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**TOWN OF DEDHAM**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**May 25, 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 7:00 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. Mr. Steeves was not present for this meeting.

**Prior to the beginning of the meeting, Mr. Podolski made the statement that Vice Chair John Bethoney is recusing himself from this Public Hearing. He explained that the agency at which Mr. Bethoney works has had a professional relationship with Giorgio Petruzziello in the past. Mr. Bethoney was not in the building and did not participate in any part of this meeting, consideration of the proposals or vote.**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:**  | **Supreme Development/Giorgio Petruzziello** |
| **Project Address:** | **42 Woodleigh Road, Dedham, MA – Scoping Session** |
| **Zoning District:** | Single Residence B  |
| **Representative(s):** | * Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA
* Giorgio Petruzziello, Supreme Development, 21 Eastbrook Road, Dedham, MA
* David Johnson, Norwood Engineering, 1410 Route 1, Norwood, MA 02062
* Michael McKay, AIA, 35 Bryant Street, Dedham, MA
 |
| **Town Consultant:** | Steven Findlen, McMahon Associates |

Mr. Steeves moved to open the Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.[[1]](#footnote-1) Mr. O’Brien moved to waive the reading of the public notice, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.1 Mr. McCarthy stated that the notice of Public Hearing was published in *The Dedham Times* on May 12, 2017, and May 19, 2017. Notices were sent to abutters within 300 feet of the property and all abutters on Woodleigh Road. Mr. Podolski noted that the Board only has four members on it due to Mr. Bethoney’s recusal.1 Input from the public was allowed and the protocol was explained. A moment of silence was observed to honor veterans who are defending the country overseas and those who have passed away. Mr. Podolski asked that God share His graces upon this country and the wonderful military that protects us. Mr. Podolski announced that the Internet is down, so there would be no televised portion of the presentation. Revised plans were made available to the audience.

The Applicant proposed a four-lot subdivision at 42 Woodleigh Road and filed a complete application package on May 5, 2017. Notice was given to the Town Clerk, and copies of the application were submitted to the Board of Health. Review was performed by Mr. McCarthy, McMahon Associates, Department of Infrastructure Engineering, and the Fire Department. Responses have been received from Engineering and the Fire Department. The project has been submitted to the Conservation Commission for storm water management, and will be seen by them on June 1, 2017. The roadway will be heard first, then as the houses are submitted, they will go before the Conservation Commission individually. The site contains approximately 100,000 square feet of land with 40 feet of frontage on Woodleigh Road in the Single Residence B zoning district. It is currently occupied by a fairly large single family dwelling. Based on the land area, it would support six or seven lots, but under the subdivision control regulations, they would need a 50 foot right of way or seek a waiver of that.

Mr. Petruzziello has met with the abutters to go over the project, and there was further discussion after the scoping session on March 23, 2017. A four-lot subdivision is proposed, and the Applicant would be requesting certain conditions to be placed on him, specifically that there is no further subdivision of the land beyond the four lots for purposes of creating any other building lots. The Applicant attempted to locate the buildings to preserve existing trees for a natural buffer around the site. They have discussed a resurfacing of Woodleigh Road from the new road out to Mount Vernon Street. They are attempting to preserve the character of the street by building a subdivision that would fit into the neighborhood. At the request of the neighbors, architect Michael McKay visited the other abutting properties to get an idea of the architectural styles. Proposed renderings of the dwellings have been submitted to the Planning Board and the abutters.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the existing conditions. There is a large home in the center, and substantially sized trees that will be retained as much as possible. A color rendering showing placement of the houses was shown. Extensive grading will be required for house placement. There is a substantial amount of existing vegetation around the site. The road is 250 feet long from the sideline of Woodleigh Road to the end of the proposed road. It was designed under the subdivision regulations for a lane, which allows less pavement, keeping the character of the neighborhood, and fewer storm water requirements. They have sited the subdivision in all cases to limit the amount of impervious surface and to protect the abutting landowners from maintaining the existing vegetation.

The plan indicates where they are disposing of the storm water run-off. There are no wetlands within or adjacent to the site. A treatment drain and storm water reduction program was explained in detail. All discharge will be into the center island, which is being constructed and landscaped as a vegetated rain garden. The main run-off goes into subsurface leeching chambers via a catch basin. This will contain all the run-off from homes in the subdivision. There will be no run-off onto Woodleigh Road. Eighteen inches of pavement is proposed. Utilities will be underground. The Fire Chief has reviewed the plans and has submitted an e-mail expressing his satisfaction with the diameter of the center island and the turning movements.

Waivers Requested:

1. Waiver for site plan scale of 1” = 20 feet instead of 1” = 40 feet.
2. Waiver for the submission of a landscape plan by a landscape architect. There will be a planting plan developed by people Mr. Petruzziello uses for his other projects.
3. Waiver for locus plan of 1” = 200 feet instead of 1” = 800 feet.
4. Waiver for the roadway to be 40 feet in width instead of 50 feet. This is for a small segment at the intersection. The requirement is 18 feet of pavement; the Fire Chief also requires that. Other than the 18 feet in the right of way, there is actually nothing else going in the right of way, i.e., no sidewalks since they are not required. The road is more adequate as a lane. It already has 40 feet of frontage.
5. Waiver for the center line to be four feet off. This allows the road to enter the site without moving an existing telephone pole and disrupting service to the neighborhood.
6. Waiver for the minimum cul-de-sac to be 191 feet instead of 250 feet. If the road was brought in further, they could reach 250 feet, but it would take down more trees, yield smaller lot size, and require more impervious pavement.
7. Waiver for a circular cul-de-sac instead of a hammerhead. This allows them to deal more appropriately with drainage.
8. Waiver from the requirement for signs and pavement markings.

McMahon Associates has reviewed the project, and on May 19, 2017, identified 11 issues. The Applicant responded today, and the only issue remaining is the name of the street. The Subdivision Rules and Regulations require that, until the Town formally approves the name of the street, it is to be written in pencil. Many of the comments from Engineering mirrored McMahon’s. Other comments will be better addressed by the Conservation Commission, including the landscaping. The landscaping plan typically submitted is because there is a sidewalk with a landscaped area on the side. It is not required. The significant plantings are in the cul-de-sac for storm water management, and will be reviewed by the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Zahka said that, based on the discussion with the Planning Board and many of the neighbors on March 23, 2017, as well as Mr. Petruzziello’s conversations with the neighbors at that meeting and correspondence with one of the neighbors, the Applicant agreed that, if approved, the condition of approval would be that there is no further subdivision of any of the lots for purposes of creating any additional building lots. The approval would be for a four-house subdivision, and it will remain in perpetuity as a four-lot subdivision. No widening is proposed regarding the resurfacing of Woodleigh Road from the subdivision road to Mount Vernon Street. They are trying to keep the area looking as much like it does today. If the Applicant has to run any utilities on Woodleigh Road, resurfacing will be done afterwards. The dwellings will be designed by Michael McKay, AIA, who proposes four completely different houses. He will keep the height down, and the attics will only be for utilities. Each home will be approximately 3,200 to 3,800 square feet, and will have clapboard siding.

Mr. Findlen, Senior Project Manager at McMahon Associates, is the peer review consultant retained by the Planning Board to do a minor site plan review; the Applicant pays for this. He does not work for the Applicant or the Town. His role is to look at the Subdivision Rules and Regulations and the requirements for the project, then report back to the Board with anything that is substandard. Mr. Findlen submitted a letter on May 19, 2017, which cited 11 issues. Five of the issues are on the waiver list.

1. Access to the subdivision required to have a general street permit for construction. The Applicant will obtain the permit.
2. Emergency access. The Fire Chief is satisfied with the proposed project.
3. Pedestrian access. No sidewalks will be provided.
4. Roadway design. They have provided the summary table showing all the design components.
5. Traffic signs and pavement markings. None has been proposed.
6. Roadway name. The subdivision will have its own street name.
7. Site plan scale of 1” = 20’; requirement is 1” = 40.'
8. Index sheet. This is not required as part of this project.
9. Locus plan. This typically needs to be 1” = 800’; they are providing 1” = 200’.
10. Aerial picture. This is not included.
11. Profile view. This is required to be 1” = 4”. *Mr. Findlen’s further comments could not be heard because he did not speak loud enough.*

Summary: Mr. Findlen sent a letter to the Applicant on May 23, 2017. The response resolved ten issues with only the street name being outstanding. If the Board is comfortable with that, it can be … *Mr. Findlen could not be heard because he did not speak loud enough.*

The road would remain a private way and, because of that, the Planning Board would want a homeowners association. This is also required by the Conservation Commission for upkeep and maintenance of the storm water management system. Mr. Podolski added that the homeowners association would also be responsible for maintaining the private way and any other amenities within the cul-de-sac. The Planning Board does not go deeply into storm water management or conservation issues, and has always deferred this to the Conservation Commission. Their comments, orders, and conditions will be added to the Planning Board Certificate of Action if the project is approved. Mr. Podolski asked about water spillage onto Woodleigh Road, and if the roadway was sloping down. Mr. Johnson said it goes 1.5% down to a low point where the catch basin is. He explained this in detail. He said there would be one catch basin plus a 75’ diameter rain garden. The diameter of the cul-de-sac is 120 feet. Mr. Steeves said that there should be no rocks in the rain garden. The contents of the rain garden, listed on the plans, are all plants that are made for rain gardens. Mr. Johnson said the species as recommended are in the State’s storm water regulations. There is a concrete berm on the inside so the asphalt does not break in. Mr. Johnson said that McMahon and Engineering have no issues with it, and they are seeing the Conservation Commission on June 1, 2017. Mr. Zahka said this is not a commercial rain garden; these have been an issue with trash and lack of care. The proposed plantings are being done for two reasons: 1) storm water management, and 2) the aesthetic aspect.

Mr. Podolski asked if the plan can be presented without waivers. Mr. Zahka said it could not; they need the right of way at the very edge. He said they could leave the length at 250 feet, and remove the telephone pole. The cul-de-sac size could be put in to the specifications and rules required by the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. Mr. Podolski explained that this is for the benefit of the neighborhood. The Board could have them put in a bigger cul-de-sac as required, or the Board can waive it and let them put in a smaller one. The latter would require less pavement and asphalt. Mr. Zahka clarified that the cul-de-sac is the size required by the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. They could also put in a square hammerhead. There will be no curb in on Woodleigh Road. Mr. Steeves cautioned the neighbors who were present, saying that if the road is pushed to 250 feet, it will be in their back yards. All utilities will be underground as stated previously. Mr. Podolski said the pillars can affect sight lines. Mr. O’Brien suggested a stone wall. Mr. Findlen said they did not check this because it is an existing condition. He said that an 18 foot roadway is sufficient.

Mr. Aldous asked about the width of the road. The pavement is 18 feet all the way. The right of way on either side is 40 feet, going up to 50 feet within the site. Mr. Aldous asked about cars turning in from Woodleigh Road. Mr. Zahka said there would be no problems because they would be using the 18 feet of pavement, and the right of way is sufficient as stated. The Fire Chief issued a letter saying that it is more than adequate for purposes of fire protection. A 50 foot right of way makes more sense in larger subdivisions. Mr. O’Brien was fine with the waivers, and said the homeowners association would take care of concerns he has regarding water infiltration in a 100-year storm. He also appreciated the designs. Mr. Podolski asked if there would be a construction management plan to keep the neighborhood informed. Mr. Petruzziello said he would notify them via e-mail. The equipment will access and egress site from Mount Vernon Street only, and there will be no exiting to Walnut Street. Mr. Steeves asked if there would be a hydrant. Mr. Petruzziello said there is only a six-inch main right now, but there is a hydrant at the bottom of the road near the entrance.

Frank Stapleton, 76 Morse Street, asked if Mr. Petruzziello anticipated moving any of the homes from where they are shown. Mr. Petruzziello said he did not anticipate this. Mr. Podolski said that both the Engineering Department and the Department of Public Works would be monitoring the site, as would Mr. McCarthy. The roadway will go in first. Mr. Petruzziello said it would be named Antonio Lane. *It is to be noted that Mr. McKay spoke, but could not be heard because he did not speak loud enough.*

Frank Sally, 35 Woodleigh Road, commented that there have been a number of potential developers. *Mr. Sally was very difficult to hear because he was so far from the microphone.* He said that this proposal is an example of how a developer can work with neighbors and come up with a suitable plan. He urged the Planning Board to get this going. Mr. Podolski said that Mr. Petruzziello is the best developer in town and he is true to his word. He told Mr. Sally that he should not expect any changes. The subdivision will receive fire protection, police protection, trash pick-up, and snow plowing. It will not receive pavement protection, management of the rain garden, or management of the underground storm water system.

Mr. Steeves moved to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. Aldous, voted unanimously 4-0.[[2]](#footnote-2) Mr. Steeves moved to approve the subdivision plan for 42 Woodleigh Road as presented and as revised on plans dated May 23, 2017, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0.2 Mr. Steeves moved to approve the waivers as presented, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote to approve the waivers was unanimous at 4-0.2 Mr. Podolski noted that these approvals are subject to a mutually agreed upon Certificate of Action and the adoption of the Conservation Commission’s approval.

The Board took a short recess.

**Prior to the beginning of the meeting, Mr. Podolski made the statement that Vice Chair John Bethoney is recusing himself from this Public Hearing. He explained that the agency at which Mr. Bethoney works has had a professional relationship with Giorgio Petruzziello in the past. Mr. Bethoney was not in the building and did not participate in any part of this meeting, consideration of the proposals or vote.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:**  | **Supreme Development** |
| **Project Address:** | **338-344 Washington Street/32 Harris Street, previously known as 350 Washington Street, Dedham, MA** |
| **Zoning District:** | Central Business  |
| **Representative(s):** | Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MAGiorgio Petruzziello, Supreme Development |

The applicant is seeking an amendment to the MNRP Special Permit to permit two restaurants, one with a floor area of approximately 2,750 square feet and 60 seats (Blue Ribbon Barbeque), and one with a floor area of approximately 3,220 square feet and 100 seats, including outdoor/patio seats (El Centro). There is a liquor license associated with that address, and it will be transferred to El Centro. Blue Ribbon Barbeque will not be service liquor. There are 74 on-site parking spaces under the building that are accessed from Harris Street/Washington Street, as well as parking in the Town municipal parking lot and the Norfolk County Registry of Deeds parking lot. This should make a significant difference with parking in Dedham Square during the day. It is to be noted that the Dedham Square management plan does not go into effect until September 2017.

Mr. Podolski asked if the Applicant though there was adequate parking for two restaurants. Mr. Zahka said there are always additional services that restaurants may want to provide for the convenience of their patrons, i.e., valet parking. This is being done on their own. There are also a lot of lots in the area that are nonproductive during the day. Mr. Steeves asked about the shared parking at the D’Attilio building across the street that existed many years ago when Mr. Zahka was on the Planning Board, and asked if that still existed. Mr. Zahka said that when they came in for this building (previously occupied by Kikuyama), they looked at this parking as well as that at 360 Washington Street, which only had eight parking spaces. In the past, Kikuyama would have needed over 200 parking spaces, and they had fewer spaces than the Applicant is providing on the site. He said there are some unoccupied, unused buildings during the evening hours, and business should get together to make arrangements.

Mr. Steeves moved to approve the amendment of the MNRP Special Permit approved on October 1, 2016, to permit two restaurants on 338-344 Washington Street/32 Harris Street, one with a floor area of approximately 2,750 square feet and 60 seats (Blue Ribbon Barbeque), and one with a floor area of approximately 3,220 square feet and 100 seats, including outdoor/patio seats (El Centro), seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0.[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Prior to the beginning of the meeting, Mr. Podolski made the statement that Vice Chair John Bethoney is recusing himself from this Public Hearing. He explained that the agency at which Mr. Bethoney works has had a professional relationship with Giorgio Petruzziello in the past. Mr. Bethoney was not in the building and did not participate in any part of this meeting, consideration of the proposals or vote.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:**  | **Supreme Development** |
| **Project Address:** | **360 Washington Street, Dedham, MA** |
| **Zoning District:** | Central Business  |
| **Representative(s):** | * Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA
* Giorgio Petruzziello, Supreme Development
* David Johnson, Norwood Engineering, 1410 Route 1, Norwood, MA 02062
 |

The Public Hearing for this mixed-use building was closed on May 18, 2017. This meeting was a follow-up to resolve McMahon’s issues, and their attempt to seek a letter from the Norfolk County regarding parking. Mr. Zahka now has a letter from the County indicating that they have voted to allow parking in the lot at the Registry of Deeds. There will be 50-75 spaces available. He said that this is the first major step in managing parking in Dedham Square.

McMahon had four comments remaining, of which three have been addressed. Parking space 13 has been re-numbered to space 19. An AutoTURN of how that space would be entered has been provided by Bayside Engineering. As stated previously, Mr. Zahka said this space has been looked at as a long-term parking space and/or if there is service that needs to be done in the building. He now has a letter from the Fire Chief regarding his satisfaction with the plan. The biggest issue was making the project safe, and the issue of sight distance was raised. There is only one curb entrance for 360 Washington Street; this also serves as a right of way to the property behind the building. The fire hydrant has been relocated in front of 360 Washington Street. There are now three parking spaces in front of the building, and these will be maintained. The sight line is now 84 feet to the left and 187 feet to the right.

The last issue is about deliveries. They have no idea who the tenants will be, so they have no idea about deliveries. Vans and small vehicles can get under the building for deliveries. If there is on-street parking, they can park and wheel the delivery to the building. A larger truck cannot get under the building, so they would have to park in the street in a manner similar to the Community Theater. There would be no parking between 5 a.m. and 6 a.m. because it would be a loading zone during those times. Mr. Zahka suggested that this be a condition of approval, and that they return once the tenants are identified. If there will be larger vehicles, they would be required to make an application to the appropriate body, i.e., Department of Public Works or Board of Selectmen, to identify the delivery times and label the three parking spaces in front of the building as a loading zone.

A draft Certificate of Action has been circulated to the Board. Exhibit B needs to be updated, and an Operations and Maintenance plan needs to be approved by the Conservation Commission. They will add into the Certificate of Action a report containing the names of the tenants, uses, and size of delivery trucks. In the event that larger trucks are required, they can utilize an on-site or single parking space. They will submit a proposed delivery schedule, and make the application as mentioned. Mr. Zahka said there is a delivery barrier beside the building, and pointed this out on the screen. Mr. Findlen said the question is whether this would be sufficient for the loading needs in the future. *He was very difficult to hear because he spoke so softly and was not near the microphones.* Mr. Zahka said that once the tenants are identified, they will return to the Board.

Mr. Findlen said there were four outstanding issues, and three have been addressed. The fourth issue was sight distance. They are required to have 200 feet, but sight distance was substandard. This was not an issue with 350 Washington Street because they had a straight shot. In this case, they are looking at immediate site access coming from Dedham Square, and vehicles cannot pull up further. Eliminating the first space is good, but there is still an issue. He said the Board should consider putting a sign out there saying “Driveway Ahead” or something that will help people exiting to see left and right sufficiently. Mr. Petruzziello said there is no pole there right now. Mr. Findlen said that they are balancing requirements vs. common sense. Mr. Steeves suggested “Right Turn Only,” but Mr. Findlen said there would still be issues. This was discussed at length. Mr. Zahka said this is not the way to measure sight lines. He showed on the screen where they measure it. Mr. Podolski said it is basically impossible to get the 200 foot line of sight out of the exit. During rush hour, no one is going fast, so a car would be lucky to get out of the site. He acknowledged that with a green light, they can come through pretty fast. This was discussed at the Dedham Square Steering Committee, and they are going to try to work on ways to slow traffic down as it comes to the green light. There is far too much speed coming from the Fire Station to the lights in the Square if it is green. Mr. Findlen said there is correspondence back and forth that shows sight distance to be substandard, so he cautioned the Board about this. Mr. O’Brien said this is a pre-existing situation anyway. *Mr. Findlen’s comment could not be heard because he spoke extremely softly and was not near the microphones.* Mr. O’Brien asked about the bus as well, saying it is a standard condition. *Again, Mr. Findlen’s comment could not be heard.* Mr. Findlen said that, given the location and the drivers, the only way they will get 200 feet is *unintelligible*. Mr. Findlen, Mr. Zahka, and the Board discussed this at length. *Mr. Findlen’s comments could not be understood.* Mr. Podolski asked if a waiver would be needed, *but he trailed off and his question could not be heard.* *Mr. McCarthy spoke, but again, could not be heard.*

Mr. Steeves moved to approve the application for a Special Permit for a mixed use building at 360 Washington Street, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0.[[4]](#footnote-4) Mr. Zahka asked for a vote to measure the building height from Washington Street only. Mr. Steeves moved to approve this, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote to approve the building height to be measured from Washington Street was unanimous at 4-0.[[5]](#footnote-5) Mr. Podolski noted that these approvals are subject to a mutually agreed upon Certificate of Action. Mr. Zahka said that the decision needs to be signed by four members because it is a Special Permit. The Board is not meeting again until June 15, 2017. He said there does not need to be a meeting to iron the decision, and asked that it be reviewed by the Board so it can be finalized and signed. There is a 20 day appeal period, and once that is over, he can apply for the liquor license transfer. Mr. Podolski said it would be ready next week.

**Prior to the beginning of the meeting, Mr. Podolski made the statement that Vice Chair John Bethoney is recusing himself from this Public Hearing. He explained that the agency at which Mr. Bethoney works has had a professional relationship with Giorgio Petruzziello in the past. Mr. Bethoney was not in the building and did not participate in any part of this meeting, consideration of the proposals or vote.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:**  | **Supreme Development/Giorgio Petruzziello** |
| **Project Address:** | **Liana Estates, Dedham, MA** |
| **Zoning District:** | Single Residence B  |
| **Representative(s):** | Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA |

Mr. Zahka is seeking release of the covenant for Lots 3 and 4 of Liana Estates. There are two left, and they are still being held. This request is because it is intended for Liana Lane to be taken as a public way. Mr. Steeves moved to release the covenant for Lot 3, known as 22 Liana Lane, and Lot 4, known as 30 Liana Lane. Mr. Aldous seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.5 The covenant was signed by the Board.

Mr. Bethoney arrived in the building and joined the Board for the rest of the meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:**  | **Michael Argiris, Dedham 865 and 875 Realty Ventures Nominee Trust** |
| **Project Address:** | **865-875 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA** |
| **Zoning District:** | Highway Business  |
| **Representative(s):** | Justin Ferris, Charles River Realty |

The Applicant wants to extend the vinyl fence to be six feet high. Mr. Ferris said the best way to do this would be to extend the fence about 40 feet to be even with the building. There would still be an open landscaped area, but they will plant a bush that would not be comfortable to walk through, maybe roses with thorns. Currently, there is an eight foot fence where it ends, and he asked if the Board had a recommendation on how to tier it. Mr. Podolski agreed that it should be extended, but preferred it to be shorter, not six feet high. He suggested that it be sloped down to maybe four feet to meet the fence, but not so someone can jump it.

Mr. Podolski asked how things are going. Mr. Ferris said landscaping has been completed. Starbucks had an issue at the beginning because they put a white film on the window. They are trying to address this with the Zoning Board of Appeals and signage.

Mr. Bethoney moved to deem the request an insubstantial modification to the existing site plan, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Mr. Steeves moved to approve the installation of the vinyl fence for approximately 40 feet. Mr. O’Brien seconded the motion. The vote to approve was unanimous at 5-0.

**Old/New Business**

**Rustcraft Road Solar, 100-280 Rustcraft Road:** The landscaping is done, but Mr. Steeves said they are not enclosed in the back. He wanted something there to the view is better. The Applicant wants the surety reduction to $7,500. Mr. Steeves moved that, upon proper screening as determined by the Town Manager of the rear of the solar units, the $7,500 cash be returned to the Applicant. Mr. Aldous seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

**Panera Bread:** Not ready

**Maribeth Reddish, 25 Eled Way:** Mr. Podolski is working on the Certificate of Action, and it is not quite ready.

**Complete Streets Policy:** Mr. McCarthy said that the Complete Streets Policy has been adopted by the Town. Mr. Aldous attended a community event last Monday that discussed walkability in the community as a whole and how the community can be made more walkable. This is a country-wide endeavor. The State has a policy for Complete Streets in connection with roadway projects, and have developed a program for which communities can apply for funding for sidewalk improvements. The Department of Public Works met with the Board of Selectmen in March. They adopted the policy, and it was approved by MassDOT at the end of April. The four elements are pedestrian travel, bicycle travel, vehicular travel, and mass transit travel. There is an attempt to bring some equity among them. The event on Monday night discussed evaluation of projects and making improvements for walkability. This would include better signage and curb cut installation. As projects come up, the Planning Board would evaluate them and how they can make it more walkable to encourage less driving. Mr. Findlen is also involved in this. An inventory of incomplete sidewalks is in process. Mr. Podolski was in favor of adopting this, but wondered why the Town does not just do it. Mr. Bethoney asked if adopting it obligates applicants to do this as part of a project. Mr. McCarthy said it did. Mr. Findlen explained the State’s role in this. *He was very difficult to understand because he spoke so softly.* There was extensive discussion.

Mr. Aldous moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. O’Brien, voted unanimously 5-0. The meeting ended at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

1. As noted, Vice Chair John Bethoney recused himself from this Public Hearing, and was not present in the building for any discussion, consideration, or vote. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As noted, Vice Chair John Bethoney recused himself from this Public Hearing, and was not present in the building for any discussion, consideration, or vote.

2 As noted, Vice Chair John Bethoney recused himself from this Public Hearing, and was not present in the building for any discussion, consideration, or vote. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. As noted, Vice Chair John Bethoney recused himself from this Public Hearing, and was not present in the building for any discussion, consideration, or vote. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. As noted, Vice Chair John Bethoney recused himself from this Public Hearing, and was not present in the building for any discussion, consideration, or vote. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. As noted, Vice Chair John Bethoney recused himself from this Public Hearing, and was not present in the building for any discussion, consideration, or vote. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)