

**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

**PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES**

Tuesday, December 11, 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: Jennifer Doherty, Administrative Assistant
Eve Tapper, Interim Town Planner

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.

Eve Tapper/Interim Town Planner

Eve Tapper was introduced as the interim town planner and replacement for former town planner Jarret Katz. She is from Newton, MA, and has a Master's degree in Planning and Urban Development from the University of Virginia. She outlined her employment experience in Maryland and Massachusetts. She has been a temporary planner for various towns. Mr. Bethoney and the Board said she is doing an excellent job.

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

This is a continuation of the Public Hearing from October 25, 2018, on the proposed Major Nonresidential Project for the Public Safety Building. The Public Hearing had been continued to November 8, 2018, and again to this evening.

Ms. Tapper said there were some unresolved issues between the architects, traffic engineers, and McMahon, the peer review consultant for the Town. They have not been able to work out these issues. Some changes needed to be made, and the architect was not ready to present these. Mr. Bethoney announced that the Public Hearing would not be heard this evening, and would be continued to a date certain. The applicant has not said when it will be ready to present. The next Planning Board meetings are scheduled for January 10, 2019, and

January 24, 2019. Ms. Porter moved to continue the Public Hearing to Thursday, January 24, 2019, at 7:00 p.m., seconded by Mr. Podolski.

Discussion:

Mr. Podolski said that before voting on the motion, he had a public statement on the Public Safety Building, the chronology, and the Board's indulgence on how the project has gone forward. On September 21, 2017, a scoping session was held with the Select Board and/or Town Manager's team. This was the initial proposal for a municipal campus site plan. On the same date, there was a large, town-wide gathering at the Middle School on the Public Safety Building. The scope of the project was explained and pictures were displayed. The next time the Planning Board saw the applicant was for another scoping session in October 2017. Not much happened at that meeting. On February 22, 2018, the applicant came before the Board with a rendering of the new Public Safety Building, but no formal application. They needed to go to the Design Review Advisory Board, but it was not clear if they had any zoning issues that would have required a Public Hearing with the Zoning Board of Appeals. A community meeting was held in April 2018, at which time Mr. Podolski asked the then administrative assistant, Susan Webster, what the status was on filing of the application. As of April 2018, there was nothing. The applicant finally submitted a formal application in August 2018.

The Board has had one official meeting with the applicant, and has had to continue the Public Hearing two or three times. Mr. Podolski said that this is a project that was fully funded by Town Meeting on November 13, 2017. The applicant has all the money to build the Public Safety Building, but nothing happens. They do not come before the Board or explain why they need the continuations; it may be because they cannot meet the issue brought up by the Town's peer review consultant, McMahan Associates. In the months since they filed, there has only been one meeting with the applicant.

The project has been on the town books and funded for over a year. As a taxpayer in Dedham, Mr. Podolski said he is concerned about what the exact object of the applicant is. He wondered if they were waiting to see if he was running for the Planning Board at the next election; he assured everyone that he will be running. He hopes that the applicant does not think it can wait him out because he will be on the Board for however long it takes to get the project approved. He said it is about time that the applicant showed courtesy to the Planning Board, which is a duly elected board in the town, and start getting the project in line. He said the project obviously came to the Board in tatters and they still cannot put it together. He is upset as a taxpayer and as a member of the Board because they have not given it their due respect. They have not even had the courtesy to send someone to the Board this evening to ask for a continuance. Mr. Bethoney said his comments are duly noted.

The motion is on the floor. The vote of the Board was unanimous at 5-0 to continue the Public Hearing to Thursday, January 24, 2019, at 7 p.m.

Applicant:	Garnett Realty Trust, Robert Naser, Trustee
Project Address:	337-339 Washington Street, Dedham, MA
Zoning District:	Central Business
Representative(s):	Robert Naser Stephen P. Rahavy, Esq., 18 Norfolk Street, Dedham, MA Michael McKay, AIA, 35 Bryant Street, Dedham, MA

Mrs. Doherty stated that the legal notice was advertised in the *Dedham Times* on November 30, 2018, and December 7, 2018. Notice was sent to abutters within 300 feet of the property on November 27, 2018. Notices were sent to the abutting towns, Boston, Needham, Canton,

and Westwood, on November 27, 2018. Mr. Podolski moved to waive the reading of the public notice, seconded by Ms. Porter, voted unanimously 5-0. Mr. Podolski moved to open the Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, voted unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Rahavy said that the applicant did not receive comments from the peer reviewer, McMahon Associates, until a week ago, and there was therefore insufficient time to respond. The applicant will be seeking three variances for the size of three of the condominium units from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Zoning Bylaw Section 7.4.3.2 allows units to be up to 1,500 square feet; the applicant is proposing two units of 1,752 square feet and one unit of 2,965 square feet. Mr. Naser planned to give the Board an overview of the project, but Mr. Bethoney cautioned him that this would open up the Public Hearing for public comment. He suggested that he wait until he has received a decision from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the size of the units so he would know what relief the ZBA would/would not grant so he can accurately present his proposal. Mr. Naser agreed with this. The hearing with the ZBA is scheduled for Wednesday, February 27, 2019.

The applicant asked to continue the Public Hearing. Mr. Podolski moved to continue the Public Hearing to Thursday, March 28, 2018, at 7 p.m., seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Mr. Rahavy said that he has worked with Ms. Tapper and Mrs. Doherty on this project, and both are excellent and extremely helpful.

Applicant:	Noble and Greenough
Project Address:	10 Campus Drive, Dedham, MA
Zoning District:	Single Residence A/Single Residence B
Representative(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mike McHugh, Director of Buildings and Grounds• Steven Ginsberg, Chief Financial and Operations Officer• Zaurie Zimmerman, ZZA Associates, 22 Carriage Drive, Lexington, MA 02420• Marcelo Arjona, AIA, LEED, Project Architect, Baker Design Group, Inc., 23 Drydock Avenue, 6th Floor, Boston MA 02210• Stephen Baker, President, Baker Design Group, Inc., 23 Drydock Avenue, 6th Floor, Boston MA 02210

The applicant requested a determination that enlargement of the Noble and Greenough auditorium does not trigger site plan review, and to discuss the filing fee. Mr. Arjona showed the location on the map. The auditorium is part of a larger building that was built in 1973. It cannot fit the number of faculty and students who meet there every day before school starts, so Noble and Greenough is requesting to enlarge it. Existing conditions were shown.

The proposed plan is enlarge the auditorium by constructing two additions on both sides and the back to keep the geometry of the building. Interior walls would be removed to achieve the increased seating capacity. The additions are similar to dormers, and allow an accessible platform on the back as well; the old building was designed so that those areas are not accessible. They will also install a handicapped lift to achieve compliance with State regulations and provide better seating for handicapped students. The seating will be extended up, and there will be two spaces underneath for expansion and improvement of the mechanical

room. The expansion will be to an open area; grading, walkways, and circulation will not be impacted. They will provide stormwater connections, which are currently nonexistent, on both sides of the building. The proposal is to hook up half the site to a new retention area across the street. The other side of the building will be connected to an existing dry well. A new gutter system will be erected to prevent shedding onto the pavement and prevent ice from forming. The project does not really impact the site in any way, and nothing is being changed other than replacing the sidewalks, which will be damaged during construction.

The Board reviewed the proposal. The applicant contends that enrollment will not be increasing, no new teachers will be hired, and circulation and parking will not be impacted in any way. They feel that this modest improvement will not impact the site to any degree. Mr. Podolski asked if they had picture of the site as it is; Mr. Arjona did not, but explained the changes on the plans. Mr. Podolski asked if the applicant would stipulate in writing what they will be doing, that enrollment will not be increased, and no new teachers will be hired. They agreed. Mr. Ginsberg said that if they do consider enrollment enlargement in the future and construction projects that deal with that, they will return to the Planning Board. Mr. Bethoney explained that an applicant should always bring in photos of existing conditions. He also said that, even though applicants may state things in writing, the Board will ask the same question for the record so that constituents know that the Planning Board is making sure that things are done in the most appropriate manner.

Mr. Aldous asked if it will be harder for people to exit through the back door in an emergency with extension of the back part of the building. Mr. Arjona said the doors are being relocated as shown on the plan, and it will make exiting the building safer. The connection with the walkways will not change. The parking will remain the same, and they will have sufficient handicapped spaces. Mr. Podolski wanted to confirm the number of seats. He has an updated letter proposing the addition of 201 seats to the existing 608. Mr. McHugh said there is bench seating, but they are replacing this with regular seats in back. The total number of seats will be 809.

Mr. Bethoney thanked Ms. Tapper for her memo dated December 11, 2018, outlining the scope of the proposal and the objectives of the applicant. He said it was very well done, helpful, and a breath of fresh air.

Mr. Bethoney said the Board needs to determine whether site plan review is required, and what the filing fee would be. Ms. Tapper said the filing fee for site plan review is \$1,000. The applicant is saying that site plan review is not required for the project, no peer review consultant is being hired, and they are basically just here for one meeting to discuss what is being done. Therefore, the Planning Board should waive the requirement for the \$1,000 filing fee. Ms. Tapper met with the applicant and, after some research, determined that as a building devoted to education, only minor site plan review is required. In addition, it was not going to affect parking. She determined that they should come before the Board to request waiver of the fee. This is not mandated because they are not going through the whole process. Mr. Bethoney said that the applicant needs to request the waiver. Accordingly Mr. Ginsberg requested that the fee of \$1,000 be waived.

Mr. O'Brien said he was up in the air about the fee because it is an educational institution. Mr. Bethoney said the Board should determine whether it needs site plan review; if so, the fee is required. He said he did not think it was necessary. Mr. Aldous moved to waive the requirement for minor site plan review for the proposed enlargement of the auditorium. Ms.

Porter seconded the motion. Mr. Podolski said the motion should have a stipulation that they not increase enrollment or additional faculty hiring. Mr. Aldous revised his motion to include a stipulation that they not increase enrollment or hiring of additional faculty. Mr. O'Brien seconded the revision of the original motion. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. Mr. Bethoney polled the Board on the fee as follows: Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Aldous, and Ms. Porter said the fee should be waived. Mr. Podolski said they should pay it, believing that the Town should receive the money for the executive summary and the work involved. He said he will not waive it. Ms. Tapper met with the applicant once, after which they revised their letter and resubmitted it. She read the revision, and wrote the executive summary. She said it was not a lot of work.

Mr. Bethoney asked the applicant what he thought they should do. He jokingly said they would offer parking and one space for Mr. Aldous, who goes to the school frequently for various programs. Mr. O'Brien suggested dedicating a parking space in perpetuity to Mr. Aldous. Mr. Podolski suggested that now that they do not need to file, they could consider a small fee; it is up to them. Mr. Ginsberg said they will do what they are told to do. Ms. Tapper said that there is nothing on the fee schedule for a scoping session, meeting with the town planner, etc. No application has been filed. *Mr. Podolski made a comment, but he spoke too softly to be understood.* Mr. Podolski said revising the fee schedule for administrative work should be considered in the future. He agreed that since they did not have to file, there should be no fee.

Mr. Aldous moved to waive the fee, seconded by Mr. O'Brien. The vote was 4-0 with Mr. Podolski abstaining. Mr. Podolski said that Mr. Aldous does go to the school frequently. Mr. McHugh offered to pick him up and bring him home whenever he wanted to go there. Mr. both thanked them and said it was a nice presentation.

Ms. Tapper said that Building Commissioner Kenneth Cimeno would like a letter from the Planning Board stating that the proposal was reviewed and approved. Mr. Bethoney said the office should get a letter from Noble and Greenough that stipulates their request and to what they agreed. This should be attached to a memo from the Planning Board stating that it did not require site plan review. Mr. Cimeno can act on this in whatever way he chooses. Copies should be included in the file.

**DISCUSSION: DEDHAM SQUARE PLANNING AND STUDY COMMITTEE
CREATION, SCOPE, MEMBERSHIP, AND OBJECTIVES**

Ms. Porter provided a packet to Board members. This is a continuation of a discussion on November 8, 2018. The committee was formed at the May 2016 Town Meeting. The main objectives were completion of Dedham Square design guidelines and performing a strategic and economic plan for Dedham Square. Town Meeting allocated \$50,000 for these. There is now a printed version of the design guidelines. There is still \$20,000 to develop the economic plan. The Select Board asked the Board to reconfigure the committee to include representation across town, and added examination of the potential use/reuse of the Police Station.

The packet highlights the Phase II objectives and scope, including potential use/re-use of the Police Station, a strategic plan that builds on the design guidelines looking at areas that are the most transformative for Dedham Square, community assets, key intersections and improvements for accessibility, potential improvements to public infrastructure and circulation,

community vision, build up analysis, development potential, and looking at municipal regulations that impede development or businesses consistent with the community vision.

The makeup of the committee based on discussions in November recommended two members of the Planning Board, one Select Board member, one Finance and Warrant Committee member, one business owner, one developer who has built in Dedham Square in the last 10 years, one member of Dedham Square Circle, and five citizens at-large to be appointed by the Planning Board, ideally residents with experience in planning, economic development, architecture, building and construction, urban design, real estate, or public transportation. The timeline for appointments was outlined. It is a large committee, but it is important to have representation from at citizens at-large. It is hard to make the committee smaller without losing one of them. Mr. Bethoney said that having a larger makeup is more productive and important because there will be members absent from time to time.

Mr. O'Brien said the Town has an aging population with needs for transportation, consideration of income level, and space. They need to find a way to include this group on the committee. He and Mr. Bethoney both think having a member from the Council on Aging, as well as a member from the at-large population, would be wise. Ms. Porter agreed, particularly since they will be located at the new Town Hall in Dedham Square. Mr. Podolski said that when the committee was originally set up, they were to concentrate on getting members from each district. Ms. Porter said that this may make the committee even larger, and recommended that there be a two-tier process for making appointments. The first step would be to identify members to be appointed by boards or have specific experience. They would then determine what precincts are lacking and make at-large appointments based on that. Mr. Podolski said this would be fine as long as this is what will be done. The current board has a lot of people from Precincts 1 and 7. They need to draw people from other precincts because they have as large a stake in this as anyone in town. The Police Station re-use is a town-wide project, and everyone who drives through the Square knows that business is up, but so is traffic. There is a lot of pass-through traffic, and the entire town needs to be involved. He is fine with Ms. Porter's recommendation on appointments if that is how it will be done. Mr. Bethoney said he is fine with that as well as long as it is the ultimate result.

Mr. Bethoney said the committee is important, and he would like to take out the "or" representatives. They need one member from the Select Board. It is not clear who appoints the business owner or the developer; he believes it should be the Planning Board. The Planning Board should also appoint the at-large members. Dedham Square Circle would have one voting member. There will be three ex-officio members, i.e., John Sisson, the Executive Director from Dedham Square Circle, and, hopefully, Ms. Tapper, none of whom can vote. Mr. Bethoney said that there would be 13 on the committee with the addition of the member from the Council on Aging.

Ms. Porter reviewed the timeline for appointments. If the Board approves formation of the new committee at this meeting, they can begin requesting recommendations from the other committees tomorrow. She said the Board would vote at this meeting to formally dissolve the existing committee, and charge the Economic Development Director with recruiting potential members for the business owner and the developer. At the meeting on January 10, 2019, the board could then evaluate the precinct representations for all the appointees to determine which precincts have openings. They can then make a decision on how to designate the five at-large seats appropriately to make sure the precincts are represented. The vacancies can then be posted on January 11, 2019. Mr. Bethoney asked Ms. Porter if a posting would

be made for a specific precinct if the Board determines that there is a vacancy in that precinct. Ms. Porter said that, if there is no one from, for example, precincts 2, 3, and 5, the posting would be for those specific precincts plus two at-large. Mr. Bethoney said the Board would discuss this. The Board will not vote on the at-large members until this is figured out. The committee would then vote on the committee makeup and to disband the existing committee. Mr. Bethoney said the Board can take that action. It could also give direction John Sisson; he had been invited to this meeting, but he could not make it. Mr. Sisson can make sure that all the committees choose a representative. The makeup would then be:

- Two members of the Planning Board
- A member of the Select Board
- A member of the Finance and Warrant Committee
- A member the Council on Aging
- A business owner in Dedham Square (appointed by the Planning Board)
- A developer who has developed property in Dedham Square (appointed by the Planning Board)
- A member of Dedham Square Circle (appointed by them)
- 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.

Mr. Bethoney asked if anyone in the audience wanted to comment on this issue. No one did.

Mr. Podolski moved to form a new Dedham Square Planning Committee to be composed of two Planning Board members, one member of the Select Board, one member of the Finance and Warrant Committee, one member of the Council on Aging, a business owner in Dedham Square, a developer who has developed property in Dedham Square in the last ten years, a member of Dedham Square Circle, and five citizens at-large to be nominated as a result of the original makeup. The motion was amended so that the business owner and the developer will be appointed by the Planning Board, and the Council on Aging member is an actual active Council on Aging member, not an appointee. Mr. O'Brien seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

The Board took a five-minute break.

DISCUSSION: MASTER PLAN: REVIEW, ADVISE AND UPDATE

W. Shaw McDermott was present for this discussion. The Master Plan from 2009 was award-winning, and it is now time to update it. The new Master Plan will be called *Dedham 2020*. Ms. Porter is currently the chair.

Ms. Porter said that they want to begin work on the new Master Plan. This meeting is to discuss the proposed committee structure so they can get the committee appointed when Town Meeting grants the funding. They are also in the process of preparing a set of recommendations to guide the RFP process and budget; this will be brought to the Planning Board in January 2019. She furnished a packet that included the recommended membership, why they are making that recommendation for the committee structure, and a timeline. They hope to start working in July 2019. This is based on Master Plan Implementation Committee meetings, conversations with town planners from other towns, MAPC, and a pro-bono volunteer committee member who did research on 25 towns approximately the same size as

Dedham and how they structure their Master Plan committee. They talked with two planning consultants as well. Mr. Bethoney asked how the proposed committee structure compares with the previous Master Plan committee. Ms. Porter said the last committee had 14 members, but their precincts were not noted. The proposed committee would have 12 members, but they are recommending three members of the Select Board be added, bringing the total to 15.

Mr. McDermott said that the committee structure reflects significant thinking about the best way to get to a superior product. The issues and challenges will be more complicated than those in 2007. They want the committee to be more compact, and they would like at-large members with experience and expertise in various areas, geographic diversity to ensure representation from a variety of neighborhoods, and an interest in increasing residents' ability to enjoy town services and community features. They propose having the select committees to present other opportunities for people to serve, and give the Planning Board additional perspectives and flexibility to incorporate geographic interests and expertise. Rather than appointing precinct by precinct, he suggested that the Planning Board can obtain broad community representation without being bound to it being specific. He noted that there have been people appointed who live in one precinct, but due to redistricting, now live in an adjacent precinct, and others move to another part of town.

The three select committees reflect what was seen in the implementation analysis. Mr. McDermott said that housing is a very important issue. It is connected to economic development, the explosively changing nature of the community, and the kinds of scientific and technology enterprises emanating from the universities. He sees this on this on the commuter rail, i.e., a flood of people who are highly trained technicians, lab workers, and nurses. There is something different happening. The population is aging, and there is a desire for different housing stock due to downsizing. There also need to be less expensive entry places in the market for younger people. Transportation within the town, due to increased traffic, and transportation to and from the town are issues as well. It is also thought that there should be more emphasis on public health because of challenges such as opioid use, addiction, mental health, aging, and environmental issues. If these were highlighted as select committees, it might attract an interesting cross-section of people.

Ms. Porter, on behalf of the Master Plan Implementation Committee, suggested a 12-member committee with seven at-large appointments. The Planning Board would make four appointments, with the Select Board making three appointments. There would be two Planning Board members, one member of Parks and Recreation, one School Committee member, and one Select Board member. The representation of Planning Board members is important because it is the highest elective office in town with the broadest reach, and the Master Plan is a planning document. The Master Plan Implementation Committee (MPIC) decided against appointing members by precinct, in part because, in talking with the different consultants who help towns with their Master Plans, the warning was that it is sometimes easy to rely on those individuals to represent an entire neighborhood. A better way to ensure rigorous neighborhood involvement is to hold meetings in every neighborhood. In the document outlining points to include in an RFP, the MPIC is making a recommendation that applicants bid with the assumption that there will be neighborhood meetings.

Mr. Bethoney asked Ms. Porter if she has already collaborated with anyone. She said that there have been a lot of conversations with Judi Barrett, Barrett Planning Group LLC, who ran a workshop and brainstorming session with the Master Plan Implementation Commit-

tee. Ms. Porter spoke with Jennifer Goldson, AICP, the consultant who ran the Livable Dedham Housing Forum, and has spoken with several people at MAPC with regard to Master Plan structure and rigorous community involvement. Mr. Bethoney agreed with the concept of neighborhood meetings.

Ms. Porter said the MPIC did not feel that the precinct appointments guarantee rigorous neighborhood participation, and this was most important from the beginning. This was done for the last Master Plan. They advised that the Planning Board include geographic diversity when making appointments. Mr. McDermott said at the last Master Plan, they had a series of subcommittees to deal with the mandated areas, i.e., land use, culture, historical resources, and open space. If the Planning Board adopts this approach, there would be a 12-member committee with select committees with chairs reporting to the main committee.

Mr. O'Brien thought of another stakeholder, the Dedham Housing Authority (DHA), but did not know how much they should be involved in ultimate planning for the future. This can be included in how much stock there would be for the aging population who need subsidies. Mr. Bethoney said they should be intimately involved with the housing select-committee, as should the Council on Aging. Mr. O'Brien did not know how strong their voice would be. The Housing Authority serves a segment of population, and should be represented. However, there is a middle group that they do not serve, i.e., people in transition such as both younger and older populations looking for affordable housing who are not subject to the normal activities of the DHA. Mr. O'Brien said he sees a wave coming of working people who are aging but have no plan for when they cannot work or when they retire because they have been living hand-to-mouth. This will be a problem for the entire country, and there needs to be some sort of subsidiary stock for them. Mr. McDermott said the DHA needs to be heard, but he did not think they need to be a member of a committee. Mr. Bethoney said the DHA, Council on Aging, and Veterans all need to be heard, but this can be done in the charrettes, neighborhood meetings, and outreach. There also need to be experts to inform where the funding money comes from. Ms. Porter agreed, and said that town employees also need to be considered. She said that there are police and fire personnel, and teachers, as well as other town employees who cannot afford to live in Dedham. There are many pieces to the puzzle. The 2009 Master Plan had good recommendations on housing, but this is the worst progress the committee has made.

Ms. Tapper was asked how Dedham compared to Newton. She said that Newton is an anomaly. The Special Permit Granting Authority for basically all Special Permits is the elected city council, which is like the Select Board. The Planning Board is planning and developments. The city gets federal funds from HUD for housing funds and community development block grants, and the Planning and Development board is the authority on most of those. They are really not a permit granting board. The Zoning Board of Appeals deals mainly with variances. She said that the problem with Newton is that the boards are too large, i.e., the City Council has 24 members, and for a Special Permit, 16 out of 24 members are needed. The Planning Board has more members as well, but it is appointed, not elected.

Mr. Bethoney asked Ms. Tapper about the statutes for the Master Plan. She cited her experience in Maryland, but did not know Newton's statutes. Mr. Bethoney said that in Massachusetts, the Planning Board is statutorily the governing body related to the Master Plan. The Planning Board does not appoint anyone from the Select Board; the Select Board appoints its own representative. He does not know what the Select Board has to do with the Master Plan other than having a voice. He is not in favor of anyone other than the Planning Board ap-

pointing the at-large members. He does not know what type of interview process that the Select Board would use to determine the qualifications necessary or the desires; this is already in the Master Plan. He said that 90% of the Master Plan is related to the Planning Board, and it should be the appointing authority. He does not believe that any of the committees should appoint anyone other than the representative from their boards. He agreed that seniors, people concerned about long-term housing, and veterans should have voices within the select committees. He said that the concerns of public safety officials and/or public employees who have to live in the community should be heard. A lot of other issues will arise that were not discussed, but they become incorporated. He agreed with having a cross-section of representation, not necessarily precinct by precinct, but when he votes for someone, he will take into consideration the section of town in which they live. He will not consider a large group of like-thinkers, but prefers a group with diversified thought. Ms. Porter agreed, and suggested that the posting not only encourage a diversified group, but the time commitment as well. The Board agreed with these thoughts.

Mr. O'Brien said the Housing Authority blankets the Council on Aging and veterans, and should have a stronger voice. Mr. Bethoney said he has no issue with adding the Housing Authority, because it is one of the top issues in the Master Plan. Mr. O'Brien said that the person who is appointed needs to be very knowledgeable about the statistics and understands what the town is lacking with regard to federal and state government. Ms. Porter said that this is challenging. The DPW director, for example, will be strongly involved but will not be appointed to the committee. The Housing Authority would have to draw very heavily on its staff, so it does not make sense for them to be on the main committee; they would have better impact as a resource. She said that Peter Smith, who is on the Dedham Square committee, has experience in state grants, and would have the expertise for this.

Mr. Steeves said that there is nothing that comes before the Planning Board that does not have to do with the Master Plan, and it does everything it can to make sure it is followed. Ms. Tapper said this is the way it should be, but it is not mandated by Massachusetts law. Mr. Steeves said this is what the Town of Dedham does. Mr. Bethoney said that when they consider waivers, the Board determines how well the proposal includes visions in the Master Plan. The Master Plan is not a regulatory document. It helps developers create better projects and more efficiently and effectively get them approved with potential greater consideration from the Board.

Ms. Porter summarized the discussion. She said Mr. Bethoney wanted seven members appointed at large by the Planning Board; he said he could yield on this, and that an appointment by the Select Board is reasonable. This leaves six appointments by the Planning Board, which is fine with the Board.

Proposed Timeline:

- January 7, 2019: Master Plan Implementation Committee meets to formalize proposal for Planning Board.
- January 10, 2019: Meet with Planning Board to present proposal and hopefully establish committee and direct Economic Development Director to begin writing RFP.
- January 11, 2019: Begin postings for committees, prepare Planning Board budget request for May 2019 Town Meeting. Mr. Bethoney said they would seek \$150,000 for a consultant to support the work of the Master Plan 2020 committee. To properly inform Town Meeting of the Master Plan, its benefits, the cost, and its importance, a

report will be created for Town Meeting members. Ms. Porter said this will be in the report from the Master Plan Implementation Committee that will be delivered to the Planning Board.

Mr. Podolski asked if funding is based on reasonable expectations of cost. Ms. Porter said it is. Mr. Podolski wanted to be sure it is enough. He is on the Capital Expenditures Committee, and the funding will likely come before them. He will be an advocate for the funding, but noted that free cash is gone, so they will need to work with the Town Manager and others to make sure they obtain funding. Mr. McDermott noted that traffic studies, which will be needed for various projects, cost a lot of money. The Master Plan committee will be able to use those studies in its report. He has already spoken with Town Manager James Kern, who is fine with the money.

Old/New Business

Ms. Porter said that last week, Boston held a meeting for neighbors to discuss the traffic impacts that will be caused by a 500-unit apartment housing development behind Prime Motors in West Roxbury at the Dedham line. She and Jason Mammone, P.E., Director of Engineering, attended the meeting. One of the most notable things was that several West Roxbury residents told the developer and the project manager from Boston Development agency that the meetings should be held in Dedham because they will be most impacted by the traffic. She will give the project manager's information to the Board and Ms. Tapper. The developer will have a shuttle bus that runs to the commuter rail, which will help traffic impact.

Ms. Porter said the state budget allocated \$1 million dollars to look at the intersection. It is not clear when that will happen, so she said it might be worth reaching out to Sen. Michael Rush. Mr. Bethoney said they have done that. Mr. Steeves said that a developer paid \$12,000 to have it examined, and nothing can be done about it. Ms. Porter said the developer will pay to have the length of the left turn lane increased, which should help a little bit.

Mr. McDermott said that if the Master Plan started in July 2019, they would have to work very hard to have it completed by the end of 2020. The object is to call it Dedham 2020, but present it at Town Meeting in May 2021. Census data will need to be obtained, and can be used for data.

Next Meeting: January 10, 2019.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

/snw