

**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

Susan Webster
Administrative Assistant

**PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES**

November 8, 2018, Lower Conference Room

Present: John R. Bethoney, Chair
Robert D. Aldous, Clerk
James E. O'Brien IV
Jessica L. Porter
Ralph I. Steeves, Associate Member for Public Hearings

Staff: Jennifer Doherty, Administrative Assistant
John Sisson, Economic Development Director

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. Podolski was not present for this meeting.

Applicant: Northeastern University
Project Address: 370 Common Street, Dedham, MA
Zoning District: Single Residence A
Representative(s):

- Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA
- Amy Lane, Design and Construction Project Manager, Northeastern University, 360 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA
- Trey Sasser, PE, Sasaki, 4 Pleasant Street, Watertown, MA

Town Consultant: Steven Findlen, McMahon Associates

The applicant seeks minor site plan review and approval for construction of a new throwing area for track and field events in an existing parking area at 370 Common Street. The property, which is in the Single Residence A zoning district, contains just shy of 900,000 square feet of land and has almost 900 feet of frontage on Common Street. It is across from the Town of Dedham Parks and Recreation facility. A 36,000 square foot building, Barletta Hall, and an oval running track and field occupy the site. The field was redone in the last couple of years to accommodate semi-professional field hockey.

The applicant wants to construct a new throwing area in an existing parking area behind Barletta Hall. The original track and field was constructed in 1988, and the throwing area was located there. Due to vegetated growth in the new 100-foot wetlands buffer area and the new use of the running area, there was insufficient length for throwing activities. The area behind Barletta Hall is relatively flat, not too close to the wetlands, and has sufficient length. No buildings will be erected, and Northeastern enjoys the educational use exemption. Under the ZBL, minor site plan review is applicable to such uses but only with respect to adding any reasonable conditions that the Board may deem necessary.

The application was filed in May 2018. The project went through lengthy peer review with McMahon, and 13 issues were identified. A final report from McMahon indicated that all issues have been addressed. They requested five waivers, two of which have to do with the plan scale. Mr. Sasser identified the building and the existing track and field on the plans. The parking lot will be turned into a field. There is an existing shed/barn, a wooded area, and ledge. The ledge would be blasted and flattened to level the space, and walls would be constructed to retain the earth. There will be new planting per the Conservation Commission due to the proximity to wetlands. They will be removing trees and replacing them. The parking areas will be redone to meet the ZBL. The drive aisles, which were 13 feet, will be widened to 24 feet, reducing the parking spaces from 56 to 32. Parking spaces will be enlarged to meet the ZBL. ADA parking will be added by the track. Vehicles would either park at the top and passengers shuttled down, or passengers dropped off and vehicles would park at the top. Additional ADA improvements will be added in both lots, and an accessible route from the parking to both throwing areas and the field will be added. There is seating behind the throwing area, and a sloped walk will be added. They have brought the plan up to the current Zoning Bylaw to the extent practical.

Waivers Requested:

1. Approval of driveway width of 18 feet. The ZBL provides that, in driveways with 10 spaces or less, the Board can approve a driveway width of 12 feet. The driveway is currently 12 feet, but they are widening it to 18 feet. The only parking spaces to which it has access are the two handicapped spaces. They cannot go wider because of wetlands and existing utilities in the area.
2. Waiver for interior landscaping to be 10%. The front landscaping is all that is seen from the road, and the area is otherwise wooded. The additional parking is in the back and is not seen. The interior landscaping, which is currently 5.5%, will be increased to 10%. Because the entire area is surrounded by woods, they believe the landscaping is sufficient.
3. Waiver for 186 parking spaces. Mr. Zahka believed there was some double counting. The building is used as office space for Barletta Hall. When track and field is taking place, the basement area is not used for offices, but as a locker room. Parking was calculated as office to come up with the original 292. Barletta Hall is used until 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, and track and field events are after 4:30 p.m. or on the weekend. Teams arrive via bus or van, not in individual vehicles. The applicant ran the numbers, and included spectators, participants, and referees on the facility. Mr. Zahka believes that the number required is 47 higher than it should be because they double-counted the basement at Barletta Hall. This is not used as office space, and is only used during events. The field had been used this way prior to it being converted to field hockey.

4. Waiver for the scale on the plan set to be 1 inch = 30 feet instead of the required 1 inch = 40 feet.
5. Waiver for locus on the plan set to be 1 inch = 100 feet.

Mr. Findlen performed minor site plan peer review of the project on behalf of the Planning Board. This peer review was paid for by the applicant. Thirteen issues identified; the applicant has satisfied eight of them, and has requested 5 waivers. Mr. Zahka explained the building uses and the methodology for parking. Mr. Findlen believes the parking is adequate for the use. There are 261 parking spaces on site, and they are reducing it to 186 to make the site more compliant. Trash and loading have been addressed and updated. The applicant has trimmed back some of the vegetation at McMahan's request to improve sight distance at the driveway. Mr. Bethoney asked if the site works better than it did. Mr. Findlen said, after discussing and resolving the issues, the current plan works better than the one submitted in May. It will be a very viable site and will function better with regard to safety and vehicular access. He believes it is a safer, well thought out plan.

Mr. O'Brien asked what the typical capacity is during events; he realized this may vary depending on the events and schools involved. Ms. Lane said there are no large events at this location. She believes there is a good amount of parking on site, and will contract with local hotels to shuttle people to the site if necessary. A very large event would happen once a year. Mr. O'Brien asked if there should be a contingency plan. Mr. Sasser said that in the past, they have worked with the Police, and parking has been in the Parks and Recreation lot and the Society of African Missions (SMA Fathers) lot across the street. Buses park at the Holiday Inn. Mr. Bethoney said that, even with the abundance of parking at this time, they have had to use the parking lots across the street. Mr. Sasser said this is for major events.

Mr. Bethoney asked what goes on at that site on a daily basis. Ms. Lane said about 40 people work in offices in Barletta Hall, the field hockey team practices on the field in the evening, and the track team practices two or three times a week. In the fall, the field hockey has about ten home games, typically on a Friday or a Saturday. There have been no track events since the track was re-done. Mr. O'Brien said that since they will be having track events, this will increase the usage. He would like to see a contingency plan for the large events. Mr. Zahka spoke with the Parks and Recreation department, which has a great relationship with Northeastern. The Town has been using the Northeastern site more than Northeastern has been using town parking. Northeastern has also allowed the Town to use the facility itself when it is available; the fields have been under construction over the last two years, so it has not been used during that time. The reciprocal parking arrangement for major events is informal, as it is with the SMA Fathers. Mr. Zahka said they would be fine with a condition in the approval that a parking management plan be submitted to the Police Department prior to large events.

Ms. Porter asked if there is designated bus parking. Mr. Sasser said not most of the time. If teams come for practice, buses park in the front to the side. The buses park at Holiday Inn for events. Ms. Porter asked if there is signage that encourages people to park in the back lots so they are not on the street. Ms. Lane said they could put up wayfaring signage indicating where there is additional parking. Mr. Findlen was asked why there was no "Bus Parking" sign on site. He understood that bus parking is off-site at Holiday Inn; this is an ar-

rangement they have made. Ms. Porter asked about the seating for spectators. Mr. Sasser pointed out two seating areas at the track. They base their seating on 250 people.

Mr. Steeves asked if the basement at Barletta Hall is underground. Mr. Sasser said there are four or five stairs down, so it is a cellar. Mr. Aldous was concerned about the loss of over 100 spaces, and asked if there was more space on the property for parking. Mr. Zahka explained that parking is shared: when Barletta Hall is being used, the track and field is not; when the track and field is in use (after hours), Barletta Hall is not. When numbers are run for Barletta Hall, there are plenty of spaces; when numbers are run for track and field, there are plenty of spaces. There would be an issue if events were run during the day, but historically, they take place after school. Mr. Findlen said he questioned this as well. The applicant explained how it would work so he would have a comfort level for the parking. His review took into account how Barletta Hall and the track and field would be able to work. There is a net loss of 106 spaces, but with the uses and the time periods, it is adequate. He reviewed the plan completely and worked with the applicant. The plan is in compliance other than the five waivers requested.

Mr. Aldous asked if they put up temporary signs during events so people would know where to park. Ms. Lane said they do. Mr. Aldous asked how often off-site parking would be needed. Mr. Sasser said it would be once a year for a major event, i.e., if Northeastern was hosting a conference championship with nine teams, or hosting the New England conference with college and high school participants; this happens once every six years. They would, however, like to host more events. Otherwise, there is enough parking on the property.

Mr. Bethoney asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. Robert Naser went to a number of track events at Northeastern, and there was never an issue with parking. He was excited to have track and field events back there.

Mr. Bethoney asked if Northeastern considers granting students waivers of the requirements of the university. There is a lot of significance in this request because other entities come to the Board. They look at the Board's decisions to see how they would impact their proposals. He noted that Northeastern has 20 acres, of which 50-60% is wooded, and the parking area is about 2 acres, which is the amount of developed land.

1. Reducing the driveway width from 24 to 18 feet. The Board had no issues with this request.
2. Interior landscaping to be 10% instead of 15% on the approximately 2 acres of paved area. The Board had no issues with this request.
3. Reducing parking to 186 spaces instead of 292. The applicant is making the site more compliant with the Zoning Bylaw. Ms. Porter said that as long as a contingency plan in place, she would support this. The applicant will create a parking management plan for large events, which will be shared with the Town and the Police Department. Mr. O'Brien added that he would like to make it more stringent by adding that there should be no parking at Wilson's Mountain during large events. He believed this parking lot should be solely for those using that site. Mr. Zahka corrected this by saying that the Wilson Mountain people are using Northeastern's parking lot. The applicant will make every effort to have as many cars as possible coming to high

intensity events park on Northeastern's property. The Certificate of Action will state that.

4. Waiver to allow the scaling to be 1 inch = 30 feet instead of the required 1 inch = 40 feet. The Board had no issues with this request.
5. Waiver to allow the locus on the plan set to be 1 inch = 100 feet. The Board had no issues with this request.

Vote on Waivers:

1. Ms. Porter moved to approve the waiver to reduce the aisle width to 18 feet instead of the required 24 feet on the area specified on the plan, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.¹
2. Ms. Porter moved to approve the waiver for interior landscaping to be 10% instead of the required 15%, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.¹
3. Ms. Porter moved to approve the waiver to reduce the parking from the required 292 spaces to 186 spaces, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.¹
4. Ms. Porter moved to allow the scale to be 1 inch = 30 feet instead of the required 1 inch = 40 feet, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.¹
5. Ms. Porter moved to allow the locus on the plan set to be 1 inch = 100 feet, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.¹

Vote on Minor Site Plan:

Ms. Porter moved to approve the minor site plan as presented subject to a mutually agreed upon Certificate of Action containing language as discussed at this meeting, to be reviewed and approved by the Board prior to execution. Mr. Aldous seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0. Mr. Zahka will prepare the Certificate of Action for review.

PUBLIC HEARING, ARTICLE 14

This article was submitted by Michael A. Podolski, Esq., Planning Board, and Carmen DelloIacono, Town Meeting Member. Mr. DelloIacono was present for this Public Hearing.

This is a continuation of the Public Hearing first held and opened on October 25, 2018, for the Special Town Meeting to be held on November 26, 2018, to see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw for Mixed Use Developments. It has been duly posted for anyone who is interested in it. Mr. Bethoney asked Economic Development Director John Sisson and Administrative Assistant Jennifer Doherty to explain the notifications that were done since the first Public Hearing. Legal notices were placed in *The Dedham Times* on October 26, 2018, and November 2, 2018. Certified mailing was sent to abutting towns and MAPC on October 23, 2018. The statutory requirement has been met and notices of receipt have been received by the Planning Board office.

The Public Hearing for Article 14 reads as follows:

¹ Mr. Podolski was absent from this meeting and there were only four voting members. Mr. Steeves did not vote on any of the motions because it was not a Public Hearing.

ARTICLE 14

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. Podolski sent a letter to the Planning Board and Mr. DelloIacono on November 6, 2018, relating to his position now as co-sponsor of Article 14. An attempt to contact him via conference call was unsuccessful. Mr. Bethoney read his letter into the record.

Town Council

Dear All,

As a co-sponsor of the above entitled article on Town Meeting Warrant for November 19, 2018, I am attaching hereto the opinion of Jonathan Eichman, Esq., Town Council for the Town of Dedham. I reached out to Town Council after initial filing of the article to request an opinion as to the legal

validity of Article 14. By the way, Town Council refers to Article 13, but in fact it is Article 14.

As you will see, Town Council has valid legal concerns on whether imposing a Planned Residential Development review upon a Mixed Use Special Permit would pass legal muster with the Attorney General. The opinion quite correctly points out that the Planned Residential approval process under the Town Zoning Bylaw is not a Special Permit. A Special Permit is required for a Mixed Use Development, and in the opinion of Town Council, we cannot legally impose the Planned Residential Development approval process upon a Special Permit. The opinion also cites an opinion of the Land Court from 2007 where that Court struck down a Special Permit approval process identical to the process our article seeks to impose.

There are many other legal reasons contained in MGL Ch. 40A why the Planned Residential Development process cannot be imposed upon a Special Permit application which are outlined in the opinion. Based upon my reading of the case law and the opinion of Town Council, I can no longer support Article 14 at the upcoming Town Meeting, and would vote, if present at the meeting, to indefinitely postpone the article. However, my withdrawal of support of this article only means that I will pursue in the future Town Meetings a Zoning Bylaw revision which will limit the number of apartments that can legally be permitted in a Mixed Use Development. Atty. Eichman has already agreed to assist me and others, including Mr. DelloIacono in putting together a legally valid restriction.

As I am not going to be present at the Planning Board meeting this Thursday evening, November 8, 2018, I am asking Chairman Bethoney to please read this e-mail into the record and note the attached opinion of Town Council. I apologize again for my absence at the November 8, 2018, meeting, but I most definitely had a scheduled snafu.

Sincerely,

Attorney Michael A. Podolski

Mr. DelloIacono said they will move forward to get answers. He said it is a positive move because of Mr. Podolski's comments, and felt that it will lead to something. His concern is the impact of the multitude of apartments on the Town. His initial article was to put a moratorium on apartments altogether. Legally, they would have to prove things. He was concerned that, with all the apartments, there is not enough attention paid to police, fire, DPW, and everything in town that goes with it. There are currently 700+ apartments in the pipeline. He said that, if the town does not build them, people will not come. He is not convinced that apartments need to be built because of the demand, although this is what has been said.

Mr. DelloIacono further said that his intention was not to sidestep the Planning Board at all. He and Mr. Podolski talked, and both agreed to this. They took the language from existing zoning and modified it. They did not take notice of the Special Permit part. The case study

was from the Town of Bellingham, and he contacted them about this. Bellingham has used this for quite a while, and it worked perfectly fine until it was challenged. They now use overlay districting.

He agreed with the indefinite postponement, and hoped that the Planning Board could put together a committee to look into this and see what part of the article could be strengthened. He has always had the utmost respect for the Board, noting that any of changes along Route One have been driven by them. Planning has worked from Legacy Place all the way down Route One. He agreed with Mr. Podolski to keep working on it for a better article.

Mr. Bethoney said the Board will work on this. The Board has no obligation to issue a Special Permit on any project, and there is no matter of right to this. The developer has a lot of obligations to ultimately show that the benefits outweigh the negative impacts. The Board has discussed taking the position that it wants to take a hiatus from issuing Special Permits for various things. An applicant can "meet the regulations," for a Special Permit. That is why the Zoning Bylaw lists it as Special Permit; this means "maybe." He advised Mr. DelloIacono to work with Mr. Podolski, who said they would research other regulatory constraints that could be put in the article and pass muster and be implemented. However, this would not be at the November Town Meeting.

Mr. O'Brien commended Mr. DelloIacono and Mr. Podolski for knowing what is happening in the Town and the planning for its future. There are a lot of single apartments, and he understands the fear of overloading the school system. There needs to be research to determine where to concentrate Special Permits. Ms. Porter said she hoped that this discussion will include understanding the needs of the community at this time. There has been recent research on the demographic needs as well as what Dedham has done on understanding the needs of the community, i.e., what type of housing it needs, who needs it, and the increased demand on older residents who want to stay in the community but not remain in their houses. Mr. DelloIacono said that discussion is good, although his opinion is different from hers. The Town used to have 27,000 residents, but now it has a little over 24,000, primarily because it does not have the families it used to. The school system was built for 27,000 residents. He understands Ms. Porter's point, but on the other hand, the Town is taxed out, and seniors are leaving for towns they can afford and are heartbroken. He said he will not sit by and watch this happen. He is more than happy to discuss this.

Mr. Bethoney asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak on Article 14. No one did.

Ms. Porter moved to close the Public Hearing on Article 14, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0. Ms. Porter moved that it be recommended to Town Meeting that the article be indefinitely postponed, seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the Board could set up a committee to discuss this. Mr. Bethoney said this can be done when Mr. Podolski is present. It can be brought up at any time under Old/New Business. Mr. Sisson said that he and Mrs. Doherty will work on a letter to go to Town Meeting members. Mr. Bethoney said there is no statutory requirement to send a letter to Town Meeting members; it has been done as a courtesy. Mr. Sisson said that envelopes are already ready, and they will get a letter out as soon as possible. Mr. Bethoney said

the Planning Board needs to review it first. He told Mr. Sisson to send it the Board members for feedback and to have it mutually agreed upon. Mr. Podolski in particular needs to see it because he was the author of Article 14, and Ms. Porter is a new member. The letter needs to include the Board's recommendation and the rationale for it.

Applicant: Town of Dedham/Public Safety Building
Project Address: 26 Bryant Street, Dedham, MA
Zoning District: Central Business
Town Consultant: Steven Findlen, Senior Project Manager, McMahon Associates
Angela Bleeker, EIT, McMahon Associates

This is a continuation of the Public Hearing from October 25, 2018, on the proposed Major Nonresidential Project for the Public Safety Building.

Mr. Bethoney acknowledged a letter from Mr. Kern saying that they are not ready to address the concerns raised by the Planning Board and the consultant at the last meeting. He has requested that the Public Hearing be continued to the next Planning Board meeting at a date and time certain. Mrs. Doherty said the proposed dates are Thursday, December 6, 2018, and Tuesday, December 11, 2018, but she cannot be present on December 6th. The Board chose to meet on Tuesday, December 11th.

Ms. Porter moved to continue the Public Hearing to Tuesday, December 11, 2018, at 7:30 p.m., seconded by Mr. Aldous. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Discussion: Article 13

Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA, was present to discuss Article 13. He was accompanied by Gregory Carlevale, Collis, LLC.

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.

The Planned Residential Development concept plan has been recommended favorably to Town Meeting, and a vote is anticipated at Town Meeting. Mr. Zahka said that Mr. Carlevale wants to move forward. During the concept plan, there was a brief discussion about a traffic report. He had sent an email to which Scott Henderson, P.E., responded with the ITE data. If a traffic report is required, Mr. Zahka would like the Planning Board to consider and weigh this if it was not waived during the concept plan. This project would have been an ANR (Form A) plan, under conventional zoning; this does not require a traffic report. A Planned Residential Development review and approval follows the procedures under the subdivi-

sion rules for a definitive subdivision plan. The procedures for review, to Mr. Zahka, have to do with how the Public Hearing is held. It specifically says that a covenant or bond needs to be posted. This is not a Special Permit, so some procedure needs to be followed. It is ambiguous as to whether a traffic report would have been required, but assuming it is, they provided the Board with the ITE material in Mr. Henderson's report.

The ITE report compared a typical five-lot ANR single family home subdivision traffic generation with a seven-unit Planned Residential Development, which ITE considers to be multi-family housing. The daily average for the five-lot single family houses is 50 trips per day. With the multi-family housing, they consider low-rise and mid-rise. The Planned Residential Development could be considered either of these. The seven-family units would be 50 trips for a low-rise, but goes down to 40 trips for mid-rise. Single family houses would typically have a minimum of three bedrooms and be of substantial size. The Planned Residential Development, while not age-restricted, it is designed as such at 1,700-1,800 square feet and two bedrooms. Thus there would be fewer people living in a PRD. Mr. Zahka asked the Board's consideration on the traffic report and asked that one not be required.

Mr. Aldous thought there would be more traffic from the PRD. The PRD would be seven units, while there would be only five single family dwellings. Mr. Zahka said that, in the seven units, there are 14 bedrooms; in the five homes there would be at least 15 bedrooms. They are giving the Board the numbers on an ITE report, but not a full traffic report. The a traffic report would put counters on the street, then add additional numbers to existing traffic numbers based on ITE's assessment of what type of dwelling it is. The applicant is trying to avoid hiring someone to do the counts. The numbers would be the same based on the ITE handbook. The Board agreed to use the ITE reports on previous applications. He is accordingly asking for a waiver on the traffic report, and will submit a memo accordingly.

The Board had no questions and was fine with no traffic study. Mr. Aldous moved to waive the perceived requirement for a traffic study for a Planned Residential Development at 219 Lower Street, seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.²

Preliminary Discussion, Dedham Square Planning Committee

Ms. Porter prepared a memo on the objectives, scope, and makeup of the new committee; she worked with Mr. Podolski, the chair of the original committee, on this. She also provided background information on the previous committee's accomplishments.

Ms. Porter gave a recap of the committee and how it was formed. In May 2016, Town Meeting allocated \$50,000 for a Dedham Square Strategic Planning Study. In January 2017, the Planning Board organized the committee after consultation with Town Council and the Board of Selectmen. In April 2017, the Dedham Square Strategic Planning and Steering Committee (DSSPSC) was formed, naming Mr. Podolski as Chair and Peter Smith as Vice Chair. The committee worked with Gamble and Associates. The first task was preparation of the Dedham Square Design Guidelines, which have been adopted by the Town after rigorous public process and guidance. In the midst of that, with the construction of the new Public Safety Building, it was realized that the Town needed to make a decision about re-use of the

² Mr. Steeves, who votes on Public Hearings in the event that a Board member is absent, voted in place of Mr. Podolski.

current Police Station. The Board of Selectmen asked the DSSPSC to expand to include neighborhood representation and add an additional aspect of the scope to study reuse of the Police Station property.

Ms. Porter said the original committee was essentially an economic development strategic plan identifying parcels that are critical for Dedham Square, identifying community assets that bring people to the Square, key intersections and improvements, improvements to public infrastructure and circulation, a community vision, and a build-up analysis, as well as any regulations that could impede development or business expansion consistent with the community vision and sensitive to the Square's history. The committee would now like to study the police station property and make recommendations about potential reuse or development.

The Planning Board will have to dissolve the current committee and appoint a new one. Many original members are interested in being reappointed and continuing with the work. Some level of continuity is probably ideal, as would appointing new members. Ms. Porter consulted with prior committee members and made recommendations on how to formulate the new one. The challenge is to have a level of expertise and representation from the important boards/committees in Town, and to have neighborhood representation. Ms. Porter recommended the following makeup:

- Two members of the Planning Board
- A member of the Board of Selectmen
- A member of the Finance and Warrant Committee
- A business owner in Dedham Square
- A developer who has developed property in Dedham Square
- A member of Dedham Square Circle
- Five citizens at large appointed by the Planning Board, encouraging, but not requiring, those with experience in planning, economic development, architecture, construction, urban design, real estate, or transportation.

This makeup has changed from the previous one because it omits the Master Plan Implementation Committee and the Zoning Board of Appeals. Given that they have finished the design guidelines, the ZBA is less critical, and the MPIC will be dissolved soon and a new Master Plan committee has not yet been formed. They are trying to keep the makeup to eleven members. She thought it would be a good idea to have a member from the Finance and Warrant Committee since the property would be re-used. Depending on the membership, Ms. Porter suggested an appointing process. Each committee would be asked to appoint a member. The Board would then determine from what precinct each appointee is, and appoint at large members from other precincts to ensure full town participation. She said that work on the committee has been ongoing for quite some time due to delays, staff turnover, and scheduling problems. The committee is eager to continue its work due to its importance for Dedham Square, and she encouraged the Planning Board consider a process so it can continue sooner, rather than later.

Mr. Aldous asked if the current committee still uses the information from Gamble and Associates. Mr. Bethoney said this is for the committee's use, but it is more for the developer's use. Mr. Sisson said newcomers are advised to have the developer's architect or designer

review the Dedham Square Guidelines and meet with Gamble and Associates; he cited the proposed development at 355 Washington Street as an example of the process. It is important for a town to provide a private developer with its vision for the community. Having guidelines helps the Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Design Review Advisory Board when it comes to developing and designing a project.

Mr. Aldous said there should be three or more developers and builders on the committee, as they are the ones who consider projects, do the actual building, and have a financial stake in them. Mr. O'Brien said there is validity to Mr. Aldous' suggestion, as builders are constrained by the land, i.e., topography and logistics of the site on which they want to build. He said there is a developer looking at 337 Washington Street, and he asked if he looked at the Dedham Square Guidelines. Mr. Sisson said he did, but Mr. Bethoney asked how the Board would know that. He asked who determines the level of compliance to the guidelines that a developer must meet. The Board has the peer reviewer and others to help determine this, but asked if there is anyone who determines to what level the developer has achieved the objectives of the guidelines. The developer's job is to show the Town how compliant they are, unless the town planner can assist in making those determinations. There is a regulatory process, and the Board has the option in the Zoning Bylaw to hire a design consultant, including an architect, to review the project. A report must be based on the guidelines and his/her opinion on the overall design. It would be a good idea to do this in the future.

Ms. Porter said that one item in the DSSPSC discussion was how to make the document useful for the Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, Design Review Advisory Board and the Building Department. A suggestion was made to set up a breakfast to which these entities would be invited for a workshop with Gamble and Associates. Understanding the goals would allow more cohesion, and would be a living document. Gamble and Associates would also be able to tell them how other towns put the guidelines to use. Mr. Sisson said he is trying to schedule this event.

Mr. Bethoney said he would like to take some time to think about the committee structure. Ms. Porter said the reason why she did not have two developers on the new committee was because of a discussion at a previous meeting about the difficulty in having requirements for members. She was trying not to be too restrictive, but would like to encourage this type of response. The Board of Selectmen felt it was important, particularly with regard to the Police station, to have a committee member from each precinct. The Planning Board will choose everyone other than those from other committees.

Mr. Bethoney, while realizing Ms. Porter's desire to keep up momentum, thought they could not do everything she suggested by the indicated dates. The next meeting will be on December 11, 2018. The existing committee will be dissolved and a new one created with specific objectives and scope. Ms. Porter asked that the Board review the information she presented. She will revise it according to their input.

Discussion, Letter from the Conservation Commission

The Board received a letter from the Conservation Commission. This will be reviewed and discussed at the next meeting.

Discussion, Board of Selectmen Meeting re: Readville Development

There are two properties being developed in Boston right near the Dedham line. Ms. Porter thought that Mr. Bethoney and Mr. Sisson were going to one of the meetings. Mr. Bethoney said he knew nothing about this. The owners met with the Board of Selectmen but not the Planning Board. Mr. Sisson said the Readville property owner may have spoken with the Board of Selectmen, but he and Mr. Bethoney were not involved. He thought that a member of the Board of Selectmen reached out directly to the developer; he is not sure who it was.

Mr. Bethoney was unhappy that the Board of Selectmen had a developer on their agenda with a major project adjacent to the Town of Dedham, and the Planning Board had no information on it. The property is off Sprague Street on the other side of the railroad tracks. Mr. Sisson said he would send the information to the Board. It is a sizable project, although it has been scaled down from the original proposal. He believed that the Board of Selectmen reached out to the developer. Mr. Sisson understood that, unless the City of Boston changes its zoning for the parcels, there is no statutory requirement for them to notify adjacent towns. If they provide some relief short of changing the zoning, they do not have to notify Dedham. He noted that he subscribes to the BPDA (Boston Planning and Development Agency) e-mail list.

Mr. Sisson also attended a meeting on October 27, 2018, with Selectman Brendan Keogh regarding a proposal for 268 apartments on four acres of land next to Prime Toyota and the mobile home park. They are under the FAR and do not need zoning change, but will need an additional use permit. It is zoned commercial, and a lot more commercial can be built there as well. The concern is traffic through Riverdale. The service level at Bridge Street, Spring Street, and VFW Parkway is already a big concern. The shortest distance between the development and Route 128 North goes right by Riverdale Elementary School as well, so there is a school zone in the morning. Mr. O'Brien also noted concerns with traffic on Route 138 through Hyde Park.

Mr. Sisson has written a draft letter to BPDA and sent it to Jason Mammone, P.E., Director of Engineering, to get his viewpoint on the engineering. He will also invite the developer, Liberty Properties, to a meeting. Mr. Steeves noted that there is only one way out from the site, which is to do a U-turn in Dedham to get to Boston. The developer plans to offer a shuttle service in the mornings and the evenings to connect the residents to the commuter rail station in West Roxbury. There is an MBTA bus service, but the residents will not have access to this because of the route and no bus stop.

Mr. Sisson will bring up these concerns to the BPDA. There may be a separate meeting on transportation. He noted that in Federal Fiscal Year 2019, there is a MassDOT transportation improvement project budgeted to improve the intersection. Mr. Steeves said there is no way they can improve it. Traffic count on the highway is 25,000 per day. Ms. Porter asked if there was some way pedestrian improvements could be made, as it is extremely difficult and dangerous for pedestrians. Mr. Sisson agreed that this is an issue. He is hopeful that the Town can work with Sen. Rush's and Rep. McMurtry's offices on this. There is funding for Route One improvements.

The Board briefly discussed the railroad bridge replacement on East Street in Westwood.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

/snw