

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, Member
Ralph I. Steeves, Associate Member



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

Jennifer Doherty
Administrative Assistant
jdoherty@dedham-ma.gov

Jarret Katz, Town Planner
jkatz@dedham-ma.gov

PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES

July 19, 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 (Public Hearings only)

Staff: Jarret Katz, Town Planner
Jennifer Doherty, 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. Mr. Bethoney, on behalf of the Planning Board, welcomed Jennifer Doherty, the new administrative assistant to the Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Design Review Advisory Board.

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

- Kevin F. Hampe, Esq., 411 Washington Street, Dedham, MA
- Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting Services, Lexington, MA

This is a continuation of the Public Hearing for a Special Permit request for redevelopment of a property as a mixed-use development and Major Nonresidential Project.

At the last visit, the board charged the applicant with the following tasks:

- Design of the building to be consistent with East Dedham Design Guidelines
- Bicycle storage
- American flag on the property

- Changes to the parking spaces shown on the plan, removing the ones on Bussey Street
- Full-sized photometric plans
- Coordination of the counts on the units and number of bedrooms
- Questions regarding building materials
- How to control off-site parking

Mr. Henderson explained several changes:

- Bicycle storage for the residents has been added close to the vestibule in the rear. It is shown on the site plans and is labeled.
- An American flag has been added to the architectural plans, and will be in the center of the front of the building.
- The parking across the street from the building has been removed from the plans. They still intend to pursue getting this striped, but it does not affect the application.
- Planting schedule: Planters along the front of the building, a combination of perennials and small shrubs. The site does not allow for more. Plans were submitted from a landscape architect.
- Photometric plan has been provided.
- There will be 12 one-bedroom apartments and 8 two-bedroom units

Architectural Materials:

- There will be Hardie material on the majority of the sides of the building, lighter shingles on the gables, and the rest typical Hardie siding board, which is a fibrous cement board that looks like wood and lasts longer.
- There is a darker AZEK board on the middle of the building.
- Trim will be PVC.
- There is real brick facing along the front.

Mr. Hampe reviewed the other items discussed at the last meeting. They were asking for a waiver for the number of parking spaces for the residential units. They originally had 20 apartments, but they are providing 16 parking spaces. The Board was concerned about how to control tenant parking. The only way it can be controlled is to have terms in the lease that if tenants were found to be parking on private property, they would be in violation and could be evicted. The Board had also been concerned about the small size of the site and the issue of parking spaces. They are asking for a waiver for four parking spaces and a complete waiver for commercial spaces. They have never had parking for the commercial spaces, and the patrons park on Bussey Street. During the day, they could pull into the residential spaces while tenants are at work, but weekends could be a problem. In proposing the 20 units, five would be affordable to make the project financial viable. If the Board is not willing to grant this type of waiver request, they would have to revise the plans to 16 units and amend the mix of units to 8 one-bedroom and 8 two-bedroom. A number of abutting residents were concerned about the possible lack of parking. The applicant is willing to work with the Board on this issue. If the Board is not inclined to grant the waiver and would be more comfortable with fewer units, the Applicant would need to request a short continuance. The project has been going on for a long time, and they would need to revise the plans to 16 units and change the mix.

Mr. Bethoney asked if they had discussed signage for the commercial spaces. Mr. Hampe said that this is another way to control patrons from using the residential spaces. They will commit to prominent, conspicuous signage in the commercial spaces stating that if someone

parks on private property, they are subject to towing, and the applicant is willing to put in his leases that if residents park on someone else's property, they would be breaching the lease.

Mr. Hampe said there are usually two employees in the store, and they park on Bussey Street in front of the building. Customers pull up to go into the store, or park on the opposite side in front of Delapa Plaza; there are six spaces there. Mr. Podolski said that the two employees have no place to park on the property. One of the owners, Anthony Ferullo, 258 Bussey Street, said that the liquor store will take half of the commercial element, and another entity will take the other side. Mr. Podolski said the other commercial tenant would need parking as well, and there is no parking for them. Mr. Hampe said that during the day, they can use the residential parking. He assumed it would be shared parking like the building across from Town Hall. If the business is open at night, this would be different. Mr. Podolski said they do not know what type of business will go in. He asked the hours of operation for the liquor store. Mr. Ferullo said hours are 9 a.m. to 9:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday, 10 a.m. to 11 p.m. on Saturday, and 12 p.m. to 6 p.m. on Sunday. They have been operating there for 25 years, and there are currently 11 apartments on the existing site, some of which are two-bedroom. There are two parking spaces. He said this functions well. There are also other businesses adjacent to the site, and the estimated 13-14 employees park along Bussey Street.

Mr. Bethoney said that the situation is getting significantly better as a result of the development. Mr. Podolski's concern is that, during redevelopment, the Board attempts to make the project the best it can be regardless of the existing conditions. The Board's job is to bring the project up to today's standards, not past standards. Mr. O'Brien agreed, and said he wanted to help a good project, and the fact that it is currently running efficiently and without any traffic issues is a plus. Ms. Porter asked how the project would be impacted if they requested fewer units. Mr. Hampe said that they would have to eliminate the affordable units.

Ms. Porter asked for clarification on the parking policy, whether each tenant would be treated the same and if it would be on a first come, first served basis. She asked if there would not be parking for the commercial use after 6 p.m. Mr. Hampe said that would probably be the case. They are anticipating that most of the tenants would be going to work during the day, which would free up spaces around the building. The commercial businesses could use those spaces during the day, but there is concern about what would happen during the evenings and on weekends when tenants are at home. There may not be enough parking for the commercial entities. Ms. Porter said that the principle behind having reduced parking for mixed-use is that people need parking at different times of the day. In this project, there is a challenge because the peak business hours are between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m., and there may be an overlap when there is residential need and commercial need for parking. She asked whether having the plantings in the ground instead of in planters would bring up the percentage to 1%. Mr. Henderson explained that the proposal does not meet all the buffers, and is not contiguous or the same width at all points. They also have no opportunity for landscaping in the interior of the property.

Mr. Bethoney said that it is customary and required that, prior to signing a Certificate of Action, the applicant submits a parking management plan that outlines how he is going to manage parking. This is required for any project that has shared parking. The Board will review and revise this, and it must be mutually agreed upon if the applicant cannot meet the parking demand required by the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Hampe said that the Zoning Bylaw requires one parking space per residential unit. The Board has discretion on the commercial parking. He

said that if the Board feels more comfortable on how the project is developed, he would ask for an opportunity to discuss continuation with his client.

Mr. Bethoney discussed issues so that the Board has clear guidance on the issues. He did not think anyone would challenge going from 16 parking spaces for 16 units regardless if they are one or two bedroom units. The Board agreed. He further said that clear guidance is needed for the affordable units. Mr. Hampe had said that if they reduced the number of units to 16, they did not want any affordable units. He reiterated this, saying that it is strictly a financial issue if at some point the project does not become viable. The Board is not concerned about the mix of the units, whether there are 8 two-bedroom and 8 one-bedroom, or some other mix.

Mr. Bethoney said that the only concerns that have arisen are the number of affordable units and where the flag will be placed. Mr. Hampe would like to continue the hearing to the next hearing or the first in August subject to revision of the interior plans to reflect 8 one bedroom units and 8 two bedroom units, and to propose 16 parking spaces on the site, but reduce the number of affordable units from 5 to 0. The Board discussed this in order to give the applicant some guidance.

Mr. Podolski commended the applicant and his team for presenting a beautiful building. He said that it is a great start for the East Dedham rehabilitation. He wanted to see the project get off on the right foot while waiving as few Zoning Bylaws as possible. He thought that 20 apartments is too much; he said he was happier with 16 apartments with 16 spaces was better. He was not too worried about the commercial or the affordable units.

Mr. Aldous said he would still like to have affordable units, but was more concerned about the parking, saying the shortage of 7 or 8 spaces was too much for him. Mr. Bethoney said he was more concerned about the affordable units. Mr. Aldous said he would like to see them kept in the plan.

Mr. O'Brien said he was more concerned that the building becomes a reality. He said it is also the neighborhood's decision as to whether they want to accept the shortage of parking. There is another aspect that has not been discussed, and that is whether the neighborhood is willing to accept a shortage of parking to see this become a reality. He said he wants the affordable units included in 20 units. Mr. Bethoney asked what he thought if it was a necessity to have 16 units. Mr. O'Brien said he would be fine if they were not included if this is what the applicant needs to do to bring this to fruition.

Mr. Steeves asked what affordable units would cost. Mr. Bethoney said they would be \$1,427, which is what the State allows for one bedroom units in Dedham; non-affordable units would be \$1,550-\$1,750. He did not know how much affordable two bedroom units would cost, but guessed it would be \$1,650-\$1,750; there are none of these in Dedham. A regular two bedroom, two bath units would be about \$1,900-\$2,000. Mr. Steeves said he would like the project to go through and for the applicant to make whatever he could. Mr. Bethoney asked about the request to go from 5 affordable units to none. Mr. Steeves said he was fine with that. Mr. Podolski agreed.

Ms. Porter said she would like to keep the affordable units if possible because Dedham has a shortage of this. She was concerned about the 20 units because, as part of the first step in

revitalizing East Dedham and as the first development with East Dedham Design Guidelines, it stresses walkability and she did not know how that would work with the existing parking plan. She did not think this was insurmountable. She did think 20 units would be workable, and said the tenants should be told that they could not be guaranteed parking. She was concerned that the neighborhood would be impacted with traffic going in and out of the parking lot at 8 p.m., but, again, did not think this was insurmountable. Mr. Bethoney asked her to clarify this. She said she was not interested in 20 units with 16 spaces without a more thoughtful parking policy. She said that 16 units with 16 spaces is fine, but she wanted an affordable component in them considering that the Board was giving relief for landscaping. She wanted the project to be more consistent with all the elements of the East Dedham Design Guidelines. Mr. Bethoney said the marketing of the development is important. There are one-bedroom apartments in town that couples rent that have two parking spaces. People with two cars are told that only one space comes with the unit, and are wished luck for finding parking for the other vehicle. He noted that there are two municipal lots in the Square, but not in East Dedham, which only has on-street parking. Ms. Porter added that there is also no public transit.

Mr. Bethoney said the applicant should not leave the meeting without a good understanding of what he needs to do to get approval for a good redevelopment of the property. Mr. O'Brien said the whole neighborhood is affordable housing, noting that he lived in East Dedham for years and benefitted from affordable housing. There are Section 8 apartments throughout the neighborhood. He was concerned that not having affordable housing would kill the project. Mr. Bethoney said there is no affordable housing requirement in the Zoning Bylaw, but Ms. Porter made a point that the Board is waiving a lot of other issues. Mr. Steeves said this project would improve the neighborhood.

Mr. Bethoney said he is fine with 16 units on the site with no affordable housing if that is what it will take to do this project. He knows that the applicant will feel beaten down by this meeting. Mr. Hampe suggested that this be continued to the first meeting in August. He anticipated that there will be a reduction to 16 units. Building size and design would stay the same, although the interior design will change. It will then come down to affordability, and they will need to look at that from a financial standpoint with the bank. He does not want a project that is approved that will not be financially viable or unsuccessful because of this. It may mean that they need to have at least one affordable unit. Mr. Bethoney noted that if there are 25% affordable units, the whole building is counted toward the Town's percentage of affordable housing stock. He said the project has waivers, i.e., parking and landscaping, but the project is well worth those considerations. Mr. Aldous said this is a commercial building to make money. If it is a commercial deal to make money, he asked why the Board is backing down, and said they should build what the Zoning Bylaw says. Mr. Hampe said it will be compliant other than the parking for the commercial element. Mr. Aldous said the applicant is in it to make money, and should follow the laws.

Audience Comment

Theresa Heisler, 27 Meadow Street: She has lived in East Dedham for 25 years. She agreed with Mr. O'Brien that the building should have 16 units and 16 parking spaces with no affordable housing. She said the Ferullos are wonderful neighbors.

Steven Davey, 31 Lewis Lane: He thinks the parking is the most important problem, and there should be one parking space per unit. He said the rezoning that spurred this project will spur

others as well. He said this is the beginning of East Dedham's revitalization, and if the Board gives away too much on this project, it will set a precedent. He asked the Board to consider future buildings. He said there will not be any useful parking in East Dedham because there is no place to put municipal parking. Mr. Bethoney said the Board looks on every project based on its own individual merit. The site has a lot of constraints, i.e., sandwiched between two other buildings, high water table, not a deep lot, so they have a lot to work with. The more that someone has to work with, the more the Board looks to understand.

Charles Krueger, Precinct 3 Chair: The residents have been working to get East Dedham revitalized for the last 15-16 years. They are now on the doorstep. He disagreed with Mr. Davey, saying that if the project fails, no one will attempt another one. The site has restraints. He did not think that the applicants were doing it for pure profit, but also out of inspiration for East Dedham Square. They opened their doors to the neighbors and told them if they did not like something on the plans, they would change it. No other contractor has done that. He said that evidently not everyone lives in East Dedham. East Dedham has carried the brunt of affordable housing in Town for years. Mr. Delapa talked about it a couple of years ago, and neighbors were furious. He did not think it was unfair to let the applicant reduce the affordable housing by four units. The project will kick off the revitalization of East Dedham. There is space for parking behind the Fire House, but no one wants to look into that. He said to attack the parking issue now. It takes a lot of waivers to start the East Dedham revitalization. He supports any project that helps to revitalize the area.

William Ralph, 5 Linden Place: His family has a business in East Dedham. With regard to parking, while it is tight, people manage. The Ferullos have the option of not doing anything. They have a building with tenants already, and there is no parking now. He would like the project to go through. It is an important project for East Dedham. He did not think this would set precedent. He felt that this would be better for the community. He said cash flow is important, and maybe they could fit some affordable into it. The architect will determine this. The number of units has not yet been determined.

Rita Mae Cushman, Vice Chair, Precinct 3: She agreed completely with Mr. Krueger. Improving East Dedham Square would be great for businesses there.

Robert Curran, Precinct 5 Town Meeting member: He was totally in favor of the project. The Town owns a certain amount of units, and asked where their parking spots are. Mr. Bethoney said they need to determine if the site will support it. He said he supported the parking plan and 20 units with a waiver for four spaces.

Brian McGrath, 109 Colburn Street: He has lived there for 11 years. He supported the 20 units with 4 affordable units. He said parking can be on the street without difficulty. He thought the original proposal would benefit the community.

Kevin Scollan, 78 Thomas Street: The building would be a huge asset for the Square. There is plenty of affordable housing within a block. He thought the applicant should charge top dollar.

Mr. Hampe said he needed time to discuss issues with his client. He preferred the first week in August. Mr. Podolski moved to continue the Public Hearing to August 9, 2018, at 7 p.m., seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

The Board took a five-minute recess.

Applicant: Hub Development, LLC
Project Address: 355-359 Washington Street, Dedham, MA
Zoning District: Central Business
Representative(s): Kevin F. Hampe, Esq., 411 Washington Street, Dedham, MA
Antonio Ferrara, owner of HUB Development, 56 Belle Avenue, West Roxbury, MA
Stephen Sousa, AIA, Project Architect, 81 Boylston Street, Brookline, MA
Town Consultant: Steven Findlen, McMahon Associates

This is a *scoping session* for an anticipated proposal for a mixed-use building. The property is occupied by CrossFit workout group and was formerly occupied by Bert's Automotive. It is in the Central Business zoning district. The plan is to demolish the existing building and construct a four-story, 24,389 square foot mixed-use building. They are proposing approximately 2,600 square feet of commercial space on the first floor and 21 one-bedroom residential units in the three floors above. One of the units would be affordable. The tenant for the commercial space is not known, but they anticipate an office tenant, possibly for the developer's business. They propose 23 parking spaces for the residential units. It is that they will request a waiver for parking spaces for the commercial space.

Mr. Sousa reviewed the site and the plans. They propose the 24,389 square foot building with 2,609 square feet of commercial space on the first level; there can be two commercial spaces. A ramp would lead to the lower level, where there would be 14 parking spaces. The upper level would have 9 spaces. There would be 9 one-bedroom units on each of the second and third floors, and the fourth floor, or penthouse unit, would have 3 one-bedroom units. Transitional materials would be used in a more contemporary way. The base would be zinc panel, and brick would be above. Windows would be black anodized casements. They would break up the façade in a couple of ways. The commercial area comes out a foot from the back wall. The residential entry is 2 feet back from the brick wall. There would be zinc cornice. The penthouse would be set back to keep it out of the sight line of the street, 13 feet back from the front, 21 feet back on the left, 22 feet back on the right, and 22 feet back from the back. There would be vertical fenestration over the residential entrance to differentiate it from the commercial space, and a three-dimensional box bay over the parking entrance. A wedge facer would be used and highlighted with contrasting bands of yellow at the window gables. The front façade material would be carried 14 feet around the corner and transition to 10" shiplap board as columns; this is open to the parking way on the side for an open viewing area. A landscape buffer would be in front of the building and on the side. The scale of the building will be broken down with pilasters up through the building and traditional clapboard or lap board 4" to the weather. The window fenestration would continue around the back; this is how the penthouse above can be seen. The rear elevation of the building is the same geometry in pieces of the building, although a lower would be added to screen car parking from adjacent properties. On the left side of the building, they are wrapping the brick around and each column will be wrapped in zinc until it transitions to the shiplap. Renderings of the building looking down Washington Street to Route One were shown, including the landscape buffer, sign band, and lighting. They are breaking down the mass of the building. The front rendering was shown. They propose a canopy over the residential entrance with signage. The back residential entrance was shown. They are trying to keep the appearance of a three-story building at the streetscape and bring the retail entrance out further. Mr. Hampe noted they met with David Gamble and Philipp Maué of Gamble Associates who are connected with the Dedham Square Steering Committee, and they made some suggestions as to the design of the building.

Mr. Aldous said the plans that were presented were terrible, the second worst he has seen in his term on the Board. There are no numbers on the plans, i.e., the distance from the sidewalk or how big the building is. Mr. Bethoney asked the Board what it thought of the building design, style, signage, height, materials, etc. He reiterated that it was a scoping session, and an introduction to an idea for a potential proposal. The Board would give guidance as to the concept, size, design, and height, etc., and whether it would support this in a Special Permit.

Mr. Aldous said it seems to take up too much room on the lot and is too high, and they are trying to get too much in too small a space. He did not particularly like what he sees. Ms. Porter liked how it integrated with Dedham Square, and provides a little variation from what exists now. She asked the height of the first floor; Mr. Sousa said it would be 13 feet. She then asked if they had considered putting in any two-bedroom units. Mr. Ferrara said that this was from a layout perspective. He consulted with Mr. Sousa about what would maximize the number of apartments. Ms. Porter said that there is a large aging population in town, and there are people looking to move to apartments with a little more space, so there is a demand and a need for two-bedroom units. She said that people also want community space, i.e., a bench in front or a slightly bigger lobby, and he should think about that. She wondered if the penthouse units had space for an open terrace. She also knows there is a demand for covered bike space, and asked them to consider that. She asked about affordable units. Mr. Hampe said they plan to have one, but will discuss this. Mr. Podolski suggested that they consider three or four.

Mr. Bethoney asked how much room is needed between each floor. Mr. Sousa said the commercial space is 13 feet floor to floor. Mr. Bethoney said that 2 to 2½ feet have to be subtracted for the HVAC and the concrete decking in between, so the height would be 10'6" to 11 feet. He said that there has been significant criticism on some of the mixed-use buildings having ceilings that are too low, and he needed to establish the correct height. He then asked the height of the second and third floors are, noting that they said they were 10 feet. Mr. Sousa said 8 feet with the HVAC and concrete decking. He said it is hard to get to 8 feet in this type of building; it takes a lot of coordination. It then gets large because it is more economical to do a larger structure. He said they are the bare minimum in order to get the 40 feet needed. Mr. Bethoney said they have compressed everything to get four floors on the 40 feet, and the heights that they are showing are not accurate. Mr. Sousa said that was correct. Ms. Porter asked about the height at the canopy; Mr. Sousa said it was 13 feet. The door is 8 feet and the transom is 2 feet, so it is about 10'6."

Mr. Bethoney then asked if height at the opening to the parking facility was from grade to the top was 13 feet. Mr. Sousa said it is 10 feet, and showed this on the plan. Mr. Bethoney asked how a fire truck could get into the garage as it needs a minimum of 14 feet. Mr. Sousa said he would have to adjust that. Mr. Bethoney agreed. If the Board goes with the building design, Mr. Sousa will have to meet with the Fire Chief to get his approval. As it stands now, there is no way to get an emergency vehicle into the garage. This was discussed at length, and it was determined that the actual height of the building to the top of the penthouse is 42 feet; this is as high as the highest building in the Square, which is the D'Attilio building. Mr. Steeves noted that the top floor of that building is uninhabitable.

Mr. Bethoney explained that what is important to the Board is the façade of the building and the way it looks in the actual height of the storefronts. Mr. Sousa said they could go higher. Mr. Bethoney said he needs a higher storefront, but he would have to take a floor off the building to do that. He again said that height is a huge issue in Dedham.

Mr. O'Brien said he liked the design of the building and how it ties in with the rest of the Town. Other than that, there are other issues to contend with, i.e., height of the building and parking.

Mr. Podolski asked how far the building would be set back from the street. Mr. Sousa said it is set back two feet from the property line. This is so they can put in a planting bed/landscape buffer. Mr. Podolski asked what the setback was from the property lines. Mr. Sousa said it is 5 feet from the side sidelines, and 12-15 feet from the back. Mr. Podolski asked if there was any proposed landscaping in back. Mr. Sousa said there will be, but they have to hire a landscape consultant. Mr. Podolski said the back of the building abuts residential property, and asked if they know where the zoning line is. Mr. Hampe said it is Single Residence B, and cuts across the back parking area of the building. He said they meet the Zoning Bylaw requirements for parking, and have two additional spaces that can be used for commercial parking. Parking in the rear would be strictly residential. Commercial parking spaces would be in the front of the building, and they would require a waiver on the additional required commercial spaces. The building does not go all the way to the back.

Mr. Podolski asked if they would be asking for a waiver on height. Mr. Hampe said they may change the height of the first floor, but they will be discussing this. Mr. Podolski asked if they discussed setbacks on floors with Gamble Associates. Mr. Sousa said they had a positive meeting with them. They really liked the design. The only other thing they discussed was softening the edge at the base of the building. Mr. Podolski sits on the committee for Dedham Square Guidelines, and Gamble Associates said it always looks nicer when you set back the floor. This has not been done on prior construction, but it will be considered on this proposal. Mr. Sousa said they have done this in a couple of ways. They have done it in a vertical plane by adding pilasters and setting back two feet on the side.

Mr. Steeves said the plans do not have any measurements on the parking space sizes. They need to be 9' x 19.' This should be marked on the plans. Mr. Podolski said that a lot of blanks need to be filled in, and this is a scoping session. He said he thought they were merely coming in to see how the Board liked the design.

Mr. Katz said they are addressing a lot of the Dedham Square Design Guidelines, which will be voted on in a couple of weeks. He also commended the applicant for consulting with Gamble Associates for their guidance. He said they were more or less within the guidelines. With regard to the height and setback, they did take this into consideration. He thought it would be a great first project to have with the applicant.

Mr. Bethoney said there are components missing that will impact the parking. They do not show any dumpster or waste location. Mr. Sousa said there is a trash room in the utility room on the lower level. Mr. Bethoney asked how a truck would get down there. Mr. Sousa said a refuse truck cannot enter the building, so it would be either barrels or bins that would be picked up by a management company. Mr. Ferrara said there would be three to four yard containers into which residents would put their trash. The company would be able to roll them out for pick-up. Mr. Sousa said they can detail this for the Board. Mr. Bethoney then asked about snow storage and whether the building would cover the entire lot and negate the need for this. Mr. Sousa said the building covers the entire parking area to a degree, so there would be no plowing on the site. Mr. Bethoney asked about the transformer for the building. Mr. Sousa said they are not prepared for this scoping session, so he does not have that information. He said there would be a utility room in the left corner of the building, and it could be located there. Mr. Bethoney said this could not be the location. Mr. Sousa said they have not yet hired consultants for the project, so this is not clear. *Some of his comments could not be understood due to paper rustling over the microphone.*

Mr. Bethoney said he was reading some previous Planning Board decisions. The way mixed-use development should work is that the majority of the first level is commercial use. However, the majority of this first level is ramps. Mr. Sousa said this is for drive aisles. Mr. Bethoney said that

the majority underneath the building on the first floor is all ramps on the left side and significant ramping on the right side. Mr. Sousa said there is only ramping on one side. The majority of the left side is at grade with no commercial. Mr. Bethoney said the main idea of mixed-use is to have as much commercial space facing the street as possible. This does not really have much commercial space on the street. There is a jogged area near the entry. Mr. Sousa said there is a retail lobby, a linear storefront measuring about 60 feet, and 24 feet that is not retail. Mr. Bethoney said the commercial use should stretch across the building and not be taken up by parking or ramping. The building is on "stilts" on the left side, and is currently proposed to be open, but they can close it. Mr. Bethoney pointed out the 24 foot aisle goes about 60 feet, maybe longer, is taken up by an aisle. The other side is taken up by a ramp. The commercial use should stretch solely across the vast majority of the lower level.

Mr. Hampe disagreed that the 10% commercial required in the Zoning Bylaw has to be across the front, and did not believe that was the definition in the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Bethoney received a heavy-handed recommendation from Mr. Sisson **(Note: Mr. Bethoney is not talking about any Petruzzello projects. He always recuses himself from all discussions, reviews, or votes on those projects, and in fact is never present in the hearing room during those meetings.)** *The following comments did not make sense to the transcriptionist.* Cars would exit and enter over the sidewalk and the vast majority of the first floor except for 2,350 square feet. He asked the applicant what the total first floor square footage was, of which they are designating only 2,350 square feet as commercial. Mr. Sousa said this is approximately 8,700 square feet, so it is about one-third. Mr. Bethoney thought it was more than that. His point was that the majority of the square footage is being used for exiting and entering parking. Mr. Sousa agreed that one third is commercial space, and two-thirds, which is the majority, is used cars entering and existing. He then asked how they would define majority. Mr. Bethoney asked why the parking was put there, demonstrating where it could be, and why the parking was in the back of the building; he marked up the plan to demonstrate. Mr. Sousa said they needed a 24-foot wide parking aisle, and Mr. Bethoney said they could put it on the left, have the building beside it, and all the parking in back. This would give them sufficient commercial space. Mr. Sousa said getting the 23 spaces is related to how they parked the site.

Mr. Ferrara interjected that the project has gone back a good amount of time. Prior to meeting with Gamble Associates, he had an informal meeting with Mr. Hampe and, he believed, Mr. Bethoney, to discuss concepts. Mr. Hampe said that they did have an entrance on one side and parking in the back. Mr. Ferrara said it would be in his interests as a developer not to have to go underground. At that meeting, the architect at that time (he was dismissed and Mr. Sousa came on the project later) had a plan showing parking in the back with the aisle wrapping around and coming out the opposite side. Mr. Bethoney asked why they did not do a 24-foot wide two-lane aisle on the far left, with the building on the right and parking in the back. There would be no digging or ramping, and they would have the commercial space on the first floor. He asked why they had all the ramps and no commercial space. He said that Dedham Square Circle wants more commercial space, and 2,350 square feet is not much because of the ramps and driveways. Mr. Ferrara said he was going to discuss this with Mr. Sousa. He said that what was brought to his attention was having more street presence for commercial. As far as overall square footage of the actual commercial area, he understood that it is a smaller footprint in the scope of 9,000 square feet. Mr. Bethoney said he considered this "fake" commercial. The presence is there, but it is fake commercial space because of the residential entrance taking up commercial space. He wanted Mr. Ferrara to think about that. He also asked where the construction would be staged since the building goes from lot line to lot line and there is no space on either side. They would have to stage it from the street, but it is a very narrow section of Washington Street.

Mr. Bethoney explained that his job to help the developer create the best project for him and the Town. This is a Special Permit project, and the Board will need to determine that the benefits outweigh the negative impacts. Washington Street cannot be closed down to stage the building. Mr. Ferrara said he has a similar building going up in West Roxbury now. He said Mr. Bethoney has a great point. The location needs to be considered when sites are being bought that are tight on both sides. Discussions need to take place with the lumbar and steel companies and figure it out before you start. Mr. Bethoney said they should cut the left side of the building off, put in a roadway on the left, and put parking in the back. Staging can then take place on the left roadway. He wants a building that can work, be aesthetically pleasing, and meets the goals of what Dedham Square wants for functionality. He wants design, functionality, and good land use. He also thought the building was too high. He said they are talking about increasing the height of the commercial space, then trying to get three floors into the remaining footage, and not exceed 40 feet. He did not think that was possible. He told them to think about this.

Mr. Steeves said the brick needs to be full brick. It will need steel that will carry the brick. It will not be a veneer. Mr. O'Brien said that he and Mr. Steeves are in the construction business, and agreed with Mr. Bethoney on the staging and the design of the building. Mr. Bethoney noted that the location was an auto repair shop for many years, and asked if they had a 21E (Massachusetts Oil and Hazardous Material Release Prevention and Response Act). Mr. Hampe said they are under a contract, and this is a condition of the contract. Mr. Bethoney also asked about stormwater management.

Mr. Aldous said the project should be simple. The building is too big, too high, and there are too many apartments. Mr. Bethoney said the Board does think the site should be redeveloped. Someone will do it, and why should it not be the applicant. He said he is bothered by commercial space on the first floor and the exiting out of a tunnel onto the sidewalk and into the street. His father lived at 412 Washington Street and dealt with coming out of the driveway onto the sidewalk and beeping sirens. He was never comfortable with that. Mr. Sisson wrote a letter on another development and he recommended a three-story building, all storefront, and no "bat cave" (ramp onto the sidewalk); Mr. Bethoney agreed with him. There is plenty of room in the back to do something with parking if the building is shortened a bit and there is a two-way drive aisle on the left. There would be no digging and it would allow for staging on the property. He said the applicant will make a lot more money with the commercial uses on the first floor because they will rent out two real spaces, not one. He explained that the residential lobby and elevator could go in back, and the rest would be commercial.

Mr. Bethoney said that scoping sessions allow projects to evolve. Mr. Ferrara said it was music to his ears to know that parking can be on ground level. He will discuss parking spaces, units, and height with Mr. Sousa. Prior to coming to the Board, there were discussions with a local architect to get a sense of what was or was not allowed for lot coverage, floor area ratio, and height, and how the guidelines are implemented. He understood that 40 feet was allowed as measured to the ceiling of the top floor; this meets the guidelines for the zoning district. He will confirm this. Mr. Bethoney said he has to take what the Board is willing to negotiate. It will be fine if he tells the Board that he meets the regulations, everything is perfect, and the benefits far outweigh the negative impacts. However, the proposed building is far from that. He will need to work with the regulatory boards, which are the Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Conservation Commission, to get what they mutually agree upon as far as what the building can be. This is particularly due to the lot constraints that he has. He suggested that Mr. Ferrara stop thinking about it and overanalyzing it, and think more about what would be a good proposal and in keeping with the character of Dedham Square, and what the residents, businesses, and property owners of Dedham Square want. As he goes through the process, there will be many people at the meeting. He needs to think about what will be embraced as opposed to spending a lot of money only to have

to change it all later when he finds it is not embraced. He advised him to come up with renderings to try to figure out where to go from there, rather than spend a lot of money. Mr. Bethoney said cited the other developments and the site constraints they have. He is concerned about how the staging will be on a very narrow section of Washington Street. He knows the building will be smaller, but it will be more accessible for fire apparatus. Mr. Podolski agreed.

Mr. Findlen said that the applicant will be required to prepare a traffic study that addresses any impacts to traffic that will access the site. The study area and intersections will be identified, and reviewed by McMahon Associates, the peer reviewer. Parking is at a premium in Dedham Square, and he has no parking to speak of for the commercial (only two spots). Mr. Bethoney said that even if the Planning Board is not terribly concerned, there may be concerns that evolve based on public sentiment's concerns over the culmination of all the developments. He advised the applicant to address parking regardless of whether he feels that he meets the requirements. He should meet with neighborhood groups and abutters, particularly the residential buildings right behind the site. Everyone within a certain radius has to be notified of the Public Hearing, and there will be concerns about what the back of the building looks like, the landscaping, the visibility, and the parking, particularly the residents directly behind the proposed building.

Robert Curran, 321 Cedar Street: He is a past grand knight and trustee of the Knights of Columbus, Council 234, which is located at 369 Washington Street and abuts the proposed development. He agreed with the Board's comments, and asked how the building would be built. His building has 14 parking spaces, one for him, one for the Colonel, and 12 others. He has to have people towed out of his parking lot. He asked where the crew would park, how he would put the wall, the materials used, and how machinery would park. He was concerned about other business and how they would be resupplied by their vendors. He said he is very concerned, although he thought the building was aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Bethoney said his concerns would be addressed and considered through the permitting process as best they can be. He said Mr. Curran's concerns are about parking and visibility; these will be addressed. Mr. Curran said he was very concerned about how the building would be constructed in such a tight site.

Amy Haelsen, Executive Director of Dedham Square Circle: The Dedham Square improvement project was completed five years ago. She said this is what they dreamed about and hoped it would happen. She said that they hoped that the public funds would spur private investment, and it has happened all along Washington Street. She has met with Mr. Ferrara and Mr. Clifford, who shared the plans and spent time talking to Gamble Associates. She agreed with maximizing commercial space as much as possible. She personally did not have a problem with the height because the top floor is set back. This was discussed extensively by the Dedham Square Steering Committee, which included Ms. Porter and Mr. Podolski. She said they needed to be thoughtful about allowing commercial developers have a project that is feasible. Mr. Bethoney asked her if she was inferring that the Board had not given other developers the opportunity to build buildings that are feasible. Ms. Haelsen said the Board needs to be realistic about space involved. The numbers have to work for developers. She said if not allowing a fourth floor that is set back is not going to work for a developer – *she did not finish this sentence*. Mr. Bethoney said that at some point there has to be a level of feasibility money-wise to make a project work. Mr. O'Brien also said there are laws of physics. Ms. Haelsen asked if the D'Attilio building was taller than the Schortmann Building across from the Police Station. Mr. Bethoney said it was not. Mr. Hampe said the grade drops on Washington Street. Mr. Bethoney said they were talking about from grade to the peak of the roof. He said the proposed building is high. He asked if the applicant had an accurate rendering of the proposed building next to the Knights of Columbus. Mr. Sousa said it was 32 feet. Mr. Bethoney did not think the Knights of Columbus building was taller, but said it may be. He thought it was out of scale, however.

Ms. Haelsen liked the idea of redeveloping the property. Mr. Bethoney asked if she wanted the Board not to impose restrictions that would cause the developer to walk away from development. She said that was correct. She asked the height of the building across the street that has Blue Ribbon Barbeque. **Mr. Bethoney did not answer this because he recused himself from sitting, hearing, or voting on that project 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 discussion of the proposal, nor was he present in the building.** Mr. Podolski said it was 40 feet. Mr. Sousa said he was proposing 40 feet as measured to the ceiling. Mr. Podolski said he believed that the second building across the street was 36 feet; it is three stories and the fourth floor was taken off.

Mr. Bethoney said he gave his personal opinion about the proposal, as did Mr. Aldous. Mr. O'Brien said this is what the scoping session is all about, and every project that has come to the Board has gone through this type of scrutiny for its actual betterment. Ms. Haelsen said the building where Café Bagel is located was four stories high and very tall according to historic pictures. When the two buildings on Washington Street went up, people were wondering what was happening to historic Dedham Square. She understood the concern about the quick development, but at the same time, she feels that this is a very attractive building and the developers are very committed. She personally is very excited, as is Dedham Square Circle, other property owners, and merchants, about redevelopment of the site. Mr. Bethoney said the Board would hear from them as the process continues. He said that something new can happen in that location, something that is feasible.

George Panagopoulos, 34 Winstead Avenue: He and his family are residents and business owners in Dedham Square. He said the Town has treated his business, as well as the others, very well. He said there has been a serious problem with parking for many years, but the last few years have been very difficult. He said his business has dropped for the first time, as well as other people, in the past seven to eight years. Parking has been a huge issue, and needs to be tackled. He asked how much parking is required if another restaurant goes in. Mr. Bethoney said it would be different because a retail business is proposed. If the use is changed to restaurant, then the parking requirement increases depending on the number of seats and other variables. What is proposed right now is no food service on the first floor based on their parking calculations for retail. If the applicant cannot find a retail business and wants to change it to food service, they would need to return to the Board to look for an additional parking waiver. Mr. Panagopoulos said it is a beautiful building based on what Dedham Square Circle wants, but when he thinks about the hopes and dreams of those who already operate in the Square, he thinks it is a little unrealistic. He thinks it should be scaled down because businesses are starting to really hurt from the traffic. There are delivery trucks who cannot park on High Street because of time restrictions by the Police. He urged the Board to really consider parking. There needs to be parking for every customer, employee, and resident of the building. He recommended that there be no parking waiver, both as a business owner and a town resident.

Town planner Jarret Katz said that work is being done to correct these issues. A consultant is being hired. He and Economic Development Director John Sisson are working those issues. Mr. Bethoney said that Beta Group was hired to look at the parking in the Square, for which they were paid hundreds of thousands of dollars to look at the Square and redesign it. Mr. Katz said this is not about a redesign; this is looking at what can be done with shared parking between different commercial spaces, and different solutions on how to increase enforcement and metering in different ways. He would be happy to discuss this with the Board at some point. Mr. Bethoney noted that this was entitled a "plan," i.e., Dedham Square Parking Plan, and the Board always wants to be made aware of everything that would impact parking, traffic, and pedestrian access (walkability). Mr. Katz said this started a little prior to him becoming the town planner, so he has been working on gathering as much activity as he can in-house and inform the Board. This is part of the

project management spreadsheet that he will be introducing soon. Ms. Porter said that there will be an open house on Wednesday, July 25, 2018, at 6:30 p.m. in the Town Hall Conference Room to get input from the public about parking. Mr. Bethoney said he did not understand that, and asked what it is, when it was decided, and who decided it. Ms. Porter said it was Mr. Sisson as part of his parking study (*she was difficult to hear because of the air conditioner*). Mr. Bethoney asked if anyone on the Board knew anything about this; no one did. She said she gets e-mails about this for every meeting. Mr. Bethoney asked her to forward them to the Board.

Mr. Bethoney said that the Planning Board would appreciate notification for all of these types of things. The people holding these discussions should want their input. The redesign of Dedham Square was never reviewed by the Planning Board, nor were any comments given, and no recommendations made, and no one asked for any input. The Board does not appreciate being left out of things with which they should be assisting.

Jean Zeiler, 59 Woodleigh Road: She liked the way the building looks, and said she has been disappointed in other buildings due to "lack of imagination in the designs." She said that underground parking could be a good thing if feasible rather than above-ground parking. She wondered if there was a space in back that could be used for something other than cars. Mr. Bethoney said the proposal is for cars in back, as well as underground. She asked about the staging, and said that it might be worth shutting down that section of Washington Street for it. She said cars can go around in a different direction. She said the short-term inconvenience would be worth it for something really nice to go in. Mr. Panagopoulos explained the closing down of Washington Street many years ago to build the bridge where the White Dove used to be. There was tremendous trouble for businesses during the Dedham Square revitalization and reconstruction program. Shutting down Washington Street for many months to come would be yet another hardship for the businesses in the Square. He said they cannot afford shutting down Washington Street for months, which is why the building has to be built on site and allow access from Washington Street. People avoid Dedham Square at all costs as it is.

Mr. Hampe thanked the Board for the time and their input into the project. They will return when they have new information. Mr. Bethoney asked them to take the comments seriously, and Mr. Hampe said they always do.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS: Nothing

NEXT MEETING: July 26, 2018, 7 p.m.

Mr. Bethoney said the agenda is still in process. He asked that the packages be delivered as soon as possible.

Mr. Bethoney said he saw an article on the Patch regarding the Open House noted previously. Mr. Sisson is the person to contact for information. Mr. Bethoney will call him tomorrow to let him know that the Planning Board would like to be informed of any planning discussions related to any planning in Dedham. The Board completely agreed.

Mr. Podolski moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

/snw