

**TOWN OF DEDHAM
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

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



Dedham Town Hall
26 Bryant Street
Dedham, MA 02026-4458
Phone 781-751-9242
Fax 781-751-9225

Susan Webster
Administrative Assistant
swebster@dedham-ma.gov

Jarret Katz, Town Planner

**PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES**

Thursday, June 21, 2018, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room

Present: John R. Bethoney, Chair
Michael A. Podolski, Vice Chair
Robert D. Aldous, Clerk
James E. O'Brien IV
Jessica L. Porter
Ralph I. Steeves, Associate Member for Special Permits

Staff: Jarret Katz, Town Planner
Susan Webster, Administrative Assistant

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. The recording of the meeting was insufficient for transcription, so the meeting was transcribed based on the administrative assistant's notes. The Board welcomed Mr. Steeves as the new associate member.

PUBLIC HEARING

Applicant: Supreme Development, Inc.
Project Address: 42 Woodleigh Road, Dedham, MA
Zoning District: Single Residence B
Representative(s): Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA
Giorgio Petruzzello, Owner/Applicant
Town Consultant: Steven Findlen, McMahan Associates

Mr. Bethoney recused himself from this Public Hearing due to a professional relationship between the agency at which he works and the applicant. He did not participate in any of the previous meetings or discussions of the proposal, nor was he present in the meeting room. Mr. Podolski assumed the chair. The Public Hearing was opened by a unanimous vote of 4-0. The reading of the Public Hearing notice was waived unanimously, 4-0. Details of notification were provided, including dates that the Public Hearing notice was published in *The Dedham Times*. All required entities were notified by statutory requirement. Dates are on record in the Planning Board file for the above property.

The applicant needs to perform minor modification of the drainage system due to geographical considerations. No other work is anticipated. The Board had no questions, and there were no comments from the audience. Mr. Aldous moved to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, voted unanimously 4-0. Mr. Aldous moved to approve the modification as requested as set forth on the application and plans. Mr. O'Brien seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

Mr. Bethoney joined the Board for the remainder of the meeting.

Town Planner Activity Report

Project Management Spreadsheet:

Mr. Katz is creating a project management spreadsheet keeping track of in-house projects with the Planning department and other town departments with whom he is coordinating. It will be updated regularly and sent to the Board. Mr. Bethoney wanted this to include where projects are in the process and the activities of the department. Ms. Porter asked if this can be put on the Town website for residents to see. Mr. Katz is taking this into consideration. The format needs to be updated periodically, and they will eventually do a large poster format that can be changed. He does want to put it on the website.

Dedham Square Design Guidelines:

The Dedham Square Design Guidelines are nearly complete. There will be revisions, after which a vote will be taken in July 2018. The guidelines will be presented to the Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Design Review Advisory Board.

Housing Study:

Mr. Katz attended a meeting at MAPC regarding housing and affording housing. A housing study will be necessary to see what the stock is in Dedham and what is needed. Mr. Katz said that it will be done by a neighborhood by neighborhood assessment. They will be physically counting and looking at the GIS with the help of an intern appointed by John Sisson. They may need to hire a consultant, and he was not sure about funding for that. Mr. Podolski said this is a big project, and asked Mr. Katz how this can be done with all the planning that is in the pipeline. Mr. O'Brien was concerned about the details, saying that there are a lot of unknown housing types in town due to tax issues, i.e., Airbnb's. Mr. Katz said the information will depend on the owners. Mr. Podolski said that Boston is studying this as well. Legislating Airbnb's is also being researched. He said that he has discussed this with Mr. Sisson and would coordinate the study with him. Mr. Bethoney asked where the intern is from, but Mr. Katz did not know; he will check with Mr. Sisson and report back.

Miscellaneous Updates: Mr. Katz attended the Master Plan Implementation Committee meeting last week. He also said that a new Administrative Assistant was hired and will start work on Monday, June 25, 2018.

Applicant:	John Wagner
Project Address:	10 Fairview Street, Dedham, MA
Zoning District:	General Residence
Representative(s):	Kevin F. Hampe, Esq., 411 Washington Street, Dedham, MA
	John Wagner, Owner/Applicant

Mr. Wagner owns both 6 and 10 Fairview Street, and lives and 6 Fairview Street. He would like to create a small lot (3C on the plan) from 10 Fairview that would become part of 6 Fairview. The plan meets frontage and access, and complies with zoning regulations. He explained that on the existing plan, there is only a distance of 10 feet between the lots, and he wanted to have more room between the two houses. Mr. Podolski said the plans show the side dimensional lengths, but not the widths. This is required. He also asked if Lot 3C is currently Lot 3A. Mr. Hampe said it is; they are asking to change the numbers because the reference is old. The width is 11 feet. The Board discussed the number on the lots in detail. Mr. Podolski moved to endorse the ANR plan, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. The Mylar and the plans were signed.

Applicant: **Audy Auto**
Project Address: **229-237 Bridge Street, Dedham, MA**
Zoning District: **Local Business**
Representative(s): **Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA**

The applicant is seeking an insubstantial modification to the parking plan approved in 2012 to relocate seven parking spaces. The ZBA approved relocation of the spaces 10 feet into the residential zone. They will be straightening them and pushing them back to open up the aisle width. They will also be erecting a new six-foot vinyl fence. The abutter has been informed, and also received a notice from the ZBA. Everything else on the plan remains the same. The audience had no comments. Mr. Podolski moved to consider the petition an insubstantial modification, seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Mr. Podolski moved to approve the new parking plan as presented, dated November 17, 2017, revised on March 29, 2018. Mr. O'Brien seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

Applicant: **Anjom, LLC**
Project Address: **235-243 Bussey Street, Dedham, MA**
Zoning District: **Central Business**
Representative(s):

- **Anthony and Michael Ferullo, Owners/Applicants**
- **Kevin F. Hampe, Esq., 411 Washington Street, Dedham, MA**
- **Michael McKay, AIA, 35 Bryant Street, Dedham, MA**
- **Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting Services, Lexington, MA**

Town Consultant **Steven Findlen, McMahan Associates**

Mr. Podolski moved to open the Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. Aldous, voted unanimously 5-0. Mr. Podolski moved to waive the reading of the public notice, seconded by Mr. Aldous, voted unanimously. Details of notification were provided, including dates that the notice was published in *The Dedham Times*. All required entities were notified by statutory requirement. Dates are on record in the Planning Board file for the above property.

There have been a couple of scoping sessions. The original presentation was for a 27-unit mixed-use building with underground parking. Test borings showed water, so underground parking was eliminated. The next presentation was for a mixed-use building 23 one-bedroom

units; this has been revised again. The current application is for a three-story mixed-use building with 20 units, of which 12 will be one-bedroom and 8 two-bedroom. Five units would be affordable. The building is in the CB zoning district, and would be 14,230 square feet with 170.57 feet of frontage on Bussey Street. There are currently four buildings on the site, all of which would be demolished. The commercial space would be 3,750 square feet, occupied by the owners and a possible office. There will be 16 residential parking spaces.

An easement for private access on Tapley Lane with a curb cut will be closed. The second curb cut on the west will be expanded and will be the primary access. There will be two other points of access. The driveway will be 22 feet wide. There will be ground level parking and parking under the second floor; this will be open on all sides. A waiver will be requested for commercial parking. Sewer and water access will be on Bussey Street, and will be reviewed by the Engineering department. Stormwater will be reviewed by the Conservation Commission. There will be no significant change in grading. There is no shedding of light off the site on the photometric plan. There is limited ability for landscaping. There will be a small area of landscaping on the side and planters in front of the building. Waivers will be requested.

The newest rendering is more residential in scale and design; this was discussed at a neighborhood meeting. The right curb cut will be removed. The storefront will be continuous. The building façade will be Hardie siding, panels, and shingles with color separation. It will be maintenance-free and look like wood. DRAB unanimously approved the plan, but requested revision of the colors and signage; they will return to them for this. There will be a first floor residential lobby and entrances for retail. Mechanicals, including an elevator, sprinklers, and machine room, will be in the basement. The footprint in each unit will be the same. There will be a common gym area on the second floor, which will also have an elevator, stairs, and a second egress in back. There will be a common hallway. Mr. McKay tried to separate the two sides of the exterior with darker cement board as shown on the rendering. The side elevation will be similar to the front and will have AZEK panels. The height of the building is just under 40 feet. All mechanical equipment will be hidden by false gables.

The first floor will be 12 feet high. The overhangs will be AZEK. They do not plan a name on the building at this time. Mr. O'Brien appreciated the work put in to keep the building historic-looking, saying it keeps the original designs when it was a mill area. Mr. McKay said the original contemporary building was not well received by the community. Most of the building will be warm gray with a dark connector. He will bring paint samples to the DRAB meeting. Mr. O'Brien asked how addresses will be determined. Mr. Henderson said he would be working with the GIS manager for these. Tapley Lane will no longer exist.

Mr. Bethoney said there are new materials requirements per the East Dedham Design Guidelines. This will be the first new building in East Dedham in 60 years. The exterior and how the site works are most important to the Planning Board. Mr. Podolski asked if they consulted the guidelines, and Mr. McKay said they did not because the design was done several years ago. Mr. O'Brien said that he believed that they have followed the guidelines whether they realized it or not. Mr. Bethoney asked Mr. McKay to look at the guidelines and determine the level of compliance with them.

There would be a place for bikes in the parking lot. Mr. Bethoney said there is no requirement for a flag, but he wants one put in. Ms. Porter said that a letter from Jason Mammone, P.E., Director of Engineering, noted that he is hesitant to have on-street parking. Mr. Bethoney said he is hesitant to put in striping across the street, where there is space for six parking spots. He

is not opposed to the applicant going to the Board of Selectmen to request striping. The applicant will need Planning Board support of this. Ms. Porter was concerned about people carrying out heavy loads from the commercial space, and would like the MBTA to have presence there. Mr. Henderson said that people occasionally park in front of the building. Pedestrians use a crosswalk. Putting this closer to the intersection is not safe.

Mr. Bethoney personally did not support spaces or striping on the opposite side of the street in relation to approval of the project. He did not want to create a situation in which someone is hurt. If the Board of Selectmen approves it, that would be fine, but not in relation to the project permitting. He did not want to vote on a project that has parking there. At a meeting with the development team, parking, designated or not, in front of the building was not encouraged. Mr. Henderson reviewed the on-site parking. There would be 16 spaces, the majority of which would be compact except for the handicapped space. The aisle would be two-way, and there would be two rows of parking. The spaces at the rear of the site measure 8½' x 17,' which is slightly narrower than usual. The spaces in the back of the building measure 8½' x 19.' The drive aisle is 24 feet.

Mr. Bethoney asked Mr. Findlen to review the site to see if there could be more parking. Mr. Findlen performed peer review of the project on behalf of the Planning Board. This peer review was paid for by the applicant. He said it is a tight site, and given the layout, it is difficult to find more parking. Angled spaces result in losing parking. This presentation shows the maximum number of spaces. No spaces can be added in the driveway because of safety and fire truck access. They made every attempt to find more spaces, but 16 is the maximum. Mr. Hampe said they will request a waiver from 20 spaces to 16.

Mr. Bethoney said the record needs to reflect the belief that the building is not viable at less than 20 units. Mr. Hampe said that the plan originally had 27 units, which they thought was sufficient due to underground parking. However, this could not be done because of the water issues. The number of units was cut back to 23 one-bedroom units, but there was no intent for 40B units at that time. It has now been cut back to 20 mixed bedroom units, and they have an increased amount of 40B units to help. This, however, is at the edge of financial viability. Mr. Bethoney said that having 20 units makes it financially viable, and of these 20, five units (20%) will be affordable.

Mr. Hampe explained affordable units, and that the state and developers contact the agency to screen applicants for eligibility. The state determines the price per zone; the developer does not determine eligibility. The developer can then accept this or not depending on references and financials. Mr. Hampe said that the owners would like to have Dedham preference. He will discuss the language proposed within what the law allows. It was suggested that the owners speak with MAPC, other attorneys, and the Dedham Housing Authority. Ms. Porter appreciated the higher percentage of affordable units. Mr. Bethoney asked Mr. Hampe if he had talked with advocates about affordable housing; he has not done this yet. Mr. McKay said that, according to state regulations, if there are 25% affordable units, the entire building goes toward the affordable housing stock for the town; this means that 20 units will go toward this.

The applicant proposed 16 parking spaces, and will request a waiver from 20 to 16 on the residential portion. Commercial requirements are for 19 spaces, but they cannot provide any. Mr. McKay said that people leave during the day, so others can use their parking spaces for commercial uses then. Mr. Podolski was concerned about where people would park in the evening when residents are home. This is an area of revitalization, and waiving 19 spaces can

be risky. He questioned whether East Dedham was willing to risk this. He was particularly concerned about safety. Dedham Square has the same issue because traffic and parking are impacted there; this will happen as East Dedham revitalizes, impacting and increasing the problems.

Customers currently pull in the driveway or park in front or across the street. They cannot park in East Dedham Plaza. This has been the practice for 25 years. The store will be 700 feet larger in this proposal. The busiest hours are from 4:30 p.m. to 8 p.m. and weekends. There are currently two or three off-street parking spaces. Ms. Porter asked if they intend to offer parking or advertise parking. Mr. Bethoney suggested that the first 16 residents get parking spaces and the last four units will not. He advised a sticker system; Mr. Steeves agreed with this and also suggested that Bussey Street use stickers. Mr. Henderson will speak with Mr. Mammone about his. The Town does not allow parking on public ways, and the Board of Selectmen will not approve it.

With regard to front landscaping, the area is paved from the curb to the building with 9-11 foot sidewalks. They can use raised five foot deep planters as wide as possible, but they cannot plant anything large because it would be too close to the building. This will be reflected on the plans. Mr. Henderson said the only problem with light spillage is right across the line, but it is not over one foot candle and it dissipates. There will be four sconces in front and wall packs along the side walls; this is sufficient for the site. There will be one wall pack at the rear exit. He will obtain a full photometric plan. Mr. Bethoney asked if there would be anything other than the gym that would develop a community feel. Mr. McKay said the gym would be for the residents only.

Mr. Findlen reviewed the traffic impact. In the initial review in December 2017, there were 17 issues, the majority of which applied to the plans themselves. He said the applicants have done everything they can, and all issues have been resolved including:

- Minor clarifications on the traffic impact study have been provided.
- Symbols were not reflected on the legend.
- Site access and vehicular/pedestrian safety. They have worked within the Fire Chief.
- Crosswalk was not reflected on the plans.
- Pedestrians crossing in front. A visual/audible system should be installed to alert pedestrians.
- Trash/loading on site, dumpster location. This has been provided and is adequate.
- Snow. This will be removed off site during storms.
- Lighting. They have provided a stamped plan, and there is no spillage.
- Scale of plan. A waiver has been requested.
- Architectural rendering did not match site plan. This has been corrected.
- Landscaping. A waiver has been requested.
- STOP signs, handicapped spaces, and signage. These have been provided.
- Turning diagrams. These have been provided.
- Parking. They proposed 16 spaces for 20 units, none for commercial. A waiver has been requested.

The hours for trash removal and deliveries must be provided. Snow removal needs to be on the plans; Mr. Henderson said this is on sheet C3. There will be a common dumpster in the back left corner, and trash and delivery trucks will back out of the parking lot. Mr. Bethoney

noted that there is another mixed-use in town that uses town trash barrels along the side of the building. These can be used by residents regardless of whether they live there. Mr. Henderson said they considered that, but the problem is where they could store the barrels.

Mr. Bethoney said the Board wants to be fair to the applicant, but also to the neighbors. He asked how they could prevent parking on nearby streets. The Certificate of Action should indicate how they can ensure that this will not happen.

Audience Comments:

Rita Mae Cushman, 121 Garfield Road: She thought the project was perfect and wished the applicants luck.

Brian McGrath, 109 Colburn Street, member of the Mother Brook Community Center: He wanted to see that the guidelines are addressed, and wanted the applicants to explain how they conform. He said they did not conform to the design 100%, but the applicants did their best. He supported the project. The applicant will return and let the Board know how they conform to the guidelines.

Carey Reid, 65 Emmett Avenue: He said the project is delightful, encouraging, and follows the guideline recommendations. He said it is great to have people whom you trust in the neighborhood, and the Ferulos are wonderful. He said it breaks his heart to see a project held up by traffic, and asked if it is absolutely impossible to go underground. Mr. Henderson said it was. Mr. Reid asked if it was possible to knock out part of the bottom of the commercial space to allow parking underneath. Mr. McKay said this would not increase the number of parking spaces, as they need 10% commercial space. Mr. Reid asked whether the diner and cleaner next door could be brought into the mix because he wanted to see this happen.

Mr. Podolski asked these supporters if they would be willing to let the project go forward despite the parking issue. Mrs. Cushman and Mr. McGrath said they would. Mr. Reid said that parking must be compliant or else there would be a major problem. He said it is a tough situation and must be solved. Mr. Bethoney asked if they would support it if there were no fewer units and no more parking, and whether they could accept the deficiencies knowing that it is the only way the project can go forward. The Board needs the guidance and opinion from the community. The ZBL requires one parking space per residential unit, and they are four spaces short. People come and go with commercial uses. The project would be a benefit to the community, and 20 units would go toward the town's 40B housing count, which is a huge benefit. They are only deficient four spaces, not 19. The situation is being improved, and the benefits outweigh the deficiencies. Mr. McGrath said that this is a precedent, but should go forward. Mr. Bethoney said that the Board looks at each project individually, and fear of precedence is a non-issue. Mr. Reid said that Mr. McGrath is convincing, and the community asked for rezoning for mixed-use.

Ms. Porter moved to continue the Public Hearing to July 19, 2018, at 7 p.m., seconded by Mr. Podolski. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

Applicant:	OCW Retail Dedham, LLC
Project Address:	150-370 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA
Zoning District:	Highway Business

- Representative(s):**
- Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA
 - Ethan Solomon, Land Use Planner, The Wilder Companies, 800 Boylston Street, Suite 1300, Boston, MA 02199
 - Sheryl Guglielmo, LEED AP, Project Manager, Di-Prete Engineering, 990 Washington Street Suite 101A Dedham, MA 02026

The applicant is converting 90,000 square feet of the former Sears store at Dedham Mall for a potential tenant, At Home. They are seeking Planning Board determination that the façade and parking lot changes are insubstantial. They will re-stripe the fire lane, add a new crosswalk, create two van-accessible handicapped spaces with signage, and change the cart corrals; this is due to federal court action for ADA compliance. The net result will be adding 2 parking spaces, going from 74 to 76, 21 of which would be van accessible. The Mall is required to have 2,975 parking spaces according to the last parking plan. Not all spaces are used. They will lose six spaces because handicapped spaces are larger, and would now have 3,085 spaces, an overage of 105 required spaces. Mr. Podolski said that any time a parking lot is touched, there must be a full review. This is an exemption due to the court action. He considered this an insubstantial change because of the forced court action. This would be a one-time pass of the full review. He commended OCW for doing this.

Mr. Podolski moved to consider the change insubstantial, seconded by Mr. Aldous, voted unanimously 5-0. Mr. Podolski moved to approve the insubstantial change, seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

- Applicant:** Dela Plaza East, Inc.
Project Address: 270, 290 Bussey Street, Dedham, MA
Zoning District: Central Business
Representative(s):
- Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA
 - James J. DeVellis, P.E., DeVellis Zrein, Inc., P.O. Box 307, Foxborough, MA 02035
 - Kenneth Cram, Bayside Engineering, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, Woburn, MA 01801
 - James Siteman, Property Manager, Delapa Properties, 511 Washington Street, Norwood, MA 02062
 - Anthony Delapa, Owner/Applicant
 - Douglas Annino, AIA, Annino Associates, 125 North Washington Street, North Attleboro, MA 02760-1673
- Town Consultant:** Steven Findlen, McMahan Associates

Mr. Podolski moved to open the Public Hearing, seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Mr. Podolski moved to waive the reading of the Public Hearing notice, seconded

by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Details of notification were provided, including dates that the Public Hearing notice was published in *The Dedham Times*. All required entities were notified by statutory requirement. Dates are on record in the Planning Board file for the above property.

The proposal is for redevelopment of Delapa Plaza as a Major Nonresidential Project Mixed Use Development requiring a Special Permit. The property would contain 24,646 square feet with commercial on the first floor and 22 one-bedroom, 2 two-bedroom, and 2 studio apartments. There would be 145 parking spaces; 22 would be under the building. It is hoped that a nice full-scale restaurant would occupy part of the commercial space in the future.

The applicant requested that the height of the building be measured from Bussey Street. Request for waivers was submitted on February 26, 2018, as noted in the Planning Board files. McMahon Associates' initial report on March 23, 2018, identified 19 issues. The applicant responded on April 7, 2018, and the second review identified 3 issues. After responding on April 8, 2018, all issues have been satisfied. They have filed a notice of intent with the Conservation Commission, and have had several hearings. This is now on hold pending the Planning Board decision so changes to the project can be incorporated.

The site is in the Central Business zoning district, and contains two lots known as 270 and 290 Bussey Street. One lot contains the existing plaza, and the other has an existing ATM. There are 101,000 square feet of land with frontage on Bussey Street. There is an existing shopping center containing 38,000 square feet of space. There are stores in front, and other uses in back. Some of the uses are as of right, some grandfathered, and some under Special Permit. There are 147 parking spaces on site; today's Zoning Bylaw requires 180 spaces, so there is a deficit of 33 spaces. ITE shows that the site is 19 spaces deficient. There has never been a parking problem, and the site has often been used as a community parking lot; this will be discontinued in the future. The rear of the property contains town-owned land and Mother Brook. To the left of the site is the East Dedham Fire Station.

The applicant wants to renovate the site into a Mixed Use Development by adding two upper floors. CVS will not be included in this. The building will blend together so it looks like one building. There would be apartments upstairs and 24,646 square feet of commercial space. The commercial space in back would be eliminated and changed into 22 under-building parking spaces; this is the ZBL requirement for 22 apartments. The Planning Board will determine how many spaces are needed for the commercial space. If the board determines that 100% was needed for commercial, there would be a deficit of 19 spaces instead of 33; if it is run by ITE, there would be a five-space surplus.

There is no landscaping at this time; the pavement goes from the building to the sidewalk. Colored renderings were shown to the Board. There would be three entrances, a back loading area, and dumpster. There would be a landscape buffer and internal landscaping. The parking spaces would be 9' x 19' and all compact spaces; this conforms. One entrance near the corner has been eliminated. The Conservation Commission has looked at the walkway along Mother Brook and town property. The building would be handicapped accessible. Mr. DeVellis has responded to McMahon's comments. The plans show the snow storage areas, signage, handicapped accessible spaced below, and near the ATM. The pedestrian walkway would go from the street to the plaza. There would be front and rear loading areas.

Mr. Zahka stated that this is not a new project, but has been ongoing. They have met with Mother Brook community group and neighbors. They have the new East Dedham Design Guidelines, and have gone line by line, explaining how they have complied.

Existing conditions were shown. The building is in bad need of updating. There is no real gross amount of landscaping, so the site is basically pavement. The parking lot is large. There is a letter from a structural engineer stating that the building is in good condition and can accept more stories. CVS is the anchor store, and there are smaller retail stores. Most of the spaces in the back are vacant, and there is no character to the area.

A rendering of the proposed building was shown with retail taken out of the lower level. This will now have 22 parking spaces for residents, an elevator, stairways, and mechanical and electrical spaces. It will be one way coming in, and exit will be through the lower level of the garage. The first floor will be similar in tenant makeup; eight tenants are anticipated. There will be an elevator in the middle hall. The two upper floors will contain 443 square foot studio apartments, 742 square foot one-bedroom apartments, and 992 square foot two-bedroom apartments. There will be a corridor down the middle. The mansard roof will have a depressed section in the middle for mechanicals.

The façade rendering was shown. The lower level will be masonry with a stone base and plinth. There will be brick on top to the second floor, and clapboard above. There will be bay windows, cupolas, balconies, and plantings. The roof would have dormers. The CVS side will be renovated with gables, a clock in the cupola, new windows, and a pergola. The underutilized loading docks would be cleaned up. There would be flat Hardie panels. There are a variety of elements on the façade, and no large expanses of wall area. There will be walkways and side-walks coming onto the site, landscaping beds, street trees, and canopy trees. There will be appropriate signage and lighting, extensive landscaping, and it will be more pedestrian friendly. There will be no apartments over CVS. The ATM kiosk will not change.

Mr. Bethoney requested that existing photography be brought to the next meeting. He commented that the rendering is very unattractive in his opinion. Mr. Zahka said the applicant's goal is to be the most desirable mixed-use building in Dedham. Given the size of the property and its location, it will have significant impact. The parking in front will be for retail, and there will be on-site security.

Mr. Cram gave a full traffic impact analysis and presented crash data from the police. Three off-site intersections and three site driveways were evaluated. His full report is in the Planning Board record. There will be no change in the level of service. Peer review asked for four clarifications on the traffic, and these have been addressed. Mr. Zahka submitted the fiscal impact report. This indicated that the project is fiscally positive for the town. A full stamped photometric plan was submitted and accepted by Mr. Findlen. Snow storage will be on every landscape island. An operations and management plan will be determined by the Conservation Commission.

Waivers Requested:

1. Aisle width of 24 feet. There are areas in which this is impossible due to the location of the building at the north and east property lines. Circulation would be one-way in the back.

2. Interior landscaping. The Zoning Bylaw requires 15%, but the applicant is requesting 10% in the interior. No frontage buffer strip is required in the CB zone, but they have added one.
3. Perimeter landscape requirement. This has been provided to the extent possible.
4. Scale of site plan. The applicant requests this to be 1"=20' instead of 1"=40'.
5. Aisle width and parking space requirements for under the building, dedicated parking, and one-way circulation.
6. Number of required parking spaces. This may not be necessary.

Mr. Podolski said this proposal makes quite a difference. Mr. Aldous said he has not seen the photometric plan. Mr. Annino provided this for him. Mr. Bethoney said the submission was excellent and well done.

Ms. Porter asked if the ATM could be moved. Mr. Zahka said it could not because it is under a long-term lease. She said this is a key intersection, and they should ideally provide more green space, i.e., a pocket park. She suggested fewer parking spaces or moving the ATM. Mr. Bethoney said the ATM may be in this location because the tenant wants it visible. Mr. Zahka reminded the Board that the tenant came in previously for additional lighting for safety. Mr. Bethoney suggested that he discuss this with the tenant. Ms. Porter discussed walkability and installation of a bike rack. Mr. Steeves said the parking is fine.

Mr. Zahka will have samples of the proposed materials at the next meeting. The cupola will be AZEK panel and clapboard with Hardie plank. There will be 30-year architectural shingles and faux brick chimneys. Windows will be double hung with mullions. There will be patio doors and polycast doric columns. The railings will be pre-finished vinyl. The bay windows will be trimmed with flat AZEK panel; there will be no shingles. Planters will be prefinished metal. There will be real brick above the stores with arches and limestone base. These will be three feet up inside the walkway at the storefront level. The storefront windows will be aluminum. The height will be about the same as it is now, about 13 feet to the roof deck and 34 feet to the rooftop.

Mr. O'Brien said this is a fantasy. He asked how the applicant would support the building. Mr. Annino said the existing concrete is in good shape, there is a steel structure from the basement to the first floor with 8 inch steel tubes, and there are proper footings. The columns would be decorative. Mr. Bethoney asked if the soil quality is sufficient. Mr. Annino said it is but they will do borings on site. They have not been done yet because it is expensive. Mr. Zahka submitted a preliminary report. Mr. Bethoney said the soil quality based on borings is insufficient. Mr. O'Brien said the design may be a moot point since it may have to be changed to lighten the load. Mr. Annino said they would probably add more footings if the bearing capacity is insufficient. They would reinforce the soil and put in pressurized footings. He said it has to be built as it is presented. Mr. O'Brien understood this, but asked him to do it for the community. Mr. Annino said they will make sure it holds before they spend any money. Mr. Bethoney asked if there will be a flag on site; Mr. Annino will look into this. Mr. Zahka will check to see if the applicant has gone to the Design Review Advisory Board.

Mr. Findlen performed peer review of the traffic study and the full set of site plans on behalf of the Planning Board. This peer review was paid for by the applicant. All the identified issues have been resolved. These included site design, circulation, trash, snow storage, landscaping, lighting, parking, radii, and deliveries. He had the applicant do further analysis of the intersection, and it is accurate. Trip generation, distribution, and level of service are fine; nothing has

changed. No changes are needed to the intersection. Parking is still short, but these will be waiver requests. Mr. Bethoney asked if the access off Sawmill Lane would have any conflict with the drive-thru exit, and Mr. Findlen said there is no issue.

Mr. Bethoney asked about affordability levels. Mr. Zahka said they added two studio apartments, and have a range of different types of apartments. The only affordable project that has been done did this on a voluntary basis. No affordable apartments are planned. They have made significant outreach to the community.

Audience Comments:

Jean Zeiler, 59 Woodleigh Road, asked if there are any sustainability components. Mr. Annino said the heating and insulation are higher rated. It will probably be a HERS building. There is not a lot of flat roof, so solar is probably not going to work. There will be water conservation measures. They will think about dual flush toilets.

Brian McGrath, 109 Colburn Street, a member of the Mother Brook Community Center: The applicant has been very good about speaking with the community, but there are still some sticking points, i.e., the ATM on the corner, MWRA pipeline. He asked about pedestrian expansion on the bridge, which carries people to East Dedham Square. He said the façade meets the lower level design guidelines, but the top does not. Mr. Annino disagreed, and said there is enough going on with the façade. Mr. Bethoney urged him to think about this. Mr. McGrath said Mother Brook Community Center has had a good response to the proposal. There are still some issues, but the landscaping will be a significant improvement. The center would like to see the site integrated with the surrounding area. Mr. McGrath said the building design is an improvement, although the height is a concern. He said the neighbors are concerned about noise due to the height of the building and the flat land over Mother Brook. They can hear the mechanical units all day, every day, all year. Mr. Findlen said he did not look at the noise component, but will. Robert Curran, 321 Cedar Street, said the mansard roof should prevent sound, but they could put in rigid insulation. He did not think sound would be a problem. Mr. Bethoney said that any landscaping has to be there forever and have a good, healthy appearance. If there is an issue, it must be replaced.

Carey Reid, 65 Emmett Avenue: He was concerned about when the dumpsters would be emptied. They are currently emptied at 4 a.m. Mr. Bethoney assured him that this would not happen in the future.

Robert Curran, 321 Cedar Street: He asked if the entrance and exit could be made two-way. Mr. DeVellis said it is one-way behind the building, but they are otherwise two-way.

Mr. Podolski moved to continue the Public Hearing to July 26, 2018 at 7 p.m., seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 4-0¹.

Mr. Podolski moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0¹. The meeting ended at 11:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

¹ Mr. O'Brien had left the meeting earlier due to work constraints and did not vote.

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

/snw