

**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](mailto:jdoherty@dedham-ma.gov)**

**Jarret Katz, Town Planner  
[jkatz@dedham-ma.gov](mailto:jkatz@dedham-ma.gov)**

**PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES  
October 25, 2018, 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 Public Hearings

**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.

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>John Aplin</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>327 Whiting Avenue, Dedham, MA</b>
<b>Zoning District:</b>	<b>General Residence</b>
<b>Representative(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>John Aplin</b></li><li>• <b>Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting, P.O. Box 626, Lexington, MA 02420</b></li></ul>

Mr. Aplin submitted a letter to the Board seeking a temporary occupancy permit for 327 Whiting Avenue. Mr. Henderson said that building construction, utilities, and everything required for operation are complete. The retaining wall, drainage, sewer, and water are finished. The remaining items are a few components of landscaping along the frontage strip; this should be done in the next few weeks. Fencing needs to be fixed, and they are waiting for brackets and hardware. The binder is down but striping and parking signage need to be done. Final pavement will need to wait until spring 2019 because asphalt plants are closing, so they will have to wait for the spring to complete the topcoat and striping. He anticipates the other items to be finished in about a month. They plan to finish everything but the topcoat, so they are looking for temporary occupancy through May 23, 2019; incomplete items will be finished no later than that. Mr. Cimeno will not issue a temporary occupancy permit without Planning Board approval.

Mr. Steeves said that, other than the unfinished items, the location looks like a million bucks, and they have done a nice job. Ms. Porter asked if the current paving is safe for cars, pedestrians, and bikes; it is.

Mr. Podolski moved to allow a temporary occupancy permit through no later than May 23, 2019, and that the items on Mr. Aplin's letter of October 24, 2018, are to be completed by November 30, 2018. Mr. Aldous seconded the motion. The striping and finish coat of asphalt will be completed by the end of May 2019. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. A letter will be sent to Mr. Cimeno indicating that the Planning Board approved the request for the temporary certificate of occupancy under those conditions.

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Costco</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>200 Legacy Boulevard, Dedham, MA</b>
<b>Zoning District:</b>	<b>RDO</b>
<b>Representative(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Stephen Glowacki, Civil Engineer, R. J. O'Connell &amp; Associates, 80 Montvale Avenue, Suite 201, Stoneham, MA 02180</b></li><li>• <b>John Paul Andrews, Director of Real Estate Development, Costco</b></li></ul>
<b>Town Consultant:</b>	<b>Steven Findlen, McMahon Associates</b>

Mr. Glowacki was before the Board in February 2018 to get input on construction of an egress curb cut from the Costco gas station to improve traffic flow on the site. Traffic counts were obtained as requested by the Board, and Atlantic Traffic was retained to assist them. It was concluded that it makes sense to open a curb cut at the far corner of the site. The entry is congested, and this curb cut was originally proposed to be exit-only (*he pointed these out on the plans, but the transcriber could not see where he was pointing*). It was determined that the best course of action is to drive traffic to the right with no left turn restrictions; signage would be included. The entry would be opened up further back so there would be no temptation for vehicles to come across. To alleviate traffic further, they thought it would be advisable to open up an entry further back as a bypass to let vehicles in another parking area come along. If the Board supports these changes, they will file a formal submission.

Mr. Podolski asked if the work has been done by the gas station. Mr. Glowacki said it only proposed; no work has been done on anything since the gas facility has been open. Ms. Porter asked if they had considered a three-way stop at the intersection connected to Legacy Place. Mr. Glowacki said this had been considered but offering any option for a vehicle to go straight across would present traffic issues and offer a conflicting movement. Ms. Porter wondered if they had looked at the impact of putting STOP signs in at the intersection between Legacy Boulevard and Legacy Place and keeping the curb cuts that are proposed. She said that a lack of STOP signs causes people turning out of Legacy Place to drive unsafely and having signs may slow traffic and allow people to exit easily out of the gas station. Mr. Glowacki said they did not propose any restrictions, but thought it was a good suggestion. Mr. O'Brien wondered if it is wide enough for a right-hand turn. Mr. Glowacki said remains a single lane, and there are several maneuvers, i.e., coming out of the gas station and people going into Legacy Place. There is a wetland area, and it is very restrictive and has a sharp slope down. Mr. O'Brien wondered how people would take a right if there is only one lane and it comes to a stop. Mr.

Glowacki said the three-way stop would mitigate traffic but would create a stop condition that may restrict vehicles and cause a back-up.

Mr. Andrews said this issue was brought up by the warehouse manager. It is an internal traffic issue because there is only one exit back into the site, and people were getting jammed in there. Most people get gas first and then go into the store, but they are trying to get relief for those who shop first and then get gas. They engaged John Harter of Atlantic Traffic after hearing the Board's comments in February, and he did some counts and analyzed what is going on. He then made recommendations, including two curb cuts. He did not mention signage, although Mr. Andrews will bring this up to him if that is the Board's concern.

Ms. Porter said the second curb cut makes sense. Mr. Bethoney said that the traffic engineer needs to look at the traffic counts before the Board would consider any STOP signs on the main road. Stop and go traffic is terrible. He wants to be sure it is practical and works but thinks Mr. Harter will say no. A STOP sign across the way before entering the main road is a necessity and should be there. He had no issues with the curb cut. The biggest issue is the entry on the corner. Mr. Glowacki said the radius is very tight. Mr. Bethoney said it does not work and explained that people have to go into the opposite lane to exit. Mr. Andrews had considered closing that. Mr. Bethoney said a traffic/civil engineer needs to determine how it can work safely. He would like this evaluated more than any of the other issues because the approach to the exit does not work. The main road is used by an apartment complex and the other parking lot and will exit from the relief point. Mr. O'Brien thought the new exit worked better than the first one because it draws traffic back onto a safe roadway. There was discussion about the curb cuts, *but the transcriptionist could not determine which ones were discussed.*

Mr. Andrews will discuss the Board's suggestions with the traffic engineer, including the STOP signs and closing the entry on the corner. He will then make an application and return to the Board.

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Frank Gobbi</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>530 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA</b>
<b>Zoning District:</b>	<b>Highway Business</b>
<b>Representative(s):</b>	<b>Frank Gobbi</b>

Mr. Gobbi was invited to the meeting by Mr. Katz to discuss grading of the parking lot at 530 Providence Highway. He is not on the agenda.

The Conservation Commission brought up some questions on grading when Mr. Gobbi paved the parking lot. They questioned why the grade changes were made, as the plans were submitted to them without grading changes. He did not need a plan for the Planning Board. Mr. Katz said he is before the Board to explain why the grading changes were made and whether he needs to submit a plan to the Board for approval if substantial changes were made. He said that Conservation Commission and the Building Commissioner wanted him to see the Board about this.

Mr. Gobbi explained that in an effort to comply with ADA laws, he raised the grade so that there were no steps and entry into the building would be level. He chose to do that rather

than constructing a ramp. He raised the grade and sloped it to the street. He did not modify the parking layout, landscaping, lighting, access, or egress.

Mr. Podolski said this is about an assertion by Conservation Commission and/or Building Department that the raising the grade to make handicapped access available is shedding water onto Mah Way. He wondered if raising the grade on a site triggered Planning Board action. Mr. Bethoney asked if Mr. Cimeno sent him to the Planning Board, and Mr. Gobbi said he did not. He believed it was the Conservation Commission. Mr. Bethoney said the Planning Board has no purview over stormwater runoff. The only question is whether what he has done triggers site plan review. He can check with Town Council, Mr. Katz, or poll the Board. Mr. O'Brien wished that the Conservation Commission or whoever else referred this to the Board had written specific on what they are looking for. Mr. Bethoney apologized that he did not look into anything, but he was unaware that he was coming to the meeting.

Mr. O'Brien said a letter should be sent to the Conservation Commission and whoever else has an interest in this issue. Mr. Bethoney said that the Planning Board is regulatory and has no enforcement ability. A determination needs to be made paving a parking lot triggers site plan review. The only section of the Zoning Bylaw is modification of an existing lot, and Mr. Gobbi has made no modifications listed, and the parking layout remains the same. The Board will be in touch with Mr. Gobbi if it needs to discuss this further.

### **PUBLIC HEARING, ARTICLE 13**

Planned Residential Development ("PRD") at 219 Lowder Street (Dedham Assessor's Map 89, Lot 37) submitted by Collis, LLC and shown on the Plan entitled "Plan of Land, 219 Lowder Street, Assessor's Map 89, Lot 37, Dedham, Massachusetts 02026 - PRD Concept" (Sheet C3), dated August 1, 2018, prepared by Henderson Consultant Services Inc. with the following conditions: (a) the PRD shall have a maximum of seven (7) dwelling units; (b) the minimum dedicated open space within the PRD shall be 21 percent of the total area; and (c) subject to a comprehensive review of the site development plan by the Planning Board, or take any other action relative thereto.

**Present:** Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA  
Gregory Carlevale, Collis, LLC  
Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting, P.O. Box 626, Lexington,  
MA 02420

Mr. Katz stated that notifications were sent out with the Town Meeting packets by Assistant Town Manager, Nancy Baker, on October 10, 2018. It was advertised in the *Dedham Times* on October 5, 2018, and October 12, 2018. Ms. Porter moved to waive the reading of the public notice, seconded by Mr. Aldous, voted unanimously 5-0. Mr. Podolski moved to open the Public Hearing, seconded by Ms. Porter, voted unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Zahka said the Planning Board is the petitioner of the article, but he is representing Collis, LLC. They requested that the Planning Board, consistent with the previous Planned Residential Development (PRD) at Cottage Circle, treat this article like a zoning article. It is not a zoning amendment or map change. The Zoning Bylaw on PRD is somewhat ambivalent on how to get to Town Meeting. The process is three steps: (1) review of concept plan by Planning Board, which the requested to be treated as a Public Hearing with notice to direct abutters

and publication in the *Dedham Times*; this has been completed; (2) recommendation to Town Meeting on the concept plan; and (3) vote at Town Meeting.

The site at 219 Lowder Street contains just shy of 65,000 square feet of land and is in the Single Residence B zoning district. Under conventional zoning, an ANR plan showed that the property could be divided into five building lots meeting all the requirements for the Single Residence B zoning district. Instead of that, the applicant submitted a concept plan for a Planned Residential Development consisting of an 8,500 square foot single building that included seven residential units. Each unit would have two bedrooms, and most would be less than 2,000 square feet. Most of the parking would be under the building. The concept plan that the Board reviewed depicted approximately 21% open space on the site.

The concept plan underwent a Public Hearing process with two sessions in addition to a scoping session. A preliminary peer review was sent to McMahon Associates, who found several issues to which the applicant responded. There was tremendous abutter and neighborhood outreach well before anything was filed with the Planning Board. There were numerous meetings to discuss the various options for the future development of the property. The result of these meetings was the PRD concept was submitted to the Planning Board. At the Public Hearing, a number of neighbors spoke, and there were numerous letters from the neighbors. The abutters were overwhelmingly in support of the concept plan submitted to the Board. They are now asking the Planning Board to recommend Article 13 to Town Meeting. If it is recommended and adopted, the applicant will return to the Planning Board with a significant site development plan and go through more rigorous review. They have brought all the slides and plans and will review these if the Board so desires.

No one in the audience spoke in favor or in opposition to the petition. The Board had no questions.

Mr. Podolski moved to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Ms. Porter moved to support Article 13 and recommend to Town Meeting that it be so voted. Mr. O'Brien seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. A letter will be sent to Town Meeting members prior to Town Meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING, ARTICLE 14**

This article was submitted by Michael A. Podolski, Esq., Planning Board, and Carmen DelloIacono, Town Meeting Member.

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaws, Section 7.4 entitled "MIXED USE DEVELOPMENTS," as follows:

Insert a new Section 7.4.1.5, as follows:

In order to establish a Mixed Use Development, a comprehensive concept plan, including identification of all special permits that may be required, shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review. If approved by the Planning Board, the Planning Board shall then recommend the concept plan to Town Meeting for its approval; if the plan is the subject of a petitioned article, it shall be referred to the Planning Board for its review and the Planning Board shall provide a recommendation prior to or at Town Meeting. If the concept plan is approved

by Town Meeting, any special permits or site plans approved by the Planning Board hereunder shall conform to such concept plan.

Amend Section 7.4.2.1 by inserting the following underlined language:

A Mixed Use Development may be allowed only upon issuance of a Special Permit by the Planning Board and after Town Meeting approval of the concept plans submitted under Section 7.4.1.5.

Amend Section 7.4.2.2 by inserting the following underlined language:

If a concept plan is approved by Town Meeting under Section 7.4.1.5 and such Mixed Use Development application or project also requires other Special Permits, the Planning Board shall be the Special Permit Granting Authority (SPGA) for all such Special Permits.

Insert a new Section 7.4.3.5 as follows:

A detailed site development plan conforming to the approved concept plan shall be submitted to the Planning Board, and shall show and identify all work to be performed and construction to be undertaken with such detail as is required for site plans, including all elevations, and use of all buildings. The procedure for the review and approval of the detailed development plans shall follow, so far as apt, the approval regulations and procedures for a definitive subdivision plan, including the requirement for a covenant or security to guarantee the performance of all work in accordance with the plan and the schedule approved by the Planning Board.

Mr. Bethoney stated that, due to a clerical error in the notification process, he has been advised by Town Council to open the Public Hearing on Article 14, and immediately continue it to the next meeting on November 8, 2018, so the adjacent communities can be duly notified as required by State statute. Mr. Katz said that the only notification sent out was the Town Meeting packets sent out by Assistant Town Manager, Nancy Baker, on October 10, 2018. He had originally thought that was enough to cover the warrant article. After discussion with Mrs. Baker and Economic Development Director John Sisson, there was concern that, since the proposal and warrant article could potentially change the wording in the Zoning Bylaw, the change would require notification to abutting towns and state agencies. Mr. Bethoney asked if the article was published in the *Dedham Times* for two consecutive weeks. Mr. Katz said it was not, but Mrs. Doherty said it was. She has notified the *Dedham Times* to run it again. Mr. Bethoney said that the State agencies (MAPC, DHCD, and Regional Planning Agency) and abutting towns (Milton, Needham, Canton, and Westwood) should be notified under Massachusetts General Law, Chapter 40A, Section 5. Mr. Katz said the notification was sent on October 23, 2018, when he was realized it should be done. Mr. Podolski said that Mr. Katz should send notifications again as required.

Mr. Podolski moved to waive the reading of the public notice, seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Ms. Porter moved to open the Public Hearing for Article 14, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Article 14 was read aloud.

No testimony was taken per Town Council's advice. Ms. Porter moved to continue the Public Hearing to Thursday, November 8, 2018, at 7:15 p.m. Mr. Aldous seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Mr. Bethoney apologized to Mr. DelloIacono for this issue.

**The Board took a five-minute recess.**

**Applicant:** Town of Dedham/Public Safety Building  
**Project Address:** 26 Bryant Street, Dedham, MA  
**Zoning District:** Central Business  
**Representative(s):**

- James Kern, Town Manager
- Fire Chief William Spillane
- Police Chief Michael D'entremont
- Brad Dore, Assoc. AIA, LEED™, AP<sup>L</sup>, MCPPO, Principal, Dore and Whittier, 260 Merrimac Street Building 7, 2nd Floor, Newburyport, MA 01950
- Chip Heitcamp, Dore and Whittier
- Nick Kavan, PE, PTOE, Senior Transportation Engineer, Nitsch Engineering, 2 Center Plaza, Suite 430, Boston, MA 02108-1928
- Stephen D. Farr, PE, ENV SP, LEED, Nitsch Engineering
- Jonathan Hedlund, PE, Senior Project Manager, Nitsch Engineering
- William Brown, Principal, Brown & Sardina, 24 Roland Street, Boston, MA 02129
- James Strahan, Brown & Sardina
- Jeff Bandini, Nitsch Engineering
- Ron Votta, Owner's Project Manager, Town of Dedham

**Town Consultant:** Steven Findlen, Senior Project Manager, McMahon Associates  
Angela Bleeker, EIT, McMahon Associates

This is a continuation of a Public Hearing for a Major Nonresidential Project for a proposed three-story, approximately 49,500 square foot public safety building on the site of the current Town Hall (Ames) that would meet the needs of the Police and Fire Departments. Mr. Findlen was hired to do a major site plan review of the project on behalf of the Planning Board. The peer review was paid for by the applicant. The site plans, traffic study, and other studies were reviewed for compliance with the Town's Zoning Bylaw. He was accompanied by Angela Bleeker, EIT, McMahon Associates. McMahon has been reviewing private development and public projects for the Town for almost 15 years, typically looking at site plans, traffic studies, vehicle and site circulation, parking, pavement markings, lighting, landscaping, loading operations, and any other pertinent information related to the project for compliance with the ZBL. Discrepancies are noted in correspondence with the applicant, who responds to all issues. Mr. Findlen has worked on the Avery School, Hebrew Senior Life, Legacy Place, Costco, BJ's, and Best Buy, among others.

The Public Safety Building (PSB) is part two of a campus project on the site. The town hall will be in the Ames building (Ames), and the PSB will be next door, completing the campus vision/civic center on the site. Meetings two years ago with departments drove the size of the building, but there were constraints on the site, i.e. site size and building footprint. Parking and turning movements are also big concerns.

Mr. Bethoney reviewed the issues to be discussed at this meeting:

1. Project overview and summary
2. Site plan
3. Vehicular and pedestrian traffic circulation
4. Parking
5. Signage and pavement markings
6. Trash and loading
7. Snow and snow storage
8. Landscaping
9. Site lighting
10. Comments required on site plan

A rendering of the building was shown, approved by Town Meeting and reviewed by other boards. Building orientation is a large topic. It is larger than Ames, and there will be a lot of earth movement. Overall frontage of the building above grade is about 20 feet longer, and from the Union Street side it is 70 feet longer. Site constraints will be an issue. This is a campus situation with Ames, and is to be reviewed in its entirety. The existing fire station will remain operational during construction, limiting how close they can get to it during underground work. The limit of work overlaps the property line. The Town will have to go outside that to complete the work, so some private property will need to be acquired.

There is an access ramp for the underground section off Union Place. There has been a slight shift of columns, so a waiver will be sought for the size of the underground parking spaces. This will be added to the final application. If they do not meet regulations, a waiver for quantity and size will be requested. Everything above grade meets size requirement. There will be a fitness room, break room, roll call room, women's and men's locker rooms, and armory in the lower level with storage for mechanicals, equipment storage, and elevator equipment. There is no plan for storing an ambulance at this time. There will be no public parking underground. There is some outside storage for evidence, fire storage, large items for trucks, and motorcycles. The trash area will be shared. They are making provisions for compactors, and conduit will be added. Snow will be taken off-site from the storage area. Radiant heat aprons will melt snow, minimizing snow removal in several locations and preserving the concrete. Only sand will be used because salt will damage concrete.

Parking on campus will be for Town Hall, Senior Center, Police Station, and Fire Station. The Ames site has 50 existing spaces. The Order of Conditions requires 143 parking spaces on the Ames project; 50 are existing spaces at the current Town Hall. The actual total from the Ames project was 93 spaces between front and back lots. Some of the parking in back will be interrupted and redistributed. They will end up with 87 spaces at Town Hall. There will be spaces for Town Hall at another location. Access will be by stairs and a ramp. *This was pointed to on the map, and the transcriptionist could not determine the location.* Police and fire personnel will park under the building via a ramp; this will be adequate for their needs. There will be 10-12 spaces in front for visitor parking, with spaces for Ames in a side lot.

The ZBL requires the PSB to have 125 spaces (1:400 per square foot). There will be 39 above ground spaces and 2 spaces on the apron. This, when added to the 86 underground parking spaces, totals 125 spaces. The remaining 87 spaces will be used for Town Hall, Senior Center,



and public parking. The total campus requires 370; they have 212, and will seek waiver for 158 spaces. Mr. Dore said they did a total buildout analysis, and they could not physically get that number of spaces on the site, so they went underground to add 86 spaces. Mr. Bethoney asked if the site was deficient for the use; Mr. Dore said they are physically unable to meet use requirements for parking even if there was no building. Mr. Podolski said the plans he has are from August 2018 and have different numbers. He asked why there are no updated ones for the Public Hearing, and when the Board would get them. Mr. Heitcamp said a lot has been changed since then.

Mr. Bethoney asked if it is the applicant's representation that the 125 dedicated spaces provided for public safety plus the 87 spaces for the other uses, even though the requirement is 370, are adequate for the campus. Mr. Dore said he did not think they could make that representation. They have represented is that this is the maximum number of spaces they are able to fit on the site. They were given this space for phase 2 of the campus. They have maxed out what they need to fit on it and still meet some of the considerations that were asked, i.e., providing green space. Mr. Bethoney said the Board needs to approve a project that it believes will work in real life environment. The Town needs a Public Safety Building that functions well. If it is provided with a \$45 million dollar facility, the residents, who are paying for it, should have one that works well. As the process continues, there have to be representations made by the developers who they believe their proposal works well. If it does not work well, it would be difficult for the Board to take a positive position. The Board can work with landscaping or building design, but it cannot work with a project in which parking, which is a major component, does not work well. Mr. Heitcamp said this has been discussed with Town Manager James Kern and Assistant Town Manager Nancy Baker. Mrs. Baker anticipates that 6-7 new positions will be added to Town Hall staff and another 6-7 employees to the Senior Center once they move into the new Town Hall. Currently, approximately 50 people work in Town Hall, although it can vary. This leaves about 37 spaces that can be used by the Senior Center and the public.

About 18 spaces are used for the fire station on a daily basis, but Chief Spillane anticipates this growing by one person per shift in the future. Police Chief Michael D'Entremont said the biggest demand is at shift change in the morning, and there are about 55. The only public safety parking spots will be underground in the PSB. Parking is in various places right now. Only a handful of people use the spaces in front of the station. He did not anticipate personnel growth in the short term. All the personnel parking will fit under the new station. Any fire vehicles or trucks would be in the apparatus space. Ms. Porter asked Mr. Heitcamp if they had considered having the functional spaces in the basement above ground so there would be more underground parking. He said it is more of a height concern, plus there are code restrictions that would increase the height of the building. There was extensive discussion using the map, but *the transcriptionist could not determine where these areas were*. The remaining spaces can be used by Town Hall employees or the public. Mr. Heitcamp said they counted this toward the Public Safety Building to meet the ZBL.

Ms. Porter noted that the original parking numbers at Ames have changed. Mr. Heitcamp said there were 93 spaces originally, but they were unable to retain those when they redistributed them to the side. He showed where spaces were added and an aisle widened. Street parking will be added along the curb. Mr. Dore said it was modified to make the site circulation work between the two lots. This leaves 106 spaces above ground with approximately 50 to be used

by Town Hall employees. Mr. Votta said there is a possibility that 7-8 spaces could be gained in front of Ames. The sidewalk is very wide, and there is also a sidewalk on the other side of the construction fence. If the curb is brought in, there could be 7-8 spaces gained. This is being investigated independent of the Public Safety Building project. Mr. Heitcamp said there would be three spaces on either side of the intersection going into Bryant Street. Mr. Bethoney noted that this will narrow the road, but the road is wide enough to accommodate this. It would also serve as a traffic calming measure, slowing cars down as they come into Dedham Square. Ms. Porter did not believe this was a sufficient traffic calming measure, and was concerned that there would be a blind spot on Bryant Street; this has a lot of heavy traffic. In addition, the Department of Public Works and Engineering were concerned about snow plowing. This will be discussed at a later point. Mr. O'Brien asked why there was no space for an ambulance. Chief Spillane said that the Town uses an outside ambulance company with which it is very satisfied. Moving forward, there is no intention for the Fire Department to assume ambulance service. If this changes, it can be addressed.

Mr. Bethoney asked who will go on record to say that this works well and why. Every other developer is required to do that. Mr. Dore said that the parking for the Public Safety Building will work well with respect to the number of staff, but it is an unknown with respect to Town Hall and how it functions daily. To have a definitive statement that it will work is somewhat judgmental. This will always be the case in an urban environment.

With regard to vehicular circulation, there are two wide aisles for two-way traffic. There will be six handicapped spaces. There will be one two-way and one-way exits. They will remove 20 spaces in the back and add a median. There is a right turn only drive exit at one driveway due to the proximity of the intersection. Circulation was discussed with DPW and Engineering. The sally port for the police will have room for two vehicles. There is secure access, and signage will indicate "Restricted Vehicles Only." *The transcriptionist could not determine where any of these areas were.* Union Place will be two-way to allow access to Route One. Union Place is not often used as a cut through to Route One, so the Town is considering using it as a restricted use road for police and fire only. There was discussion about local permitting so that the buildings on Union Place could still use it, but there is no clear cut answer to that right now. Mr. Findlen said that, in doing this, the building behind Town Hall would not be able to use it. Mr. Heitcamp said that Mr. Kern is working on this.

Ms. Porter asked where the driveway with the right turn only exit is; *this was pointed out on the map, but could not be identified by the transcriptionist.* Mr. Bethoney asked if the radius would be changed from Washington Street onto Bryant Street. Mr. Heitcamp said that, after discussion with the Planning Board, DPW and the town engineer, they are considering making it a more perpendicular intersection with a STOP line. Cars will not be able to access Bryant Street by sweeping into it; they will have to make a right turn onto the street. This will require cars to come up slower into the intersection where cars would be exiting, and thus be safer; the new roadway will be closer to the intersection than it is now. Intersections will be discussed at a later point. There will be an Opticom system for emergency response at the intersections, which will activate when calls come in. A beacon across the street will stop traffic, and there will be systems stopping vehicles at the other locations. This will clear the intersections when emergency vehicles need to use them.

Mr. Bethoney said that, if the level of service is going to degrade as a result of the project, the applicant is obligated to propose mitigation measures to offset the impact. They should not return and tell the Board that the level of service has gone from a C to an F, but there is nothing they can do there. They must look into that carefully because the intersections are brutal today. Any time a project comes in that is proposed, the town has the opportunity to make improvements, especially when the proposal negatively impacts what already does not work well. Mr. Heitcamp understood.

Mr. Findlen has reviewed the entire application set including the site plan from the August submission, which has not changed from the initial review. He reviewed the full traffic study and has submitted two letters to the Board. He specifically discussed issues with the site plan, and has identified 30 issues. He also went through the traffic report and identified 25-26 issues. This is the first time he has seen the plans without the arrows, but some of his comments were that the traffic study did not match up with the plans in terms of circulation; he has asked for clarification so they both match. Mr. Heitcamp said the only change that they have reviewed was the parking counts. Mr. Dore said they also changed the dimensions of a couple of spaces underground because of changes to the structure as part of the design. Mr. Findlen said they met informally this week to discuss some of the issues, but he has not received formal responses in writing to tie into some of the issues discussed at that time. Mr. Heitcamp said that some of the issues are out of sync because the traffic report was done a year and a half prior to the design. They will update the submission.

Chief Spillane reviewed the apparatus turning movements through and in front of the site. The curbs work. They reviewed how the apparatus comes through the parking lot, out of the driveway, and into the bay, and how it swings onto Union Place. Mr. Findlen has not seen a formal written response on this. Mr. Dore said they will respond to all questions formally.

Mr. Brown discussed pedestrian site circulation. The sidewalks along Washington Street and Bryant Street will use the same details as Dedham Square (brick edges with concrete infill). He explained where pedestrians would come into and out of the building; *the transcriptionist could not determine where any of these areas were because he pointed at the map.* Striped areas for handicapped spaces, grades (4% and 5% at two areas), and location of the stairs with railing were shown. An open space at a triangular area has granite pavement, a granite wall that will protect pedestrians seated on the benches from traffic, and seat walls. The benches will be the same as those in Dedham Square. The Fire Station bell will be in this area. The planting plans have been reviewed by the Conservation Commission. There is a rain garden with a two foot depression that draws water from the parking lot. The bottom is stone, and there are plantings around the basin. There is no lawn.

Mr. Bethoney said that anything represented on a plan must be what the Board expects to be on the ground when it is completed. Nothing should be embellished. Approval will condition that the rendering represented throughout the review is part of the record and is what will be on the ground. Mr. Brown said the canopy of the trees they install will vary, some being six feet, some smaller. One tree will have a canopy of 25 feet. The rendering shows what canopies will be in about 15 years, not what they will look like when initially planted. Mr. Bethoney said the plans should indicate this. Mr. Dore asked if it would help if they noted that the representation shown on the plans is based on 15-year expectancy; Mr. Bethoney said that would

be fine as long as it was discussed with the Board, and they show at what height the landscaping was planted. Mr. Podolski said he thought it was disingenuous to show sizes on the plan that are not what will actually be planted. The plan should reflect the exact size that is going to be planted.

Ms. Porter said there is going to be a lot of public interest in the project, and people without parks nearby have great hopes for the green space. There should be better focus on the seating area and visuals on this area on the next drawings so the public can get a sense of what it will be. She also said a larger set of drawings would be better. Mr. Brown said the best thing to do is to look at the construction drawings to see the detail. Mr. Bethoney asked the development team if, in their professional opinion, there are typically gathering areas next public safety facilities where there can be emergency situations. Mr. Dore said there are probably none. However, they are looking at this site as more of a municipal campus. There have been a number of community meetings to discuss community use.

The entrances, benches, and trash receptacles were shown. Pavers and benches will be the same as at the Town Hall. Security bollards will prevent ramming into the building. They will be planting on structure, so there will be trees in aluminum planters that match the aluminum on the building; they are raised approximately 3½ feet. There will be square planters, and a longer planter with two trees to provide a buffer for the apparatus bay. The flagpole will be in a plinth made out of granite that matches the granite on the building. He showed the access to a ramp coming down past the sally port. There will be a gate, the location of which was pointed to and could not be determined. This will require a pass card and not be accessible to the general public. There will be five bike racks, a handicapped ramp, and plantings. He showed the 120 foot radio towers on the plan, which are necessary for two-way communication. He supplied images of the proposed benches, bollards, etc.

Ms. Porter said that, given that the site is a campus but was not planned as such originally, it would be helpful to do an approximation of what the whole campus would look like, i.e., where there will be plantings. Mr. Brown said they did not do the landscaping at Ames, so they would need to go to the site to see what is actually there as compared with what is on the plan. Mr. Dore believed that there have been some changes from the original plan throughout the construction period. He said they could put something together to show the campus perspective to give a sense of it.

Mr. Bethoney asked how the abutting area, shown on the plan as the gray area, is contiguous with the Public Safety Building. He could not determine what it is because it does not look like the approved plan. He also does not know to what extent it is complete. This needs to be reviewed. The Board wants the two sites to be one contiguous campus, so if it does not gel with Ames, Ames needs to be corrected. Mr. Brown said the initial concept there was reasonable, but there is a better way to execute it with native perennial plants mixed with native shrubs that have leaves throughout the year. Mr. Bethoney said that right now, the site looks like a savannah that has died. This is why the Board wants the plans to show exactly what is to be planted. He said the Board did not get what they perceived they would. He asked that the applicant to look at the campus landscaping. Mr. O'Brien said that it appears that things have changed on the Ames site and there is less space now. He was looking forward to a com-

munity space, especially at the Town Hall, for celebration, for a meeting place, and for townspeople to come together. He wondered what green space is left, and said the Board needs to review the campus situation.

Mr. Bethoney said the Board wants it to look like a campus, a contiguously green, well landscaped site from one end of Town Hall to the end of the Public Safety Building. This is what was always discussed. If the landscaping at Town Hall is complete, it needs to be completely re-done. If it is not complete and more work needs to be done, the Board needs to see how different it would look from what it is right now. Mr. Brown said he thinks the landscaping along the edge lacks structure. Mr. Dore said their specific task does not include the Town Hall, but he will talk with Mr. Kern to try to meet the request. He will report back on this. Mr. Votta said the Town Hall plantings were done as approved with no substitutions, but it has not been kept up. There are a lot of weeds, it has not been trimmed, and it is growing wild. Mr. Bethoney said it was not done per the representation, only per the fine print. He believed that the plans shown this evening are different from what is on the ground. He assumed that the developer came to the Board in good faith. Mr. Votta said that it is difficult to distinguish the plants from weeds. The plants do not need a lot of water, and there is no well on sell on the site.

Mr. Steeves asked Mr. Votta if he could be the project manager for the PSB site and have it go the way it should, not like the Town Hall. Mr. Votta said it should go forward. The Town Hall situation cannot be discussed at this time, but there were issues that caused the project to shut down. It will hopefully be completed within the next month. He said he will watch the PSB carefully to ensure that nothing happens. The Town Hall project was started on August 10, 2016, and was expected to be completed in July 2017. Mr. Bethoney said nothing can be done on the PSB until the Town Hall is completed so the current Town Hall can be razed. Mr. Kern said the Town is in the process of hopefully agreeing to a completion agreement with the bonding company responsible for completing the project. Under that agreement, which has been drafted but not yet approved by the Board of Selectmen, the substantial completion will be around St. Patricks' Day in March 2019. After that, there is a sequence of things that have to be completed outside the building. Total completion is targeted for May 2019. Construction on the PSB would hopefully start in mid-November if the Town and the surety company can come to an agreement.

Mr. Podolski asked if the new Town Hall has heat. Mr. Votta said it does not. There is water in the system, sprinkler systems, standpipes for the Fire Department, and plumbing. Mr. Podolski asked if the pipes will freeze if there is a bad winter. Mr. Votta said that the town is working toward an agreement to be able to start the permanent heating systems in the building prior to an official agreement. If that fails, they will use temporary heat.

Mr. Heitcamp showed the photometric plan for the site. McMahon had commented on spillover on the property line. The area of main concern, the location of which was pointed to and could not be determined, abutted businesses and parking areas for the businesses, some of which are right up to the property line. They will address the light levels there. Another area of concern was identified, again, the location of which was pointed to and could not be determined, but there will eventually (in 15 years or so) be a dense line of arborvitae. They will review the fixtures and the locations to ensure that there is no spillover to adjacent properties. The other McMahon comment was that the lighting plan should be stamped; they will do

that. He will send a pdf of the plan set or put it on the website so the Board can address specific issues.

Mr. Findlen briefly summarized the issues related to the site. A letter was submitted to the Board on October 18, 2018, that identified 29 issues needing written responses.

1. Trash/Loading Operations: A written operations plan outlining present and future operations is required.
2. Snow Storage: A formal written plan is required.
3. Parking:
  - a. List the variances and relief needed on cover sheet.
  - b. Explain how the number of spaces were determined, explaining the land use numbers they used and what the ZBL requires.
  - c. Handicapped parking locations and number of spaces are required.
  - d. Aisle width and parking space dimensions are required. It appears that these will meet the ZBL with the exception of some of the underground spaces; this will require a waiver.
  - e. Explain the connections and operation between the Town Hall and PSB parking lots.
4. Vehicular Site Circulation: Explanation is required regarding the consistency between the traffic report and site plan; they did not seem to mesh.
5. Turning Templates: Emergency and all turning vehicles must be able to access the site and the intersection. Review of the turning templates and videos will be done.
6. Preemption System: If this is proposed, a specific signal plan should be supplied showing how it operates. This will be discussed when traffic is reviewed.
7. Curb Radii: Certain radii are required in the ZBL. A summary chart of all radii should be supplied.
8. Alternative Locations for Building: The applicant has been asked to look into this to determine if there is a better location in the campus site for circulation. This has been preliminarily discussed. There will be a separate meeting for architecture.
9. Pedestrian Circulation: This ties into the intersection and will be discussed during the traffic evaluation.
10. Curb Ramps and Proposed Pedestrian Accommodations: Curb ramps must be ADA compliant.
11. Mid-Block Crossing on Bryant Street: This will be discussed during the traffic evaluation.
12. Existing Sidewalk on Washington Street in front of *(unintelligible due to vehicular traffic)*: This will be discussed during the traffic evaluation.
13. Landscaping: Landscaping waivers should be listed on the cover sheet. The planting table should be clarified for compliance with the ZBL. A planting schedule needs to be clarified.
14. Site lighting: Spill over should be clarified.
15. Minor Site Plan Issues: General comments about locus and scales to conform to the ZBL.

Responses will be received and Mr. Findlen will respond to those.

Mr. Steeves asked Mr. Findlen to determine if there is a better building location with regard to site circulation. He will review the applicant's responses.

Audience: The audience was asked for public input or questions. There were none.

Mr. Bethoney asked if the applicant had provided boards with detailed photographs of the proposed plantings in their past developments. Mr. Brown had a plant book that showed the botanical and common names, and these are also noted on the plans. Grasses are proposed, but they are not large specimens. They generally go from mid-May to mid-October. The planting plan shows the plants to be arranged so that grasses are among other shrubs that do not brown out. Mr. Bethoney asked it was possible to get a rendering of the landscaping looking at the building from the street and the parking area, and how it will look from the side as opposed to an aerial view. Mr. Brown said it is virtually impossible to give an actual depiction of what it will look like because it is so extensive. Mr. Bethoney asked if they have done any recent sites with even remotely similar plantings that the Board can see. Mr. Brown said it would be difficult to take photographs right now, but they do have photographs from past sites. He was asked to review the Town Hall site for consistency.

Mr. Bethoney asked if the applicant would be ready for the November 8, 2018, meeting. Mr. Dore said they will respond to Mr. Findlen's concerns between this meeting and the next, and review them at the next meeting. They will determine what other items they are close to being able to discuss, but not items that are not ready. They will let the Board know what these items are, i.e., architecture, layout of the building, or traffic; this will cover the entire bylaw requirement for review. Mr. Dore asked if it would be helpful to only respond to this evening's issues. Mr. Bethoney said that if it is more productive, that would be fine. There is no real need to do more since the Town Hall will not be completed before May 2019. Mr. Dore agreed, and said they want to be thorough. Mr. Podolski moved to continue the Public Hearing to November 8, 2018, at 8 p.m., seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Mr. Bethoney thanked the applicant for its cooperation, patience, and professionalism. He reminded the applicant to submit plans as soon as possible in a binder and full size per Ms. Porter's request.

### **Old/New Business**

Ms. Porter noted that the Board received a good write-up about a decision made on Providence Highway, which was highlighted as "Build a Better Burb." The nationwide article is drawn from a new case study by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council and the Congress for the New Urbanism, *Reclaiming the Strip Mall: A Common Suburban Form, Transformed*, by Christopher Kuschel. Mr. Bethoney joked that this is commonplace. She explained that the article was concerning how to transform strip malls, and noted the new Mixed Use Development called The Dior as a great example of exemplary planning. The Board was noted for its invaluable assistance in the process. Mr. Bethoney appreciated the acknowledgement.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

/snw