 no later than December 31, 2025.
- B. When applicable, the Treasurer-Collector of the city shall use the MSCI ESG (environmental, social, governance) Controversies and Global Norms Methodology to make determinations regarding investments of public funds that violate the prohibitions of Sec. 2-697 (A) through (D).

The MSCI ESG Controversies and Global Norms Methodology “is designed to provide timely and consistent assessments of companies’ involvement in ESG-related controversies and incidents concerning corporate entities... Cases include alleged company violations of existing laws and/or regulations to which they are subject to, or an alleged company action or event that violates commonly accepted international norms, including, but not limited to, global norms and conventions.”

The MSCI ESG Controversies and Global Norms Methodology references the following documents used to make determinations regarding violations of international norms and laws:

- United Nations Declaration of Human Rights
- United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

- International Labour Organization Convention No. 169: Indigenous and Tribal Peoples
- International Labour Organization Convention No. 105: Abolition of Forced Labour Convention
- United Nations Minorities Declaration
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
- International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
- International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
- Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide

As of June 2024, the MSCI ESG Controversies and Global Norms Methodology identified “vulnerable demographics” of “31 national (i.e., civilians and refugees), ethnic, racial and religious groups... located and/or originated from countries with ongoing international armed conflicts or military offensives.”

The Treasurer-Collector of the city shall use the most recently updated version of the MSCI ESG Controversies and Global Norms Methodology, which is updated regularly.

- C. On or before December 31, 2026, and annually thereafter, the City Council shall review Sec. 2-698(B) to ensure that the MSCI ESG Controversies and Global Norms Methodology remains applicable to making determinations regarding the prohibitions of Sec. 2-697 (A) through (D).

Sec. 2-699. - Disposition of Proceeds of Sales Required by Prohibition of Certain Local Investments.

Any proceeds of the sales required under this Subsection shall be invested as much as reasonably possible in institutions or companies which invest or conduct business or operations in the city or the commonwealth of Massachusetts so long as such use is consistent with sound and prudent investment policy, subject to the provisions of M.G.L. c.44, §§ 54 and 55 and the Prudent Investor Act, M.G.L. c. 203C.

Sec. 2-700. - Report on Local Investment.

Upon achieving compliance with Sec. 2-698, the Treasurer-Collector shall submit a report within 120 days to the Medford City Council regarding the status of investments affected by Sec. 2-697.

The Treasurer-Collector shall review all investments annually and submit a report to the Medford City Council on an annual basis regarding the status of investments affected by Sec. 2-697.

Sec. 2-701. - Severability.

The provisions of this section are severable. If any subsection, provision or portion of this section is determined to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions of this section shall continue to be valid.

Secs. 2-702—2-720. - Reserved.

President Bears moved to waive the reading for a summary by the proponent (Councilor Lazzaro second)—approved on a roll call vote of five in favor, one opposed (Scarpelli) and one absent (Callahan).

Addressing the Council:

Dave Sherman Rosemary Way	Josh Eckart-Lee 347 Main St
Ann Castner-Williams	Ken Gareau 52 Lamber St
Claire Sheriden 190 High Street	Benjamin Strime 76 Marion St
Renee Korgood 25 Brook Park	Rachel Sensenig 86 Golden Av
Illana 60 Ashland Street	Tracy Nobel Sharon St
Dennis 120 North Street	Anna Meyer 6 Douglas Rd
Patrick 50 Princeton Street	Ellen Epstein
David Harris 151 Sharon Street	Robert Paine 15 West St
Nick Gialeo 40 Robinson Rd	Roni Miller
Zachary Chartok	Evan Fontana
Vincent Timmons 43 Winter St	Matt Avin
Munir Jirmanus	Eileen 3920 Mystic Valley Pkwy
Dina Alami 3780 Mystic Valley Pkwy	Barry Ingber 9 Draper St
Miranda Briseno	Paulette Buchheim
Mikah Kesselman 499 Main S	Bryce York
Owen Berson south Medford	Rahaf Suileman
Jennifer Yanco 16 Monument St	Fern Rometti -Brown
Adrienne Apel South Medford	Benjamin Stein-Ebert
Mike Cohen 200 Brooks St	Sam Goldstein 29 Martin St
Nila Armanis summit Ave	Michael Dewberry
Takeo Rivera 75 4 th St	Karam Havibala
Ezekial Silverstein 71 Kenmia Rd	Nate Merritt 373 Riverside Av
Micahel Prenke	jane deegott
Barbara Rutstein	Brenda Price
Paulette Bartabiti	Andrew Castanetti
Gina Chen	Fawaz Abusharq

President Bears moved to approve for first reading (Councilor Lazzaro second)—approved on a roll call vote of five in favor, one opposed (Scarpelli) and one absent (Callahan).

Vice President Collins declared a five-minute recess, after which the Council reconvened.

25-123 - Offered by President Bears

Whereas, on July 16, 2025, the Council President outlined a shared path forward for Medford's Zoning Updates Project that outlined a clear and responsive approach to continuing this essential project to enable Medford's future growth and development; and,

Whereas, the specific zoning amendment proposals reflect hard work to make our city's vision and plans a reality over the past several years, starting with requests for funding for zoning updates prior to 2020; the initiation of the first phase of this project from 2020 to 2022 by recodifying the zoning ordinance; the planning processes between 2020 and 2024 to create the Comprehensive Plan, Climate Plan, and Housing Plan that incorporated input from thousands of residents and hundreds of public engagement events and approaches; and continuing over the past 18 months with the City Council and Mayor's Planning Department staff, Building Commissioner, Communications

Director, and other city staff working with Innes Associates to create zoning proposals that concretely implement our city's plans; and,

Whereas, it is essential to the well-being of Medford residents and the future of our city that the Medford Zoning Ordinance is amended so that we can build more housing, create more vibrant commercial squares, and focus on mixed-use development that activates corridors of our city with so much potential that have been ignored for too long; and,

Whereas, after more than five years, our community is in the hardest phase of this project, and we must help secure the progress we all know Medford needs by seeing this work through to completion; and,

Whereas, for nearly two years, the Council, Community Development Board, and city staff have worked with the resources made available to us by the Mayor and have consistently and persistently advocated to the Mayor to engage more deeply in the process, provide more city resources to ensure the success of this collaboration between the City Council and the Mayor's administration, and work to ensure that accurate information reaches as many residents as possible to get them involved in this rezoning project; and,

Whereas, the Mayor's written response on July 31, 2025, contained inaccurate information and presented a narrative that does not correctly represent the mayor or her administration's core role in the Zoning Updates Project since its beginning; and,

Whereas, the Mayor's decision to limit her direct participation in this essential, major, and transformative project until recently has been a barrier to accessing City communications resources under her control to ensure as many residents as possible are able to engage in this process; and,

Whereas, the proposed extended timeline was drafted with the specific intention of receiving collaborative input from the mayor; and,

Whereas, Council leadership continues to extend its hand of open engagement and collaboration on this project as it has for nearly two years and the Council President has offered times to sit with the mayor to discuss the specifics regarding additional funding and resources for expanded public engagement to support the extended consideration of proposed zoning amendments; and,

Whereas, the people of the City of Medford have placed their trust in the elected members of the Medford City Council to update the Medford Zoning Ordinance, and the City Council has conducted a robust and extensive process to propose zoning amendments with the resources provided and within the restrictions of the contract signed by the mayor; and,

Whereas, a potential decision by the Mayor to end this Zoning Updates Project by canceling the contract with the zoning consultant team and refusing to provide the resources and support necessary to implement the city's plans and address decades of inaction and broken zoning, which has caused to harmful outcomes in all of our neighborhoods, would be a disservice to the city's residents and seriously damage the future of Medford; now, therefore:

Be it Resolved by the Medford City Council that we collaboratively establish an extended timeline for the consideration of the proposed Residential Districts and ADUs zoning proposal as well as off-street residential parking requirements with the Mayor's Office and planning team, which includes proposing a new draft no sooner than November 2025 after a series of neighborhood discussions to take place this fall and any final City Council vote no sooner than April 2026.

Be it Further Resolved that the City Council requests that the Community Development Board continue its plan to meet on August 6, 2025 to provide direction regarding drafting of new recommendations for the Residential Districts zoning proposal that

incorporate the feedback provided by residents during the CDB's public hearings and discussions over the last several months to the City Council and planning team.

Be it Further Resolved that we request that the City Council, Community Development Board, and planning team prioritize completing the proposed commercial framework and focus on the remaining proposed districts for Medford Square, West Medford Square, the 'Other Corridors', and Tufts Institutional Zoning through the end of 2025.

Be it Further Resolved that we request that the mayor allocate the necessary resources from the city's reserve funds to provide the Council, Community Development Board, planning team, and city staff with the support needed to conduct even more robust public outreach over the next year, including subject to discussion:

- At least \$150,000 in total funds (including any funds currently appropriated in FY26 budget) to extend the city's contract with the Innes Associates team through December 2026
- An additional \$50,000 in funds to pay for communications to residents that are reviewed and approved by the consensus of all of the branches of the city leading the project (Mayor's Office, City Council, and Planning Department) that help inform residents about the proposals and what opportunities they will have to make their voices heard and share their comments with the Community Development Board and the City Council

Addressing the Council:

- Danielle Evans, PDS Senior Planner
- Cheryl Rodriguez
- Nick Giurleo
- Page Buldini
- Micah Kesselman
- Sam Goldstein
- Nate Merritt

Councilor Scarpelli moved to approve a B-paper requesting that the Office of Planning, Development and Sustainability release a statement articulating the recommendations of the Community Development Board regarding the approved Salem Street Neighborhood Corridor District zoning and which recommendations the Council voted to accept (President Bears second)—approved on a roll call vote of six in favor and one absent (Callahan).

President Bears moved to approve for main paper (Councilor Lazzaro second)—approved on a roll call vote of five in favor, one opposed (Scarpelli) and one absent (Callahan).

25-124 - Offered by Councilor Callahan and Vice President Collins

Tree Committee Ordinance

Councilor Leming moved to table (Vice President Collins second)—approved on a roll call vote of five in favor and two absent (Callahan and Tseng).

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR

25-118— Personnel Ordinance

June 10, 2025

Via Electronic Delivery

To the Honorable President and
Members of the Medford City Council
Medford City Hall
Medford, MA 02155

Re: Personnel Ordinance

Dear President Bears and City Councilors:

I respectfully request and recommend that the City Council approve the following amendment to the Revised Ordinances Chapter 66 entitled “Personnel,” Article II entitled “Reserved” (the city’s “Classification and Compensation Plan),” formerly included as Art. II §§, 66-31—66-40, by adopting the following change:

Amendment A

The language of Non-Union Public Works “NPW” shall be amended to include the following position:

“Civil Project Manager”

Respectfully submitted,


Breanna Lungo-Koehn
Mayor

Vice President Collins moved to approve for third reading (Councilor Lazzaro second)—approved on a roll call vote of four in favor, one opposed (Scarpelli), and two absent (Callahan and Tseng).

Adjournment:

Councilor Leming moved to adjourn at 1:35 a.m. (Councilor Lazzaro second)—approved on a roll call vote of five in favor and two absent (Callahan and Tseng).

President Bears adjourned the meeting at 1:35 a.m.

A true copy, Attest

Richard Eliseo Jr.
Assistant City Clerk