

Planning Board

John R. Bethoney, Chair
Ralph I. Steeves, Vice Chair
Robert D. Aldous, Clerk
James E. O'Brien IV
Michael A. Podolski, Esq.

TOWN OF DEDHAM
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS



Dedham Town Hall
26 Bryant Street
Dedham, MA 02026-4458
Phone 781-751-9242

Administrative Assistant
Susan Webster
swebster@dedham-ma.gov

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

Thursday, March 22, 2018, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room

Present: John R. Bethoney, Chair
Robert D. Aldous, Clerk
James E. O'Brien IV
Michael A. Podolski, Esq.

Mark Bobrowski, Consultant to Planning Board

Not Present: Ralph Steeves

Staff: Susan Webster, Administrative Assistant

Call to order 7:09 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.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING ARTICLES
MAY 21, 2018, TOWN MEETING

ARTICLE 20

Mr. Aldous moved to open the Public Hearing on Article 20, seconded by Mr. Podolski. The vote to open the Planning Board was unanimous at 4-0. Mr. Aldous moved to waive the reading of the public notice, seconded by Mr. Podolski. The vote to waive the reading was unanimous at 4-0. Public Hearing notice for the proposed zoning articles for the spring Town Meeting was posted in Town Hall on March 2, 2018, and advertised in the *Dedham Times* on March 2, 2018, and March 9, 2018. Abutting towns (Needham, Westwood, Canton, and Milton), City of Boston, Department of Housing and Community Development, Metropolitan Area Planning Council, and Boston Planning & Development Agency were notified on March 6, 2018, via certified mail, return receipt. Therefore, all required entities were notified per the statutory requirement.

Mr. Bethoney announced that the Planning Board has requested Mark Bobrowski, Esq., 9 Damonmill Square, Suite 4A-4, Concord, MA 01742-2858, a leading Massachusetts Land Use and Zoning attorney and author, to review the Zoning Bylaw and the proposed articles. He has prepared a report, which will become public record this evening, on his comments, opinions, and recommendations.

Present:

- Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA 02026
- Dan Lee, Senior Director, Development, Greystar, 374 Congress Street, Suite 202, Boston, MA 02210
- Steve Mack, Greystar, 374 Congress Street, Suite 202, Boston, MA 02210
- Edward L. Pesce, P.E., LEED® AP, Pesce Engineering & Associates, Inc., 451 Raymond Road, Plymouth, MA 02360
- Christian Regnier, Esq., Goulston & Storrs, 400 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA 02110

Mr. Bethoney read Article 20 for the record. Mr. Zahka submitted Article 20, on behalf of Greystar, which would amend the Zoning Bylaw to allow a development for Age Restricted Housing Developments. If it is adopted by Town Meeting, there will be an application submitted for such a development at 122-124 Quabish Road, which is a sand and gravel operation owned by Joseph Federico. Adoption of this article does not approve any project, and it is not allowed as a matter of right. It allows submission of applications in the future to the Planning Board for review.

This amendment would create a new use category called Age Restricted Housing Developments, to the extent allowed by law. It would be restricted to 55+ individuals, with the exception of those bringing a spouse or significant other who is under that age. A minimum of 10% of the units would be affordable, but this is not a 40B project. They would be local action units, a state housing initiative administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) to encourage communities to produce affordable housing for low and moderate income households. To Mr. Zahka's knowledge, this is the first time that there would actually be a Dedham Zoning Bylaw that mandates that there be some portion of a housing development committed to affordability. To the extent allowable by law, the affordable units would have a Dedham preference. In terms of the 10% or the affordability, and in terms of the Dedham preference, it requires the cooperation of between the developer and the Town. The Town would submit the appropriate documentation in cooperation with the developer to show that there is a need for such preference, and this would need to be approved by the State. With regard to the affordability component, the Dedham preference component, and the age restriction component, this would be, per the bylaw, in perpetuity.

The bylaw provides that this new use would only be allowed in the RDO zoning district, only be allowed on a minimum lot or lots, if combined, that have five acres of land or more. To differentiate between a Mixed Use Development, it specifically says that there is no commercial component except for accessory uses that go along with this type of development. Given the population they seek to serve, convenience is required, so the bylaw provides that it has to be within 500 feet of a major shopping center as defined in the bylaw. It is only allowed by Special Permit from the Planning Board. As the article has been drafted, they have provided that this would be treated as a major nonresidential project (MNP), which is the highest, most vigorous site plan review process that is allowed under the Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Zahka also hopes that it will be treated as a PC development to give the Planning Board the flexibility to "massage" the project as it things necessary.

There is clearly a defined need for Age Restricted Housing Developments. The Town of Dedham Master Plan and the Planning Board's study undertaken by Dr. Barry Bluestone of Northeastern University clearly highlights the aging population in Dedham. In that study, it was projected that, by the year 2030, 41% of Dedham's population would be 55 or older. Both studies highlight the significant gap in housing opportunities for this population. Simply put, unless some of these options are provided, long-time residents would not be able to remain in Dedham and would have to move to a place that could accommodate this type of living arrangement. The Master Plan identifies a goal for expansion of housing options for Dedham's aging population. The Planning Board has made some inroads into that with the mixed use development bylaw. Most recently, someone used a long-time bylaw for the first time for a Planned Residential development that offered alternate options for housing. However, there is still a major gap. Mr. Zahka is the attorney for several developers who have mixed use apartments, and he gets phone calls from Dedham residents looking for apartments. Many have relocated and stayed within Dedham in these mixed use developments. However, there are many who do not want to be above commercial entities.

Mr. Zahka said this only gets them to the table. The bylaw is not a panacea for everything Dedham needs, but he believes it is a great start. If the project moves forward, he hopes that the Board would take the opportunity to examine the possibility of expanding where this type of use could go. It will, however, not address all the needs of every economic level of Dedham residents. In order to get the different levels of housing options available, it would take someone like Greystar to come and make a proposal such as this in which at least a component of this would serve those who would be eligible for the affordable units, as well as the various levels of availability in terms of the rental structure.

Mr. Zahka, prior to coming before the Board, met with two Planning Board members and Economic Development Director John Sisson to discuss the bylaw. At that time, it was strongly suggested that they visit the article with various other town agencies and boards. To date, they have met with the Master Plan Implementation Committee, Council on Aging, Dedham Housing Authority, and members of Livable Dedham, and these meetings have been extremely positive. Each entity had questions and concerns, and each has its own specific agenda. Each board requested more affordable housing in this proposal. The bylaw as written it is a minimum of 10%. They assume that when they come before the Planning Board with a proposal, this will clearly be a question that comes up at the Planning Board level, and that it will be negotiated with the applicant. He said clearly that there is nothing that is off the table. What the applicant can grant is something that would need to be economically feasible from the applicant's perspective. For example, the Dedham Housing Authority (DHA), did not ask for an increase in the 10%, even though they would like to see that. Instead, they asked that the applicant look internally to that 10%; typically it is based on 80% of median income. The DHA had suggested that maybe a couple of 10% units could be, instead of 80% of median income, 50% to open it up to more of a base. At this point, they are still in the preliminary stage, and this will be discussed if the bylaw goes through and it comes before the Planning Board.

Mr. Zahka said that the bylaw is extremely positive, and offers different housing choices and price ranges. It will not address everyone's concern, nor could it. He explained how it is done. A developer comes in with a project that offers the town, in addition to what the developer is looking for, something that specifically addresses the town's need. He believes this does that

at a number of levels in terms of looking at it from an economic standpoint. Again, he said that nothing is off the table, but they first need to get to the table. There would be additional benefits to the project. From a land use perspective, it is a much better use of land than the current sand and gravel operating. It would eliminate noise and trucks. Mr. Zahka has had discussion with people who live off Central Avenue in the Wildwood Road and Oscar's Way area. They are a considerable distance away, at least 300 feet, and can hear the operation of the sand and gravel business. The distance between the proposed buildings to the closest single family dwelling in that neighborhood would be well over 900 feet. A letter was submitted from a resident, Antonio Petruzzello, in support of the development. The project would be essentially noiseless given the distance and the fact that parking is inside the building. It would also act as an additional buffer from any noise at Legacy Place. It would also be an opportunity to examine Legacy Boulevard and the traffic that currently exists. The applicant would need to submit a complete traffic report during the review process that will need Planning Board and peer review to see how the traffic can be handled. They have already commissioned, in draft form, a traffic consultant. Mr. Zahka said that an Age Restricted Housing Development would generate the least amount of traffic than any other use of the site. The next appropriate use of the site would be for some kind of commercial activity or retail center of about 75,000 square feet on an eight acre site, and this would generate about 4,000 trips per day. This type of age restricted housing is nowhere near that, and is in fact considerably less, anywhere from 30 to 50% less traffic generator than the same number of housing units that are not age restricted.

Dan Lee then gave the background of Greystar. There is a glaring need for 55+ housing. The concept for this project would be for generally healthy, active adults in an age-restricted community. There would be an activity director, concierge, 10,000 square foot clubhouse with a gym, yoga studio, and a demonstration kitchen. The residents cook their own meals and drive their own cars. There would be no skilled nursing or rehabilitation therapists. Residents would pay only for what they need. They are seeking approval for the zoning amendment, not the project itself, but should it be adopted, they look forward to returning to the Board with their proposal. They anticipate 200-225 units, and renderings were shown. The parking garage would be the farthest away from Legacy Boulevard. Mr. Bethoney asked if it was a luxury community, and Mr. Lee said it was. He showed the site plan and renderings of the proposed building. Access is off Quabish Road, and there would be a four-story parking garage. Staffing for the facility would be in line with traditional apartment communities, four to eight employees at a time. The majority of parking spaces would be for residents. There would be 1.35 parking spaces per resident for a total of 270.

Mr. O'Brien asked if there were any other facilities in Massachusetts. Mr. Lee said there is a facility being built in Barnstable. There is one in Virginia Beach, Virginia, and another in Fairfax County, Virginia. There are 35 facilities under construction or predevelopment. They will be relatively similar in terms of the quality of finishes, and there will be a lot of green space with a walking path that will be open to the public. They would only be using five acres of the eight available acres for the footprint of the building.

Mr. Zahka explained that, on the affordable component, there are one bedroom, one bedroom with den, or two bedroom units, so it is basically the same distribution among the affordable and regular units. They are scattered throughout the building. Other than someone's lease, there is no differentiation in the units. Mr. Bethoney asked if Dedham residents would be set aside for the affordable units, or if they would be open to anyone who applied and qualified,

regardless of where they live. He wondered if Dedham residents would have to compete for the affordable units. Mr. Zahka said the proposed bylaw has proposed Dedham preference. Dedham preference in a bylaw, however, does not carry the day. It requires everyone to make an application, regardless of whether they are a town resident, which demonstrates a need for the affordability component. Part of the application process would have the units declared as affordable units. The state would make a determination if Dedham has that need. If that determination is made, Mr. Zahka understands that up to 70% of the affordable units can have the Dedham preference.

The Planning Board had consulted Mr. Bobrowski for his input on the article. He said that typically the owner would do something in the admission lease with a tenant selection plan that is incorporated into Dedham preference. This has already been done. The list of ongoing affordable apartments must be kept ongoing. Mr. Bethoney said it is legally impossible to designate the affordable units to Dedham residents who qualify. Mr. Bobrowski agreed. Up to 70% can be so designated, but it would be subject to approval by DHCD in order to count those units subsidized housing. There has to be a constant give-and-talk with DHCD on how the tenant selection is structured. Mr. Bethoney said this is doing amount the landlord or management company, the town, and the state. Mr. O'Brien asked if affordable housing stock is tied into the ratio. Mr. Bobrowski said this would be project by project. The affordables count toward the affordable housing stock of the town if they meet the Local Action Unit criteria. Mr. O'Brien asked if any had been challenged. Mr. Bobrowski said that age restricted housing in the context of federal and state anti-discrimination laws. The one triggered in this instance is family makeup. You cannot discriminate based on family makeup under Federal and State law. Age Restricted Housing Development has an exception to the antidiscrimination provisions because they describe household makeup by design. The Federal law says that, as a minimum 80% of the units have to be occupied by one person who is 55 or older. There are other possibilities. You can have a model in which 100% of the units are occupied by 100% of people 55 and over.

Mr. Bethoney

AT THIS POINT THE RECORDING WAS NO LONGER AVAILABLE, AND THERE IS NO DEDHAM TV VIDEO. THE REMAINDER OF THE MINUTES ARE FROM SUSAN WEBSTER'S PERSONAL NOTES.

John	Legally impossible to designate affordable units to Dedham residents.
Mark B.	LISTEN.
Jay	Is affordable stock tied into ratio?
Mark B.	No. LISTEN.
Jay	Has any of this been challenged – age restriction?
Mark B.	LISTEN.
John	Age – what about bringing in children?
Mark B.	7.8.2 – I would ask for answer.
John	To Lee – grandchild living with them.
Lee	Intent is not to have children or grandchildren.
Mark B.	Spouse can be younger.
Jay	Mairead – what about her if I wanted to move in there.

Mark B.	Lee says no.
Lee	We engage 3 rd party to facilitate lottery, administrative aspects. They only do this, no other work.
John	Has Greystar built in Dedham before?
Lee	No.
Mike	Other projects – provision that it has to be within 500 ft of major shopping center?
Lee	No.
Mike	Why would we want this in bylaw? There might be another site not close to shopping center. Amend bylaw?
Mark B.	Or variance.
Peter	We felt that it is a convenience. Also, self-limited. Town may eliminate shopping center aspect in future allow in other zoning district. Expect that town will like project and open it up by amending bylaw.
Mike	Other developments within 500 feet?
Lee	Both VA are, Barnstable not.
Mike	Comment – why would this be PC development?
Peter	MNP is type of review process – most rigorous. Don't know why it's on zoning use chart. Same with PC development. LISTEN. I compared it to mixed use – 90% residential, 10% commercial. As long as bylaw says how it will be reviewed, it won't be an issue.
Mike	Requirements – lot frontage, etc. – concerned about height of bldgs. in town. What is anticipated height? Needs to be discussed. Lower height in town.
Pesci, Pesci Eng.	looking it up – possibly 50 ft range. Four stories. Parking incorporated in bldg.
Peter	Bylaw says no higher than 50 ft.
Mike	Side and rear setbacks – should they be further? 25 ft in SRA district. This says 20 ft.
Peter	LISTEN. Side yard 30 ft. Front door on Quabish. Rear yard greatest distance.
Pesci	Height 48 feet, but not finalized. Setbacks restricted by wetlands. More than 20 feet off Quabish – 25 or so. Bump out at garage is a little more than 20. Can't see it th Goes down to Wigwam Brook – there is town-owned land.
Mike	If approved, we will want town people have access to Wigwam. Concerned that it is tied into shopping center, but this will be discussed, concerned about height and setbacks. Concept is great, time has come.
Bob	Setbacks – don't like 15 feet – want more. It's to stop fires from jumping to other bldgs. Want minimum of 20, prefer 25 ft. Front and rear don't bother me. 500 ft from stores – can Planning Board grant waiver?
Peter	Property is under agreement. With PC development, more discretion on dimensional requirement. Self-limited for town to see how it works out.

Mark B.	Report PC Development – SP. Could put Planning Board SP. Would regular LISTEN. Age restriction – highlighted area. This could be condo project as well. Cannot discriminate between ownership. Can convert to condos if desired. PC Development – LISTEN. Understand now. Just shooting for MNP. There are a lot of similarities between Burlington and Dedham. Need redevelopment in some places. Burlington has one-of-a-kind districts. If public purpose behind single district, good.
John	This bylaw is for this site.
Mark B.	No problem with that. Think about that.
Jay	Concern – can't lock everything up, but fear that it will change into something different.
John	Luxury has to do with price.
Jay	Age issue – eventually luxury apts degraded into affordable for its age. How do you keep something the same?
Mark B.	Tough call – Life expectancy before complete renovation? Valuable piece of property, won't let it degrade.
Mike	Make it clear – putting this bylaw in place for that location – what is parcel currently zoned for? Retail and/or commercial
Peter	RDO district. Because site has 8 acres, qualifies for overriding it. Assume that next highest use is retail.
John	Public comment
Diane Barry Preston	Showed brochures. Livable Dedham. Not taking position, but discussed need. Concern is affordability. Need to serve diverse range of economics. LISTEN. Would like higher numbers. Great concept.
Marie Louise Kehoe	848 High Street. Dedham's priority affordable for low income. Hope that one day we will see area dedicated to just that. People being forced to give up houses due to taxes, but they don't want to leave Dedham. What do we do about it?
John	Are we asking private developer to do something about this?
MLK	Need partnership. I recognize the need.
John	LISTEN. What do you think is reasonable?
MLK	This is first step. I have an idea, but will reserve until first step is mastered.
Sisson	Greystar engineer worked with Conservation. Site plan responded to MAPC study and Urban Land study. Town will work to find out implications.
John	RDO district, 5+ acres, 500 ft from shopping, MNP permit, considered PC development, fits Master Plan objectives and Bluestone report, recognizes aging population.
Mike	Taking what could be retail parcel and changing its use to this is a win for the town. Will help mitigate tremendous

	amts of traffic from potential retail. Great for residents who live there, for town, and hopefully working with developer if bylaw passes, tackle affordability for residents.
Bob	Wish people would not mention Mr. Bluestone.
John	Explain what SP means.
Mark B	SP is discretionary – applicant has burden of proof to show board, board has criteria that must be fit. Board assesses, makes judgement on detrimental or not. LISTEN.
John	Does applicant have to build under SP? Benefits outweigh problems.
Mark B	No.
John	No requirement to approve. Allowing applicant opportunity to propose and convince only.
Peter	If Mark B. submitted language – leave it open so it can be worked out.
Mark B.	Need to clean up age restriction, language.
John	Will deliberate on articles on Monday.
John	Continue to 3/26
Mike/Bob/unan.	
Article 21	LISTEN
Motion to open	LISTEN
Publication in DT Certified mailings	LISTEN
Peter	Ethan Solomon, AICP, Wilder Companies
Peter	Rezone portion of land by mall from GR to HB. Most of mall is located in HB. 80 ft strip of land is in GR abutting Rte 1.
Board – no questions	
Mark B.	Report – no comments.
Audience	No comments.
Peter	Commendation for me. Tremendous effort dealing with all boards. Also commended Sisson. Keeps wheels going. Appreciate it.
John	Totally agree.
Motion to close	Bob/Mike/unan.
Article 22	7.4 Mixed Use, 10.0 definitions
Sisson	
Motion to open	Mike/Bob/unan.
Motion to waive reading	Mike/Bob/unan.
Mike DT ads, etc.	
Sisson	Wanted to have more research available, passed out preliminary info. Tried to get draft list together – 26 parcels, 11 in RDO. Preliminary. LISTEN. Worked with MAPC. LISTEN.

	Interesting idea. Need planner to discuss. LISTEN. Open to discussion.
Mark B.	technical point – amendment introduces itself. Looked at my version -
John	will it disqualify article if not italicized and bold?
Mark B.	That’s moderator’s call.
Sisson	Town counsel does not like way we do it. I submitted bold, not italicized.
Mark B.	In striking out requirement for 1 st floor nonresidential – many towns insist 1 st floor nonresidential. End result will not be that multifamily bldgs. will be joined by commercial, but commercial bldgs. will be joined by multifamily bldgs. Nothing illegal, but it needs work.
john	when was Planning Board alerted or provided article for consideration – maybe a week ago?
sisson	Just before TM requirements submitted – cannot remember. Rich McCarthy discussed with me.
John	board has heard no discussion.
Mark B.	Repercussions are so large that you need significant answers before recommending.
Jay	Changes whole theme of what town looks like. Cities like this have store downstairs, apartments upstairs. Turns town into city look.
Bob	Don’t like it.
Mike	Premature for this TM, but need to consider. Withdraw or IP it to get more definition, impact on multiple parcels. Huge policy jump.
Mark B.	LISTEN. Appropriate for 1 st floor to be commercial, nonresidential. Can be for gym, etc. LISTEN. Do it district by district.
Sisson	In research, we have one size fits all approach. Want to look into that.
John	Applaud effort. More research is needed, you are not planner. Don’t have answers to questions that would be asked at TM. Inappropriate to say you need more time at TM. If bylaw was approved and on books, where CFA is, could that have been apartment bldg.?
Sisson	Not 5 acres.
John	Bob’s Discount?
Sisson	No. Papa Gino’s Plaza, BJs, Best Buy, Plaza would be good.
John	Goal is to get process started, but not with bylaw presentation. Draft passed out to Planning Board, circulated, discussed. Planning Board carries a lot of weight at TM. Never had bylaw fail at TM. Is current bylaw not working to the extent it should?

Sisson	Not a real estate developer. Height restriction. If you have a large developed lot, i.e., Best Buy, Papa Gino's, if someone wanted to redevelop, it provides Planning Board with more discretion that it has today to consider how properties might be redeveloped.
John	Discussed. Maybe adding options to better utilize redevelopment?
Sisson	Opens conversation. Would still be SP.
John	Did developers complain?
Sisson	Talked with developers, parties interested. Overlay approach could be investigated.
John	What if community doesn't like it?
Mike	You jumped over process.
Mark B.	LISTEN.
John	Will deliberate on Monday.
Audience	No comment.
Mike/Bob/unan.	close hearing
LISTEN	
	5 minute break.
Bussey Street	Kevin, Mike McKay, Scott Henderson Michael and Anthony Ferullo
Kevin	Project started in January 2017. Proposed 27 units, mixed use over commercial. Knock down 4 bldgs on site. Present plans are for 20 units. Original plans had underground parking, but water issues, has been eliminated. Parking on ground floor – want input from board on number of units. 16 one bedroom, 4 2 bedroom units, 5 units affordable. 16 parking spaces, need waiver for commercial use. More than adequate on-street parking. Asking for waiver for 16 spaces for apartments. Have worked closely with McMahan on design. Feel strongly that they will file rather quickly and move process along.
Scott	Expand existing curb cut on left to access parking at rear. Will be below 2 nd , 3 rd , built on stilts, covered parking. Access on right for residential. Second curb cut will be closed. LISTEN. Working with Concom. Reviewed by DPW, Eng. Only issues outstanding with McMahan. Drive aisle 22 feet.
McKay	Good advice to check groundwater – Did complete redesign with underground garage. Design was too tight in garage. Now no underground parking – slab. Good soil in front. LISTEN. Design – previous designs had garages. LISTEN. Mixture of brick, siding, Board suggested more residential. Exterior design same. Façade – Hardie, cement board.
Steve F.	17 issues initially. Worked with applicant. Letter in February, issues down to 8. Letter on 3/9/18, 2 issues to be addressed – changing of arch rendering did not match plans,

	parking for commercial. Doesn't meet requirement for retail use. Very responsive.
John	You need 19 for retail, provide 0, 20 for residential, provide 16. Height?
Mike	40'. Two commercial, one is liquor store.
John	Landscaping plan?
Scott	No – not much room for green space, requesting waiver for 0%.
Mike	In front of bldg?
Scott	We can put planters.
Mike	Width of sidewalk?
Scott	Varies – 7 to 10 feet.
Mike	Need something in front to make it attractive.
John	It comes down to parking.
Mike	No issue with it. Has worked hard to get here.
Jay	Agree.
Bob	They can't do anything more.
Rita Mae Cushman	Support it.
Sisson	I've argued against parking on street. Now I see all the challenges, they did very good job.
John	Will you prevent residents, business from parking on other sites, particularly Delapa. Need parking management plan. Need conditions for lease requirements. How many cars would park in front of bldg?
Scott	4.
John	Has town designated parking for specific uses? Forget the question. We need stripes. Sisson – handle that. LISTEN. Need rationale to grant/accept concessions for spaces with alternatives. Want patrons encouraged to park on street.
Kevin	Across street – there are 10 unstriped in front of plaza.
John	Sisson – work on that.
Sisson	Will work with Engineering, BOS.
John	Example – Mariposa worked with town. You need to work with DPW, Eng., BOS to do something and figure out the best it can be.
Kevin	Thanks for input. Should be ready to file shortly.
Peter	RK Associates
Peter, David Baker	Request waiver for 2 spaces – from 175 to 173.
Peter	Minor site plan review. LISTEN. No change in Staples bldg. 62 Eastern – 2,510 sqft two story bldg. Propose demolition, replace with 1,800 sqft one story bldg. Essentially in same location, orientation changed slight. Incr driveway off Eastern Ave to 24 ft wide. ZBA granted whatever relief needed to move forward. Loses 2 parking spaces, but

	<p>smaller bldg decreases parking demand. June 2014 had waiver of 89 spaces. Now losing 2. LISTEN. Peer reviewed – 17 issues identified, responded and now 3/21/18 report – all addressed and resolved. Safety – reviewed by Fire Chief, satisfied. Driveway – proposed, subject to state/town approval, do not block signage, pavement marking – will check with Eng. Shrubs obstructing view – will be removed. Previously approved plan had 4 waivers – requesting that they be brought forward – no change.</p>
John	Bldg design.
David Baker	Showed proposed bldg. LISTEN. This is what tenants want and what we want to build.
Peter	Current parking waiver – required 264, provide 175 (89 spaces) – LISTEN.
John	This is one lot. LISTEN. Not looking to do more review than small area in return for arch. design. Not inclined to support design.
Baker	Understand. RK has long history of site, trying to make it better. Intersection moved to alleviate traffic. Had full site plan review last time for light poles. Our feeling is that this is what we would like to do. Went thru effort of looking for redesign, responded to peer review comments, he showed Planning Board what they proposed. If board insists on cape style, they have the right.
John	Consider original rendering.
Baker	Your prerogative.
George Panagopoulos	34 Winstead Avenue. Area has been eyesore. Need to create bldg like first proposal – more residential, people will be more comfortable.
Baker	Misunderstood peer review comments.
Peter	LISTEN.
John	LISTEN.
Mike/Bob/unan.	Approve as presented with waiver requests – old design
Old/New Business	
Mike	Status of town planner.
Sisson	<p>Town made offer to candidate, she declined. Had better offer in Boston. A lot of competition. Back at square 1. Doing informal outreaching. Part-time planner – reaching out to engineering, commercial firms. Private sector pays more.</p>
Mike	Kern refuses to talk to us. Maybe offer a higher salary? Is he considering that?
Sisson	We would negotiate if we had a candidate we like. LISTEN.
Mike/Bob/unan.	Adjourn
End 10:30 p.m.	

