

TOWN OF DEDHAM
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

John R. Bethoney, Chair
Michael A. Podolski, Esq., Vice Chair
James E. O'Brien IV, Member
Jessica L. Porter, Member
James McGrail, Esq., Member



Dedham Town Hall
450 Washington Street
Dedham, MA 02026
Phone 781-751-9240

Jeremy Rosenberger
Planning Director

**PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

February 21, 2019, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room

Present: John R. Bethoney, Chair
Michael A. Podolski, Vice Chair
James E. O'Brien IV
Jessica L. Porter

Absent: Robert D. Aldous
Eve Tapper, Interim Town Planner

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. Aldous and Ms. Tapper were not present for this meeting

DISCUSSION: TOWN MEETING ZONING ARTICLES, SPRING 2019 TOWN MEETING

The Board discussed the spring 2019 Town Meeting zoning articles prior to submission to the Town Administrator's office.

First Article:

Carmen DelloIacono has submitted two proposed zoning articles:

1. To change the 10% requirement of the nonresidential component in a Mixed Use Development to 20%
2. To require a mandatory 10% affordable housing component in a Mixed Use Development as defined in the State law

The Board has had multiple discussions over the past year regarding proposing to Town Meeting a comprehensive approach for reviewing, advising, and updating the Mixed Use Development bylaw (MUD). Mr. Bethoney and Ms. Tapper have also discussed this with Town Counsels Jonathan Eichman, Esq., and Lauren Goldberg, Esq. Based the Board's discussions, Atty. Eichman has proposed two zoning articles for consideration:

1. Require Town Meeting to authorize a short-term moratorium on all MUDs until 11/30/19, allowing the Board to fund the hiring of three consultants (zoning attorney and two engineering consultants) to look at the MUD stock in town, the benefits they have provided, and the negative impacts they have caused. The study date will be from the May 2019 Town Meeting to the fall 2019 Town Meeting. The findings will be presented at the May 2020 Town Meeting. Information, observations, and interviews with town officials, developers, land owners, and citizens will be presented at that time and recommendations will be made. Based on the recommendations, the Planning Board, working with the zoning attorney on the study team, will create regulatory reforms to submit to fall Town Meeting for consideration.

Mr. DelloIacono's articles are similar and address similar use types. At the fall 2018 Town Meeting, Mr. Podolski and Mr. DelloIacono proposed a change to the ZBL in what turned out to be a misguided attempt to place controls on the MUD bylaw. Town Counsel advised them that their of imposing Planned Residential Development (PRD) restrictions on a Special Permit was improper, so the bylaw was withdrawn prior to Town Meeting with the promise to look at the MUD bylaw in the future. It may now be time.

Mr. DelloIacono has now submitted two articles to specifically address and restrict provisions within this bylaw. However, Mr. Podolski was not sure that changing parts of a bylaw by removing and inserting language is the best way to do this. He believed that a comprehensive change, if warranted, would be better done after studying the problem, if there is one, with the MUD bylaw, have it examined by experts who report to the Board, and decide what, if anything, the Board may want to do with the bylaw. He, Mr. Bethoney, and Mr. O'Brien have been on the Board for 15 years, and have seen an explosion of MUDs, especially in Dedham Square where there have been at least six, one on Providence Highway next to the old Chili's, three in East Dedham, and one on East Street by Dedham Crossing. It seems that Mixed Use Development is the preferred development for at least Dedham Square, and possibly other areas of town. This is not bad in and of itself, but he is concerned as a resident whether they are overpopulating the number of apartments that might be needed in Town, and how adding more apartments without more controls changes its basic character and development. He has always considered Dedham to be a basic single family residential town, and wondered if that would quickly change if there is no study into bringing about large increase in the number of MUDs (retail on the first floor and up to three floors of apartments above the retail with a total building height of no more than 40 feet). He has been concerned about this for at least two years, and this is what drove him to create the initial article for the Town Meeting last year. The bylaw needs to be examined to be sure it is what the Town really wants and/or truly needs.

Mr. Podolski spoke with Mr. Bethoney and a developer informally last week. Mr. Bethoney, a broker, said that he is aware of people who are selling and needing to move to apartments. Mr. Podolski knows one person who did this, but no one else to his knowledge. He said that Mr. Bethoney would know more about this because of his business. There are about 9,000 households in Dedham, and 20-25 people who have sold their houses and moved into apartments, which is not a "tidal wave" of needing more apartments. He does not want the Town to become city-like. The continued construction of multiple apartments above retail, if it is not warranted or needed, is not in the best interests of the town. He advised stopping and looking at this to see what it looks like. Mr. Bethoney agreed, saying "it can't hurt." Mr. Podolski said he may be wrong, but the goal/purpose of looking at this is to do it now in-

stead of five years from now when the town is filled with MUDs with hundreds of apartments that may or may not be filled.

Mr. O'Brien sees a lot of MUDs being built in Town, and this may be the wave of this new type of apartment living. He said that Route One, which basically cuts the Town in half, is perfectly situated for these types of buildings. He commended Mr. DelloIacono's belief that something needs to be done, but creating a reaction often causes an opposite reaction. He believes that a study needs to be done prior to changing the ZBL. It could also show some areas about which the Board is concerned, and these could be added to the study. He was particularly concerned that all the two-bedroom apartments overtaxing the school system. Ms. Porter agreed that this should be studied, but wondered if Mr. DelloIacono's article should be set aside. Mr. Bethoney said that he could withdraw his article, and he has e-mailed him about this; Mr. DelloIacono is out of the country on vacation and was not present for the meeting.

Ms. Porter noted that several questions have been raised about Mixed Use Developments including parking requirements, density issues, percentage of commercial space, affordability and affordable units, different needs in different precincts, unit size restrictions, electrical vehicle charging, and changing the bylaw to make it clearer and the possibility of allowing waivers. Given the broad scope of these issues, the Town would be well served by doing a comprehensive study. She knows of several people who would consider selling their houses if there were more two-bedroom apartments. It would make sense to understand the demographics and the impacts. Assuming that the Board wants to have MUDs, she wondered if there are ways to change the ZBL to make it easier for developers to choose to make them condominiums. Mr. Bethoney said there is no restriction on these. She hoped the study included talking to developers to understand whether they would be inclined to build condos if there were different requirements. She felt that this would make it friendlier for condo development. She understood Mr. Podolski's desire not to make Dedham more citified, but said there are huge economic benefits Mixed Use Development.

Mr. Bethoney said he thinks a study is long overdue. He and Mr. Podolski have discussed this ever since the Planned Residential Development proposal at Town Meeting was nixed at because of statutory requirements. He summarized as follows:

1. Require Town Meeting to authorize a short-term moratorium on all MUDs until 11/30/19, allowing the Board to fund the hiring of legal counsel, and two experts, one to study the impacts and benefits that MUDs have had on the Town, and an engineering consultant to look at the sites, of what they are comprised, the number of units, the percentage that are nonresidential, etc. The study date will be from the May 2019 Town Meeting to the fall 2019 Town Meeting.
2. Interviews will be conducted with town leaders, citizens, developers, land owners, legal counsel, etc., to determine where they stand, what they think, and how the current bylaws in place right now benefit the community at large and how they may hinder the community at large.
3. Once the report has been developed and provided, the Planning Board, working with the study's legal counsel, will create zoning amendments to be proposed to Town Meeting relating specifically to Mixed Use Development. The proposed amendments will be based on the results of the study and the input of the citizenry.

4. The zoning article will discuss the proposal of the moratorium, the proposal of the study, and ask for a specific amount of money to be allocated toward that study. In the draft bylaw, that amount is left blank because it needs to be discussed by the Board and negotiated with the study team. Attorney Mark Bobrowski has been asked to put together his study team, including peer review consultant McMahon Associates, who has worked with the Town since the mid-2000's, and Barrett Planning Group and Judi Barrett, who was instrumental in representing the Town for the Legacy Place project and analyzing its long-term benefits and long-term negative impacts. Attorney Bobrowski, whose qualifications are second to none and who will lead the team, has written much of the State Zoning Code and recodified Dedham's Zoning Bylaw twice since Mr. Bethoney has been a member of the Board. He is considered to be the foremost zoning expert, besides Attorney Peter Zahka, in the State.

An outline of what they propose to be their roles has been prepared. The Board will review and negotiate this if and when Town Meeting authorizes the moratorium, study, and funding. An estimated cost proposal of \$61,000 has been submitted. Mr. Podolski said the Board should ask for a bit more money as a safety net.

- a. McMahon Associates has outlined four tasks that they believe will be necessary. This would be approximately \$30,000.
- b. Judi Barrett, Barrett Planning Group, has outlined four tasks estimated at approximately \$18,500. She will interview town leaders, citizens, developers, land owners, legal counsel, etc. Mr. Bethoney spoke with her today and told her this is very important, and they want to hear what the citizens and community leaders felt. He has asked her to perform a charrette with a community meeting to see what interested citizens, not necessarily elected or appointed, are asked what they want and what their visions are for the community. She said she would be very willing to hold as many as necessary. Her fee will cover that.
- c. Atty. Bobrowski has estimated approximately \$12,500.

Mr. O'Brien asked at which Town Meeting they would get the funding. Mr. Bethoney said it would be this May's Town Meeting. He, as chair, has put in a placeholder for as many articles as necessary on behalf of the Planning Board. Prior to publishing the warrant, the Board has the opportunity to submit articles. Once the funding is obtained, the study will begin. He also said that the money may be able to come from the Planning Board budget, as there is a substantial amount available because there is no salary for a town planner. He will discuss this with Assistant Town Manager Nancy Baker. He is not sure if that money needs to go back into a general account. Mr. O'Brien said that Town Meeting should be informed how highly regarded the study committee members are. Mr. Bethoney said that this will be done with the Finance and Warrant Committee.

Mr. Sisson is working with the Massachusetts Housing Partnership (MHP) and Livable Dedham on a couple of housing studies. They will definitely coordinate with the consultants and provide them with their findings. The MHP is working on demographic information based on federal data; this data is pretty good, although not great. They are just starting to work with the consultant from Livable Dedham, although they are about six months behind because they have not had the staff to work on this. Mr. Bethoney said there are other hous-

ing studies through MAPC that have been presented to the Board over the last few years, and the consultants can look through that. The housing issue is of significant importance. Many citizens are asking when enough it enough, and the Board needs to determine that with the help of others. Any involvement that Mr. Sisson can have through the Economic Development office will be helpful.

There were no comments from the audience. Ms. Porter said that if the Board decides to go ahead with this, there should be some communication with other boards that have ongoing projects. Mr. Bethoney spoke with Atty. Goldberg about at what point any developments in the pipeline are not affected by the May Town Meeting. She will speak with Atty. Eichman about the timeline and when the window of opportunity is, and let the Board know.

Mr. Bethoney asked the Board to carefully look over the zoning amendment and send any recommendations on wording or wordsmithing to Ms. Tapper and Mr. Sisson. There will be no meeting on this. Ms. Baker told him that she needed the final language or close to it, on February 25th or 26th because she will be publishing the warrant on Friday, March 1, 2019. The article will ultimately be reviewed and revised by Mr. Eichman to reflect any changes, and then sent to the Board for final review.

A Public Hearing will need to be held on this article and Mr. DelloIacono's article if he wishes to proceed after discussing the results of this meeting with Mr. Bethoney. Mr. Sisson asked when the Board would like to hold this. He passed out a list of three dates and said that any of them would be ample for posting, mailing notices to abutting communities, and providing the Board sufficient time to draft and distribute a memo to Town Meeting members. Mr. Sisson provided dates for certified mailing, publication, and distribution; Mr. Bethoney thanked him. The Board originally chose April 11, 2019, but Ms. Porter suggested April 25, 2019, because there may be newly elected Town Meeting members may want to attend the Public Hearing. However, she deferred to the Board on the date. Mr. Podolski proposed April 25, 2019, as this is after the April election, and the Board agreed. Mr. Sisson will prepare the necessary information for the Public Hearing.

Second Article:

This article about the accessory dwelling unit bylaw may be proposed to Town Meeting. It would allow, under certain circumstances as outlined in the bylaw, ADUs in Single Residence A and Single Residence B. It would allow the ZBA to consider waiving and having significant discretion in considering an accessory dwelling unit in these zoning districts.

Mr. Podolski said that in reading the current bylaw (which Atty. Zahka calls the "in-law by-law"), he noted that the proposal will change the name, which he believes is warranted. He has thought about this extensively, and is beginning to have grave concerns about what this would do if taken to the ultimate measure. As he understands the proposal to amend the by-law, it would allow a person who owns a single family dwelling in either SRA or SRB to convert it to an owner-occupied two family dwelling. He wondered if that would defeat the purpose of a having SRA or SRB zoning districts if owners in those districts who have a need, financial or otherwise, were allowed to convert their single family dwellings to two family dwellings, as long the owner lives there. It seems to be incongruous with why there are SRA and SRB zoning districts in the first place. It especially bothers him that it can be allowed in the extreme so that people can rent them out. He could see the need for such a proposal if a family-related person(s) will live in the converted single family dwelling.

Mr. Podolski did not necessarily object to allowing construction, whether in an existing building or adding on to an existing building if it is to be occupied by a family member of the owner. However, he wondered what would prevent an owner from converting his single family dwelling into a two family dwelling by building a one bath, two bedroom addition, moving into that, and renting out the larger portion of the house. Mr. Zahka said this can be done. Mr. Podolski said he believes this totally defeats the concept of single family. He has discussed this with Ms. Tapper. He said that if someone wants a two-family, they should move into a zoning district that allows it. It flies in the face of single family zoning. Mr. O'Brien said that in this scenario, it eliminates a single family dwelling forever; once it is converted, it runs with the property. Neighbors might not be happy since they bought their homes in a single family zoning district, and there would now be a two family dwelling. Mr. Podolski said it does not make sense. Mr. O'Brien said a clever developer could do a lot.

Ms. Porter spoke with Mr. Cimeno at length, and understood Mr. Eichman's language as saying that, despite the many ways that the existing bylaw is deficient and antiquated, the dwelling unit is to be specifically designed to be occupied by no more than two people. In the case Mr. Podolski stated previously, the house becomes a two-family because the owner is renting out the existing house and is occupying the small addition. He said this needs more study. Someone needs to convince him that these should be in Single Residence A or Single Residence B zoning districts. The districts should also be re-named since they are no longer single residence zoning districts. If it is for a family need, he is fine with that. However, if it comes down to an owner moving into the smaller unit and renting out the rest of the house, that is different. He questioned who would enforce that since the Building Department does not have enough people to do that.

Ms. Porter was curious about the specifics of his concerns. She said it would be up to the ZBA to allow waivers, and would help by giving people more flexibility. She has talked with three different families with older children moving in. Her original interest in changing the accessory dwelling unit bylaw came from Livable Dedham and the housing forum. Many, many residents would like to have parents or adult children move in with them. She shared Mr. Podolski's concerns, but trusts the ZBA to use its discretion and judgement. She suggested adding something to the bylaw with regard to "family occupied." It is hard to enforce, but it would help the ZBA to understand the intent.

Ms. Porter then said she has researched other communities that have tried to loosen their accessory dwelling unit restrictions to ease housing challenges, and understands that they have done well with it; she mentioned Needham in particular. The State is also encouraging communities to change the zoning. Mr. Eichman's proposal seems to be an incremental step to see how it works. Mr. Podolski asked what Needham did, but Ms. Porter was not sure. Mr. Bethoney said that if it is successful, the Board should look at it. He asked Mr. Sisson to look into Needham's work with it. Mr. Sisson said that Newton has passed something, as have Lexington and other communities. There are other constraints in addition to zoning that limit the ability of a homeowner to convert an existing dwelling and create an accessory dwelling unit. Zoning requirements and existing nonconforming houses are an issue, as is the requirement to have a fire barrier between dwelling units and significant costs. He spoke with the planner in Newton, and they do not anticipate more than a few dozen conversions. He will obtain as much information as he can from other communities with successful conversions. Mr. O'Brien agreed with Mr. Podolski's opinions. He has sympathy for family needs, but they can be achieved one way or another. He disagreed with converting a single

family dwelling in SRA and SRB zoning districts. He felt that it would degrade over time, eventually turning into condos, for example.

Mr. Bethoney said that the first order of business in any bylaw is to craft something that the Board believes two-thirds of Town Meeting members would support. A member may ask why the Board is putting owner-occupied two unit dwellings in a single residence district. The Board could say that Building Commissioner Kenneth Cimeno said it would be easier to enforce because right now it cannot be enforced or regulated due to sufficient regulatory control. If it is allowed within the regulations and under scrutiny, it would be more enforceable by creating rules around which people can have what some people already have. The Board could say that it fulfills a need to a significant degree, that there are studies from other communities that this works, or that there are affidavits from community leaders that this really works and should be tried in Dedham. The Board has been successful at Town Meeting because it does its homework, collects information, and makes decisions based on good information and good guidance. Town Meeting approves the Board's articles because it sees that what the Board has put into the proposal has merit, and they perceive that the proposal is good for the Town. This means the Board has to think about the way Town Meeting members will look at anything it proposes.

Mr. Bethoney has spoken with Diane Barry-Preston, the director of Livable Dedham, and asked her this question. Mr. Cimeno and others have recommended that any changes to the property run with the property. If an accessory dwelling unit is created for a family member who eventually moves or passes away, and the house ultimately goes on the market, the ADU runs with the property. If the next person buys the house but does not need the ADU, they can rent the unit and create supplemental income to help afford the property. In particular, older people can age in place by supplementing their income in a larger house that is expensive to own, i.e., high taxes, maintenance, insurance, etc., by renting out the accessory dwelling unit, and they could stay in their house. He wondered if Town Meeting would find this beneficial enough to have a 66% vote in favor of ADUs. The Board needs to figure out how the community feels as a whole, particularly in the zoning districts that are affected. Community outreach is necessary to inform people what the Board is doing and why, and to obtain feedback that would convince the Board that it is or is not a good idea. It will avoid questions when someone is constructing the accessory dwelling unit. This article is that important because it will allow a change in what people believe they have today. The Board will consider this between now and 2/25/19, provide the comments to Mr. Sisson and Ms. Tapper, and go from there.

Audience: No comments were made.

Zoning Article:

Mr. Sisson said there is one more zoning article submitted by Police Chief D'entremont regarding dog kennels. The ZBL is very restrictive, requiring five acres for someone to operate a dog kennel, which is effectively a prohibition of the use. The problem is that there are illegal kennels in Town, and there was a dog fatality in the last few weeks. The Animal Control officer, Jayson Tracy, has been working with Chief D'entremont and Mr. Cimeno to come up with a solution so that kennels can be regulated and inspected. The language for this article has not yet been finalized, but Mr. Sisson will get this to the Board as soon as he can. Mr. Bethoney suggested that this be sent to Town Counsel for review. Mr. Sisson thought this has been done, but will confirm this.

REVIEW AND VOTE ON CERTIFICATE OF ACTION FOR 219 LOWDER STREET

Present: Peter A. Zahka, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA
Gregory Carlevale, Manager, Collis, LLC

Mr. Zahka submitted a Certificate of Action for Planning Board approval. He hoped that the Board will review, change, and approve it so it can be filed with the Town Clerk. This follows the subdivision procedures, so there will be a 20 day appeal period. After that, the Applicant will return to the Board with a covenant or bond, whichever the Board requires per Subdivision rules.

Mr. Podolski reviewed the Certificate of Action and has changed some wording. A correction will be made to the number of parking spaces in the basement because two different numbers (14 on page 1 and 17 on page 1) are in the decision. Mr. Zahka said there will be 21 parking spaces, 17 under the building and four outside.

Mr. Podolski asked the board to consider adding a sentence in #16 at the end of this decision and all decisions going forward as follows:

“This decision, including all waivers and conditions herein, shall hold no precedential value whatsoever, nor bind the Planning Board as to any future similar type projects the Board may consider.”

This should prevent other applicants from expecting the same decisions because it was rendered in this specific instance. All decisions are decided on its own individual merits. Mr. Zahka had no problem with this. Mr. Podolski noted that this is a different concept Planned Residential Development, and each future one will be decided individually. The Board agreed with this subject to Mr. Podolski's changes.

Mr. Podolski moved to approve the Certificate of Action as amended, to be reviewed and signed once resubmitted. Mr. O'Brien seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0. Mr. Zahka will make the corrections and resubmit the Certificate of Action for signature. The Board wished Mr. Carlevale well.

DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON PEER REVIEW APPOINTMENT, JORDAAN, LLC, 197 MILTON STREET

Present: Peter A. Zahka, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA
Steven Findlen, McMahan Associates, Peer Review Consultant

Mr. Zahka submitted an application on 2/8/19 for a minor site plan review for the project at 197 Milton Street. The applicant came before the Board and the peer review consultant in May 2018 to close the automotive bays and convert them to a convenience store. The pumps would remain. Plans were submitted to the Board and showed that the roofs will be slanted. There have been several renditions before they determined what the Board wanted. The Zoning Board of Appeals approved closing the bays and allowing the retail use. The scoping session showed the building changes and two curb cuts on River Street; there are none at this time. One of the curb cuts will be exit only. They have put in an internal pedestrian walkway

as requested. They were also required to landscape to the extent possible. The site is basically all pavement.

The entire project has seven parking spaces, not counting spaces at the pumps. The ZBL provides that site review can be done in-house if there are nine or fewer parking spaces. The exact number of parking spaces required is debatable. Mr. Cimeno said that it is considered a gas station despite being a convenience store with gas pumps. The ZBL requirement for a gas station is five spaces per bay, but they will no longer have bays. More practically, if it is looked at as a convenience store, i.e., retail use, the requirement is for 12 spaces. The applicant is providing seven, which does not include the six spaces for the cars at the pumps.

Mr. Zahka asked what further review the Board wants. He asked that the Board understand that there will only be seven spaces, and that because it is less than nine, peer review is not required. Mr. Podolski did not especially like the building design but it is better than what exists. One of his issues is the amount of retail space and how many more people will come there for the retail portion of the building as opposed to the gas portion. His other concern is that the bylaw language assumes that there is a full-time planner to review the plan; that position is vacant at this time. He did not think it would be fair to ask a part-time planner to analyze this, so he believed that McMahan should perform the review, with limited instructions as to exactly what would be reviewed, and report back to the Board with his concerns.

Mr. Zahka said a floor plan has been provided. There is a very small addition to the building, but the footprint is basically the same. Mr. O'Brien said there is more room for parking, at least six on one side and another three on another side depending on whether they keep the air pumps. Mr. Zahka said the goal was not to restrict the number of parking spaces; they tried to maximize the parking spaces on the site while allowing for true circulation and meeting the ZBL. The spaces in back were angled and made one-way in order to meet the bylaw. There is a lot of room there, but once this is regulated, there will not be as much room. Mr. O'Brien said there is a lot of traffic going behind the building to avoid the lights. Mr. Zahka said that the aisle behind the building is 16 feet wide and paved right up to the property line. There is very minimal landscaping there, and they are trying to maintain that. The whole idea is to make a working site that is vastly improved aesthetically given that it is at a major corner in town. It is a minor site plan review, so there is no traffic report. The reason for being here is to define what the review would be. Defining the sidewalks and the curb cuts will improve safety. He is asking for a limited review.

Mr. O'Brien said that people park in front of the bays and they cannot be used. They also pull over to change their oil, fill their windshield washer fluid, etc., which presents a problem that is common in multi-use gas stations. Mr. Podolski wanted a review of the traffic and parking on the site, as well as compliance levels. Mr. O'Brien said that identifying the best entrance and exit for the curb cuts is very important.

Mr. Bethoney asked Mr. Findlen, peer review consultant from McMahan Associates, if he could perform a limited scope peer review of the project. The peer review will be paid for by the applicant. Mr. Findlen said that trip generation/traffic assessment is important, but this is a minor site plan review, and no traffic report is required. Mr. Podolski would still like to see the ITE. Mr. Bethoney said the Planning Board will agree, once a vote is taken, to a limited scope of minor site plan review for the site. He suggested that an architect or engineer develop a plan as close to compliance as absolutely possible. If he returns and says that, alt-

though his scope is limited, but everything is wrong, the applicant will have to go back to the drawing board. He supports upgrading the site. The building changes are significantly better.

Mr. Zahka deferred to the Board's request for a review. He calculated the worst case scenario for parking, which is retail, and determined that 12 spaces were required. He said they have seven, so he is requesting one waiver for parking. He is also requesting three waivers for landscaping. Mr. Podolski said he has no issue with the landscaping waivers at all, but just wants to be sure the site works. Mr. Bethoney said he would like the site as green as possible.

Mr. Findlen asked if there was any possibility of having just one curb cut on either Milton Street or River Street. Mr. Zahka said there was not; otherwise, a delivery vehicle would be able to get in but not out. Mr. Findlen said the one curb cut would allow for more parking and travel. He also said it would impact the intersection, and this must be answered as part of the review. Unfortunately, he did not believe they would get any information on this without a traffic report. Mr. O'Brien was not sure how this would work. It is the main route to Route 128 from the city. Ms. Porter asked if they would check with Joe Flanagan of the DPW about the intersection, which was part of the Complete Streets Prioritization plan that the DPW put together. An expert has looked at it, and it would be good to be sure that the suggestions for the sidewalk and crosswalk are consistent with the recommendations. There may be an opportunity to upgrade some of that with his client's construction. Mr. Zahka has already put in a call to Mr. Flanagan. The intersection has an island that could use some TLC. He thought that someone on the Board may encourage the applicant to do something, i.e., adopt it per Civic Pride, since he is already doing work. He agreed to look into this.

Mr. Bethoney asked Mr. Findlen for a limited scope proposal. This will be done.

As an aside, Mr. Zahka said he just learned that there are plans to reconstruct Ames Street all the way down Bridge Street. Mr. Bethoney said this is a state project, but he did not know when this would be done. He has received letters regarding this, which includes sidewalk improvement, because his office is on Ames Street. This is why a new gas line has gone in. Mr. O'Brien asked if someone had applied for that, but Mr. Bethoney had no idea.

DISCUSSION AND APPOINTMENTS FOR MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE AND DEDHAM SQUARE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Dedham Square Planning Committee

There are two applications for a business owner from Dedham Square and a developer from Dedham Square (Peter Smith and Giorgio Petruzzello). Two Planning Board members need to be appointed, and the Board is awaiting appointment of one member each of the Select Board, Finance and Warrant Committee, and Council on Aging. Once these are chosen, advertising will be done for citizens-at-large and determine the makeup based on where they live and the areas that are already covered. Dedham Square has appointed Ryan McDermott as its representative. The Board chose Mr. Podolski and Ms. Porter to represent them, although there was no vote on it.

Mr. O'Brien moved to appoint Ms. Porter to the Dedham Square Planning Committee, seconded by Mr. Podolski. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.¹ Ms. Porter moved to appoint Mr. Podolski to the Dedham Square Planning Committee, seconded by Mr. O'Brien. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.² Mr. Bethoney thanked Ms. Porter and Mr. Podolski for their service.

Ms. Porter asked if the posting has an expiration date; Mr. Bethoney said it is March 5, 2019. The Board will review Mr. Smith's and Mr. Petruzzello's applicants and appoint at the next meeting.

Master Plan Steering Committee

Two members of the Planning Board are needed to serve on this. Mr. O'Brien and Ms. Porter said they will do it. Mr. Podolski moved to appoint Mr. O'Brien, seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.³ Mr. Podolski moved to appoint Ms. Porter, seconded by Mr. O'Brien. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.⁴ Mr. Bethoney thanked Ms. Porter and Mr. O'Brien for their service.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

The Planning Board has been requested to appoint a member to the Town Manager Search Committee. Mr. Podolski, Mr. O'Brien, and Ms. Porter were not interested. Mr. Bethoney said he was interested. Mr. Podolski moved to appoint Mr. Bethoney, seconded by Mr. O'Brien. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.⁵ Mr. O'Brien asked on what date Mr. Kern would retire. Ms. Doherty did not know.

Mr. Podolski moved to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Porter. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Bethoney, Chair

/snw

ⁱ Mr. Aldous was not present for this meeting and thus did not vote on Ms. Porter's appointment.

² Mr. Aldous was not present for this meeting and thus did not vote on Mr. Podolski's appointment.

-
- ³ Mr. Aldous was not present for this meeting and thus did not vote on Mr. Podolski's appointment.
- ⁴ Mr. Aldous was not present for this meeting and thus did not vote on Ms. Porter's appointment.
- ⁵ Mr. Aldous was not present for this meeting and thus did not vote on Mr. Bethoney's appointment.