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**TOWN OF DEDHAM**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**May 11, 2017, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room**

**Present:** Michael A. Podolski, Esq., Chair

John R. Bethoney, Vice Chair

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

Ralph I. Steeves

James E. O’Brien IV

Richard J. McCarthy, Jr., Planning Director

Call to order 6:30 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Plans, documents, studies, etc., referred to are incorporated as part of the public records and are on file in the Planning and Zoning office.

**PRESENTATION**

**TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT**

**Presenter:** Chris Kushcel, AICP, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)

The project was originally started by Eric Halvorsen, who had previously been at MAPC. Mr. Kushcel is taking over. The study area included Wigwam Pond, Legacy Place, and Route 1. The reasons for the study are for the following:

1. Meet Master Plan goals (village designs in commercial centers, redevelopment of large parcels, corporate station ideas, encouragement toward mixed use development, and housing options)
2. Advantages: Individual benefits, i.e., potential for aging in place, local government benefits, i.e., tax revenue, lower costs, and societal benefits
3. Grid-like street design
4. Safety improvements

Mr. Kushcel reviewed the past three meetings with landowners and the public at large in which they sought input on what they would like to see in the future. They have also been to the Planning Board with a presentation. He showed material on the demographic trends and cultural shifts that make mixed use more attractive:

Demographics

* Household size is shrinking and is projected to continue to shrink.
* Population is growing and is projected to continue.
* Age group growing the most is seniors, then 20-34.
* People want to downsize into maintenance-free homes from which they can walk to stores, etc.
* People are marrying later and looking for smaller homes.
* The younger generation wants a more downtown, village-like environment.
* Demand is strong for residential and apartments, as well as retail uses, especially restaurants.
* It is difficult to do a target market strategy for commercial office space.

Connectivity is in demand, then longer term development. More walkable areas with sidewalks are required. If a neighborhood is designed well, it will be walkable. Connection between the Corporate Station and Legacy Place is encouraged. Enrolling in the Complete Streets program is encouraged; this provides communities with $400,000 in grant funding to implement it. The Urban Land Institute (ULI) study regarding connectivity between Route 1 and Rustcraft Road was discussed.

Recommendations

* Zoning changes, i.e., dimensional standards and considering design guidelines
* Encourage/require incentives for a variety of uses.

Considerations

* Development of underutilized parcels
* Ground floor retail and outside seating
* Work with owners to improve sense of connection in apartment buildings
* Sidewalks on Legacy Boulevard
* Mixed use
* Design elements
* Parking
* Townhouses or small single family dwellings, or a combination
* Maximize access to Wigwam Pond

Mr. Podolski said this is the most comprehensive study the Board has seen for what he considers the Wigwam area. The commercial area is pretty much built out and done. The study has a lot of ideas, but many are not feasible. The Rustcraft/Route 1 connection is unlikely to happen. When the buildings were built, the residential neighborhood was promised that there would never been a roadway going between Rustcraft Road and Route 1. The proposed connection would divert a lot of traffic coming south on Route 1 through and into their neighborhoods. With regard to corridor studies, the Town has studied this and spent a lot of money on this. Route 1 has already been built out, but the study would potentially change it. Mr. McCarthy said that there has been development along Route 1, but there are capacity issues. Traffic is getting diverted off Route 1 into neighborhoods for a variety of reasons, so this would be studied to attempt to keep it on Route 1. Walkability could be improved along Route 1; people do not feel safe at this time. The Complete Streets study would look at everything to see if improvements could be made to walkability, i.e., improving and adding crosswalks, signals, and lighting. Route 1 is a State highway, and MassDOT would have to be involved.

Mr. Podolski said that a Rustcraft Road sidewalk has been discussed for ten years, and the Town has refused to fund it. It finally went to the State and it took five more years to fund it. Unfortunately, the Conservation Commission shut the sidewalks down. This is a Town problem, and the Town is not ready to do these things. He liked the idea of people coming out of the train station and going across to Jefferson Station and the Legacy Place area. The crosswalk has just been redesigned, and they have added a kiss and ride area. There are two sets of railroad tracks, and he asked how they could put a bridge over them or how people on the Allied Drive side could get safely over the railroad tracks to the Rustcraft side. Mr. Kushcel said the tracks are at grade and people safely walk over them now. The crosswalk on the apartment building side by Legacy Place would be right at the edge of the property. If someone wanted to get to Legacy Place or the rain station, he/she would walk through the parking lot. Mr. Podolski said the landowners would need to allow the Town of Dedham on their land to put in a sidewalk. He said there is a concept that this could happen with a public-owned portion along Wigwam Pond; he asked if there is public property there. Mr. McCarthy said there is property, but it is on the north side, not the south side. Mr. Kushcel was asked if he would suggest development right up to the edge of Wigwam Pond. He said it would not be to the very edge; *his further comments could not be understood.* Mr. Podolski asked about opening it up just for public use rather than development. Mr. Kushcel said his study calls for preserving part of it for the public. At Stergis way, he suggested making the roads a grid. There is a lot of space, and it is a good place for development.

Mr. Podolski agreed that there should be a sidewalk on Legacy Boulevard. If they ever return to the Board, they will be required to do that. He asked how to get the landowners to come back to the Planning Board so this can be discussed. Mr. McCarthy suggested that a lot of this would happen when redevelopment occurs. The next step would be to lay this out schematically to see how it would work so that, when they come in, there is a better idea of how it would work. Mr. Kushcel said Legacy Place was at the first forum. Mr. McCarthy said they are not as interested, although they would be if it is complementary to them. As adjacent properties develop, walkability would increase.

Mr. Podolski said that this is the biggest problem with development of the T lot on Allied Drive. He went through the area the previous night at 5:30 p.m. to get to the Dedham Hilton for Annual Town Meeting, it took him ten minutes to get around the rotary. Housing would likely result in 100 or more vehicles going in and out of one road to multiple buildings, and he did not see how this would happen. Mr. Kushcel said that if housing went in there, the majority of people living in that type of environment would be seniors who do not drive, or people using the commuter rail. Mr. Steeves said the commuter rail parking lot has space for 500 vehicles, and there were 350 cars parked there today. He asked where cars would park if a building was put there. Mr. Kushcel said that part of the development would require structured parking (parking garage) to accommodate the number of cars. Mr. Podolski said this does not address the traffic issue.

Mr. Bethoney said Mr. Kushcel has done a good job without preconceived notions. However, presentations do not take the residents’ sentiments and/or the developments or plans that the Board has already considered for these locations. He was happy that people were not interviewed about their preferences. The average citizen has broad thoughts on what they want to see, but they do not understand site design, traffic, parking, or the Planning Board process. A lot of what was presented could not happen without significant landowner cooperation. The only time landowners are willing to cooperate is when they need something. Every approved project could have come out better in hindsight, but there are a lot of departments, engineers, traffic consultants with whom the Board has to consult. Every project is significantly improved by the time it is approved, but the Town does not get everything it wants.

Mr. Aldous said the study did not take into consideration what the landowners and people spending money to develop want. They want to do what makes them money; they do not care about the presentation. The ideas are good, but they mean nothing to developers. Talking to developers/landowners would have brought up ideas for the study. Mr. Bethoney asked how to get these people interested in doing this. Mr. Kushcel said that the reason they do this planning is so developers would build what the community wants. It should not just be what the developers want. Mr. Bethoney asked him if he felt that what he has put forth would be attractive enough to developers that they would succeed. Mr. Kushcel said there is a huge demand for this type of mixed use building that is walkable, particularly around a transit station.

Mr. O’Brien said that what Mr. Kushcel has seen has a reason because of past history, obstacles, developers looking for their own advantage, and owners. He acknowledged that it has not been perfect. There are limitations, i.e., Wigwam Pond has been blocked in and this has prevent people from accessing it. This has left the Town with a bit of a jewel. He said changes are necessary, but cautioned not to overdevelop the area and to consult with residents. He felt that more open, accessible, park-like land should be included.

Mr. Podolski said it was a wonderful presentation and gives the Board a lot to think about. The Town adopted the Complete Streets funding recently. The Board supports Wigwam Pond access. Mr. Podolski did not know that there was no walkability between the T station through the apartment buildings to Legacy Place. He thought there was a sidewalk going through there. He said this definitely needs to be pursued. The “sticky wicket” is how to handle the Corporate Station development. There is one roadway in and two lanes in and out. It will be extremely hard to put something more down there. With regard to Route 1, the Highway Business zoning district could be looked at; mixed use is allowed there. However, Mr. Kushcel is talking about something more to advance development on the highway. There is a new application before the Board now for a mixed use development, and he hopes that goes through. He asked Mr. Kushcel if there would be a final presentation, and was told that there will be a report given to the Board. He will be happy to speak to any member of the Board.

Jim Maher, Parks and Recreation Commission, reminded the Board about a letter from the commission given to them about a year ago in regard to mitigation with builders in the Town. He heard about the application noted above that would bring in new apartments to Town. The Parks and Recreation Commission is creating a master plan for recreation and open space. The top three items on their survey were walking trails, biking, and a rail trail, all of which tie into walkability. More apartments are being put in a part of town in which there are no recreational aspects. There is walkability for which the community is looking at Wigwam Pond. Mr. Podolski said the Board does not have the ability or authority to request builders to pay for a walking trail. The Parks and Rec’s survey results showed that the residents want recreational needs, not new fields or youth leagues. The Commission asked the Board to remember that when it is working with contractors and to be filters for developments coming to the Town. The Parks and Rec’s clients are looking for the trails, biking, and walkability. The Town Forest would be a trail that walkers could use, but there is no parking available. Mr. Bethoney said that the Planning Board does not have the authority to do this, and does not have the ability to link mitigation to any project unless it minimizes its impact. The only way to get mitigation is to creatively have the developer come up with its own ideas as a good will gesture so that the benefits outweigh the negative impacts on the Town. Mr. Maher, asking for the Board’s consideration, said that if the clientele wants more walkability, the Board should tell the developers.

Mr. Podolski asked if the MAPC could come up with some concepts, strategies, or ways to get owners of private land to want to cooperate with the Board on doing these ideas. Mr. Kushcel will do that. Mr. Podolski cautioned Mr. Kushcel that they have to be very cognizant of residential areas and the impact of traffic. Mr. McCarthy said that, with regard to the corridor study, it should be made a priority because it is a state highway. Otherwise, the state will not prioritize it. An example is the bus on Washington Street. People disembark to get to work at Legacy Place and need to cross Route 1. This is a significant safety issue. The state has not put in sidewalks and the intersection is not safe. People do this because they have no other choice. The corridor study would look at that and possibly get sidewalks to allow the bus to get to Providence Highway to drop off the passengers. The study would be more of an analysis of this section. Mr. Podolski agreed that this area needs protection.

Mr. Podolski thanked Mr. Kushcel for his presentation.

**East Dedham Design Guidelines**

**Present:** Josh Fiala, Senior Regional Planner, MAPC

John Haven, RLA ASLA, Chair, Design Review Advisory Board

Bryce Gibson, Vice Chair, Design Review Advisory Board

Christine Perec, Design Review Advisory Board

Steven Davey, Design Review Advisory Board

The guidelines will be district-based, providing a very specific link between previous visions and community-based planning efforts to direct conversation with developers to develop the community in such way please the community. It is a draft document intended to be given to any developer interested in East Dedham. It was prepared in conjunction with the working group including James E. O’Brien IV of the Planning Board, Paul Corey of Design Review Advisory Board, the East Dedham Revitalization Committee, the Mother Brook Community Group, Mother Brook Arts and Community Center, and residents. Steven Findlen of McMahon Associates, the Planning Board’s peer review consultant was also present.

The detailed guidelines were reviewed, including streets, signs, landscaping, and design of renovated and new buildings. It also included other town-wide design guidelines and definitions. It focused mainly on properties fronting on Bussey and High Streets, and looked at the nature of commercial and residential properties. The uses in that area are varied, and the guidelines look to address multiple types of properties. Zoning will not be modified in any way. The guidelines will effectively be adding design characteristics to the zoning district; they are not standards. They would be contingent on whether a developer would be willing to improve his projects with them. They tried to create them in such a way that they would be a good resource for the Planning Board and the Design Review Advisory Board in their reviews. It is hoped that both Boards will adopt them. It is hoped that the Town Manager and other boards will provide support for the document as it is finalized.

Mr. Podolski asked if Mr. Fiala was aware that there are large projects coming up in East Dedham, and if he had looked at the concept plans to see if they jibe with the guidelines. Mr. Fiala said he had, and that they are at a point to integrate. Mr. Podolski advised those applicants to look at the guidelines. Mr. O’Brien noted that the projects have changed because of the study, so it has already had an effect. Mr. Podolski said that it will take 30-45 days to review the draft, and then it will be put on the June 22, 2017, agenda for approval. Mr. Davey said the guidelines will be presented to Mother Brook Community Group on May 17, 2017, and he wanted everyone to review them before they are approved.

Mr. Bethoney said the guidelines were very well done, including the examples and details. He said it will be a great tool for developers to improve what they want to build and to garner support from the neighborhood. He asked what authority, or “teeth,” is built into the guidelines. He wondered what would happen if an applicant meets all regulations, but not the guidelines, and wondered what the Planning Board could do to enforce them. Mr. Fiala said the guidelines are not mandatory, but having them is stronger than not. They give the Planning Board and the Design Review Advisory Board the ability to question, but they are not enforceable, merely recommendations. As things proceed, some areas will become mandatory. Mr. Bethoney said this has been tried in the past, but Town Meeting has not been favorable.

Mr. Aldous said it is a terrific report. He asked if they had looked into the future, saying that East Dedham Square was rebuilt in the 1960’s. People at that time loved the Square, but now they want it re-done. He wondered if this will be what people want. Mr. Fiala said that people back then were all about using cars; now people are looking for walkability and fewer cars. Mr. O’Brien said that Delapa Plaza is the largest stakeholder. The owner has offered his vision of what he would like, which is a mixed-use building built upon the existing structure. He wondered if the guidelines would change his vision. Mr. Steeves thanked everyone for the effort. He was surprised that there were so many groups of people involved, as this is very rare. He hoped it would continue.

Mr. Gibson said the guidelines are very well put together. He asked if Mr. Fiala had any quantitative evidence that following them would allow for more foot traffic and bring in more money. Mr. Bethoney said that it is pretty well understood that nice things bring in more people and thus more money. He said that more quantification is necessary. Mr. Fiala said that a case study or two would work for that. Mr. Haven noted that this has been done in the past. The Design Review Advisory Board has a challenge reminding developers that the guidelines exist. He asked who would tell developers about them, and Mr. Podolski said the Planning Board would do that. He said that as the guidelines become necessary, they will be put into the Zoning Bylaw. Conflicts in the Zoning Bylaw in terms of what is required include setbacks. Mr. Podolski said the Planning Board will look into changing setbacks in Central Business in the Zoning Bylaw at the November Town Meeting. As far as the guidelines are concerned, an applicant is not required to follow them, and the Design Review Advisory Board is an advisory board only. Mr. Findlen asked if they become set in stone when they are approved on June 22, 2017, and Mr. Podolski said they will.

Mr. Podolski thanked Mr. Fiala for his presentation, and specifically thanked the Design Review Advisory Board for all the work it did in the design guidelines. The Planning Board knew how much time and effort DRAB put into this, and commended them for their hard work.

**Master Plan Implementation Committee Final Master Plan Update**

Jessica Porter attended in place of Chairman W. Shaw McDermott. The Master Plan update will be presented at Town Meeting. There have been no substantive changes since it was presented in April 2017. A summary of the action items will be available at Town Meeting, and a full update will be available at Town Hall. It will also be on the Town website.

Mr. Podolski said that nothing has been done about orphan property. He has a lot of clients who want to sell these parcels to their neighbors. A procedure is needed because most of these are in tax title; discussion with the Town Treasurer will be necessary.

He said that the update was a lot of work and the group did a great job. He agreed with doing a new Master Plan in 2020, rather than 2019, as it ties into the census. This would give it three years to obtain funding to prepare the new plan. Ms. Porter said that the Committee is already discussing some of the new best practices, similar to commensurate models like the MAPC does. They are also looking into different things that other towns are doing to get public input in creative ways.

Mr. Podolski said that posting at Town Hall is not enough in this day and age. The Board is toying with the idea of doing mailings to at least Town Meeting members on a quarterly basis to update what is going on in town. These could be included with property tax bills. Ms. Porter said she is taking a map of the town to the Farmer’s Market and school fairs to see if people will become more engaged. Mr. Podolski said a zoning map will be put up at Town Meeting.

Mr. Podolski expressed the Board’s gratitude and thanks for their endeavors.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | **Marybeth Reddish** |
| **Project Address:** | **25 Eled Way, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** | **SITE-01-17-2191** |
| **Zoning District:** | LMA, FPOD |
| **Representative(s):** | * Kevin F. Hampe, Esq., 411 Washington Street, Dedham, MA * Marybeth Reddish, Agent/Owner * Matthew Bombaci, P.E., Bohler Engineering, [352 Turnpike Rd, Southborough, MA 01772](https://www.bing.com/local?lid=YN873x9181976639943399235&id=YN873x9181976639943399235&q=Bohler+Engineering&name=Bohler+Engineering&cp=42.2881965637207%7e-71.5562896728516&ppois=42.2881965637207_-71.5562896728516_Bohler+Engineering&FORM=SNAPST) |
| **Town Consultant:** | Steven Findlen, McMahon Associates |

The Applicant returned for minor site plan review regarding using part of the property as a car leasing business, XChange Leasing, which is a subsidiary of Uber. XChange will be storing vehicles on the site to be leased by drivers from Uber. The operation plan was presented to the Planning Board at the last meeting. It was sent out for peer review with McMahon Associates, who had 20 “no” comments. These issues have all been resolved.

*NOTE: Mr. Bombaci was very difficult to understand due to the faintness of his voice, the speed with which he spoke, and his propensity for mumbling and trailing off when speaking. Every attempt was made to try to decipher his comments.*

Mr. Bombaci explained that issues including outdoor storage, circulation around the building, and one-way signage have all been resolved satisfactorily. They prepared an AutoTURN for the Fire Chief, who was satisfied. Comments from the Town Engineer, Jason Mammone, P.E., have been addressed, and an as-built will be prepared. At the last meeting, Mr. Steeves was concerned about snow storage. There is fencing along Mother Brook, which prohibits snow storage. Mr. Bombaci said this will be in an area to the left of the building and away from Mother Brook. Mr. Steeves’ concern about the location of the gas meters has been resolved. Mr. Aldous asked about the easement, which was raised by Mr. Mammone. Mr. Bombaci said it is the same owner, and they have historically let the Town use it. This will continue. Mr. Findlen said that the Applicant has been very responsive regarding safety and access. He said that the site has improved from when he first saw it. Mr. Podolski asked the Applicant if pavement or stormwater would be touched in any way. Mr. Bombaci said they would not.

Mr. Podolski said the Board will do a Certificate of Action. One of the neighbors was concerned about Uber drivers and the recent issues with them. He asked if there was something to the effect that there will be no short-term leasing out of the site. Mr. Hampe said that they have added the standard operation with a minimum lease being 30 days. This will be in the Certificate of Action. Mr. Podolski said this will prevent a lot of vehicles going in and out of the site on a daily basis. This would indicate to the Building Department that maybe they are leasing vehicles for a shorter term, and enforcement would be necessary.

Mr. Bethoney noted that, earlier in the meeting, the townspeople would like the Planning Board to put on the table and request mitigation for rail trails, walking areas, and paths. He asked if the Applicant would be interested in contributing toward such an endeavor through mitigation. He withdrew his request, which brought laughter to the room. Mr. Hampe commented on the idea of how the Planning Board is able to encourage mitigation. As Mr. Bethoney had indicated, it is more difficult when an applicant comes in with everything all set and not needing any waivers or help. When a developer knows he needs relief from the Board and wants things to progress quickly, sometimes he can be encouraged to look at the guidelines and maybe help out in those areas proposed by the Board. Mr. Bethoney said the Board has employed that strategy in the past. He just wanted to bring that to the Applicant’s attention.

Mr. Steeves moved to approve the revised minor site plan dated through May 4, 2017, as presented, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

Mr. Steeves moved to approve the following waivers as called out on the front page of the plan:

1. Waiver from the construction standards of using the existing pavement surface
2. Waiver from parking lot interior landscaped areas
3. Waiver from parking lot perimeter landscaped areas for a five-foot setback of landscaping perimeters
4. Waiver from the site plan to be on a scale of 1”= 40 feet.

Mr. Aldous seconded the motion. The vote to approve the waivers was unanimous at 5-0.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | **Chick-fil-A, Inc.** |
| **Project Address:** | **100-140 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** | **SITE-02-16-2067** |
| **Zoning District:** | Highway Business |
| **Representative(s):** | Anthony Donarto, Bohler Engineering, 352 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772 |
| **Town Consultant:** | Stephen Findlen, McMahon Associates |

Mr. Donato returned to discuss MassDOT and the changes requested off site; these were conditions of approval. There is a new development in the project as well. Chick-fil-A has negotiated a deal for an area leased by others at the south end of the site. They are proposing 25 additional parking spaces at this location, bringing them into compliance with parking, so the waiver is no longer necessary. They are proposing landscaping as well. The area will be less impervious after construction. They went to the Design Review Advisory Board last week, who approved the landscape plan. They received a letter from Lisa Eggleston, the Conservation Commission reviewer, and she has approved the stormwater plan. With regard to MassDOT, they requested a sidewalk link to the highway. This has been done by eliminating two spaces. They will install a landscape island and a shelter for pedestrians to cross. The two spaces were offset by the 25 that have been added. There will be minor changes with the crossing at the entrance. The existing curb cut in front of Ocean State Job Lot will be removed. Landscaping will be increased.

Mr. Findlen said there were some minor comments related to landscaping and pedestrian safety. He had asked that the striped area be more curved landscape paths, and they have done that. Crosswalk markings have been added across the driveway. All comments have been addressed.

Mr. Podolski said that the site is better than it had been, and wished Chick-fil-A the greatest success. He said that the Board welcomes nice businesses to Dedham, and this is a great asset to the community. Mr. Steeves moved to approve the minor site plan as presented, seconded by Mr. Aldous, and voted unanimously 5-0.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | **Marbridge, LLC** |
| **Project Address:** | **280 Bridge Street, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** | **SITE- 04-16-2083** |
| **Zoning District:** | General Residence |
| **Representative(s):** | Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting Services, LLC, P.O. Box 626, Lexington, MA 02420 |

Mr. Henderson said the dumpster was not originally near the building. The parking has been moved away from the face of the building to ensure that they are ADA-compliant for handicapped parking. That allowed the opportunity to shift a space from the back right corner of the parking lot to the front. There is a wheel stop in the back corner space, and it will be moved to the new location. It will not be striped to be delineated as a space because the edge of the pavement is off to the side. They will then move the dumpster to the back corner. Mr. Steeves moved to approve the site modification plan as proposed, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

**Annual Town Meeting:**

The Board was reminded that the Annual Town Meeting is Monday, May 17, 2017, at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Podolski said that the Mini Town Meeting went well. Two things came up for discussion:

1. Marijuana moratorium. He explained the Board’s position, and said he thought the Town itself should vote on whether it wants retail sale of marijuana in town. This may come up again at Town Meeting.
2. Lodging house. Building Commissioner Kenneth Cimeno was present and spoke on this to try to explain the concept. Mr. Podolski thought everyone agreed. It is difficult for people to understand that there is a bylaw that allows up to three rentals. This change will cover over three unrelated rentals. The Board does not want to stop people from renting, but it wants to be able to enforce it when it is not done properly.

The Board’s Town Meeting report went out on Tuesday, May 9, 2017, and a copy of the zoning map was attached at the request of Brad Bauer. There will be a zoning map on PowerPoint at Town Meeting. The Board discussed the marijuana issue at length.

**255 West Street:** Mr. Carlevale informed Mr. McCarthy that the footprint of Unit 1 is being changed. Mr. Steeves moved to approve the moving of the footprint of Unit 1 as proposed and as outlined on the planned residential development of Charlesbend, LLC, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

**Prior to the beginning discussion regarding the Certificate of Action for 125 Washington Street and the screening at 333 East Street, Mr. Bethoney made the statement that he is recusing himself from this matter. He explained that the agency at which he works has had a professional relationship with Supreme Development, LLC, and David Raftery in the past. He left the hearing room and the building at 9:20 p.m. and did not participate in any part of this discussion or consideration of the Certificate of Action.**

**Moylough, LLC, 333 East Street:** The Board had requested that the Applicant screen the utilities on the top of the building. Mr. McCarthy has reviewed this, and Mr. Steeves and Mr. O’Brien have seen the building. Mr. Podolski said that, as he went down Washington Street, he saw a panel of slats. Mr. McCarthy said it only goes around two sides. Mr. Steeves said it should be at least three sides. Mr. Podolski said it could go half-way down to make sure it is not seen. It must be painted beige. After discussion, Mr. Steeves moved to approve screening on three sides, seconded by Mr. Aldous, and voted unanimously, 4-0.[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Certificate of Action, 125 Washington Street:**  A footnote will be added to note why Mr. Bethoney recused himself. Mr. Steeves moved to approve the Certificate of Action, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.1

Mr. Steeves moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0. The meeting concluded at 9:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

/snw

1. As noted above, Mr. Bethoney had recused himself from this discussion and was not in the building. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)