

**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**  
**Andrew Pepoli, Associate Member**



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

**Jeremy Rosenberger**  
**Planning Director**

**PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
TOWN OF DEDHAM  
450 WASHINGTON STREET  
DEDHAM, MA**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
VIA TELECONFERENCE  
MARCH 24, 2021, 7:00 P.M.**

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS:**

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

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF:**

Jeremy Rosenberger	Planning Director
Michelle Tinger	Assistant Planning Director
Jennifer Doherty	Administrative Assistant

Minutes prepared by Cassidy Civiero of Minutes Solutions Inc. from an audio recording.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Chairman of the Planning Board, Mr. Bethoney, called the Planning Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING, 146, 188, AND 216 LOWDER STREET AND 125 STONEY LEA ROAD – OLD GROVE PARTNERS LLC**

*Request for approval of a Planned Residential Development (PRD), as shown on a detailed site development plan submitted in accordance with Section 7.1 of the Dedham Zoning By-*

*Law. The proposed PRD shall have a maximum of twenty-six (26) dwelling units on +/- sixty-two (62) acres. The properties are located at 146, 188, and 216 Lowder Street and 125 Stoney Lea Road, Dedham MA, situated within a Single Residence A Zoning District, and shown on Dedham Assessors' Map 105, Lots 17, 19, 23 and Map 118, Lot 31. Representative: Mr. Peter A. Zhaka Esq.*

Mr. Bethoney stated that since this proposal was last discussed, the applicant has submitted the findings of their traffic report. A peer-reviewed report was received, and McMahon Associates identified nine issues. A neighborhood letter was received that covered multiple issues, including traffic.

Mr. Hollis Perry, 72 Chestnut Street, Dedham, MA, is a lifelong Dedham resident who expressed concern about traffic impacts on the neighborhood.

The Open Space and Recreation Committee recommended that the Board consider the project in the affirmative for all of the open space it provides and the conservation land on the property that will be protected.

Mr. Peter A. Zhaka, Attorney, with offices at 12 School Street, Dedham, MA, stated that the full traffic report was peer-reviewed during the concept plan stage, and the project was reduced to 26 instead of 30 units.

Mr. Bernie Guen presented the traffic report from the applicant, highlighted as follows:

- The intersection of High Street and Lowder Street is currently at Service Level F during the evening peak hours.
- In the evening, from 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., there was a total of 28 vehicles, which represents less than one vehicle per minute.
- A signal is not warranted at the High Street and Lowder Street intersection, with or without the project.
- This project will not require second access on High Street because of the number of vehicles generated by the project site. However, secondary access would also have even more traffic cutting through a subdivision.
- Mitigation at the High Street and Lowder Street intersection could be achieved by installing a rectangular rapid flashing beacon. Under State law, cars must stop at the flashing beacon.
- New pedestrian signs, stop signs, and pavement striping would be implemented at Lowder Street and High Street, Lowder Street and Sawyer Drive, and Lowder Street and Wompatuk Road.
- There would be a short sidewalk extension blending into the existing sidewalk on Lowder Street as you come out of the new road.
- The total impact of this project would be low because of the surrounding study area.

Mr. Zhaka noted that the traffic study does not consider the number of bedrooms per dwelling, as the ITE states, "single-family house." An agreement was achieved by the end of the

peer-review process that the traffic report was done correctly and the impacts on this roadway system would be minimal.

Ms. Porter inquired whether the applicant has read the report from the engineer and his suggestions for mitigation. Mr. Bethoney clarified that the Town Engineer requested in writing that the Planning Board consider conditioning the applicant to make a payment of \$500,000 to the Town, \$100,000 of which would go toward a study of the area, and \$400,000 to implement the traffic mitigation derived from the survey of the ground.

Mr. Zhaka responded that, during the concept phase, Mr. McGrail had indicated that he, along with the TAC and the neighborhood, had a dialogue about the existing conditions that led to the request from the engineer. Mr. Zhaka added that there was a response to the engineer that the traffic impacts are expected to be minimal, and the applicant would provide the \$100,000 for a Town performed traffic mitigation study, not \$500,000. Mr. Zhaka suggested that the sidewalk be ended as originally proposed rather than further extended.

Ms. Porter requested clarification on the difference between Service Level F and Service Level E. Mr. Guen responded that a vehicle waiting longer than 50 seconds is Level F and 36 to 50 seconds is Level E. Ms. Porter inquired whether the grading scale stops at Level F and Mr. Guen responded affirmatively and stated that the methodology is conservative.

Ms. Porter inquired, if, hypothetically, the intersection was currently at Level E, would it go to Level F from the increase in traffic from the proposed project. Mr. Guen responded that he believes so and stated that the seconds stop being counted after Level F, so he does not have the number of seconds that the wait time will increase by.

Mr. McGrail inquired about the cost of a rectangular rapid flashing beacon. Mr. Guen responded that it depends on the design, but it would be a maximum of \$15,000.

Mr. Bethoney stated that the neighborhood wrote a letter regarding traffic, and the applicant responded, and the neighborhood has now provided an additional letter to that response. At Mr. Bethoney's request, Mr. Zhaka spoke to the comments on traffic from the letter. The neighborhood suggested that the Planning Board and the Town work with a subgroup to undertake a study. The most deeply felt concerns by abutters are access and traffic.

Mr. Zhaka stated that the study proposed by the engineer for which the applicant has said he will pay \$100,000 would address this concern. Mr. Zhaka had a great conversation with Mr. Jim Hooper, and the letter represented an excellent discourse. Mr. Zhaka added that there was discussion on considering a second entrance to what is proposed. However, the traffic generated by this project does not warrant a second entrance; it is not legal given what was voted on at Town Meeting. Mr. Bethoney stated that he would characterize the request from the letter as a public safety concern and a necessity for a second separate access from the site to alleviate all traffic having to access one point.

Mr. Bethoney inquired whether the traffic study considered the probably age demographic of the potential owners of the units within this PRD. Mr. Zhaka responded that the units

are not age-restrictive, but the units have been designed with older people in mind as they have a first-floor master. Mr. Bethoney stated that he asked a yes or no question. Mr. Zhaka responded no.

Mr. Bethoney noted that the neighborhood letter references the last two PRDs on West Street and Lowder Street. Mr. Bethoney feels the age demographic should be discussed, as there is a different level of peak-hour impact when talking about typical working-age people and retirees. When Mr. Bethoney discussed age demographics with the developer of the other PRDs, he was told that the occupants are overwhelmingly retirees. Some do not live at the PRDs full-time throughout the year and usually prioritize their schedules to not travel the roadways during peak times.

Mr. Bethoney inquired why the traffic engineers did not consider the age demographic or gather information from the developer of the other PRDs and stated that this should have been part of the applicant's presentation. Mr. Guen responded that IT is used to generate the number of trips for a standard traffic study, even if it may be lower. Therefore, if it were an age-restricted property, the traffic would be considerably lower. Still, unless the PRD has that specific designation, the State guidelines must be followed when determining the trip rate. Mr. Bethoney responded that a caveat should have been mentioned while adhering to the guidelines.

Mr. Jim Hooper, 0 Wompatuk Road, Dedham, MA, stated that he is a close neighbor for the proposed PRD. He handled primary communications with the owner of the previously constructed PRD next door to the neighborhood. Mr. Hooper stated that the letter's purpose was not to oppose the addition of one car but, given the level of service and access issues that residents in these neighborhood experience daily, why would additional vehicles be added until the more significant traffic problem is addressed.

Mr. Hooper stated this project is not causing the traffic problem. However, there is a problem, and the solutions must come from the Town, the project, and the developer of the PRD. Mr. Hooper added that this is a safety concern, especially with residents walking more during COVID-19. Residents who signed the letter felt a breakdown in communication between the Town, the developer, and the neighborhood. Mr. Hooper apologized for any inconvenience for this project in its late stage.

Mr. Bethoney inquired with Mr. Hooper about his opinion of the overall communication with the developer. Mr. Bethoney contacted Mr. Zhaka to request that he provide the Board with a chronology of the interactions between the developer and the neighborhood and the developer and the Town. Mr. Bethoney inquired whether Mr. Zhaka has prepared this information. Mr. Zhaka confirmed and highlighted the information as follows:

- This project commenced in late-Spring 2019. The applicant, Mr. Joyce, had developed conceptual plans and held small group meetings with two (2) or three (3) people in the neighborhood at a time.
- Two (2) larger general meetings were held at the Dedham Country Day School in June and July 2019. Mr. Zhaka did a mailing to abutters within three hundred (300)

feet of his property, and each meeting seemed to have approximately forty (40) residents in attendance.

- Before any formal submission, on October 24, 2019, the Planning Board held a scoping session that was well attended.
- The applicant formally filed at the end of 2019/early 2020 with the Phase 1 concept plan. High-level plans were developed as required by the Board, and a full peer-reviewed traffic report was conducted at that time.
- There were three (3) public hearings held by the Planning Board. Notice these meetings were sent out more than once to abutters, at least within three hundred (300) feet of the proposed PRD. These hearings were held pre-March 2020 and were in-person events.
- In February 2020, the Planning Board voted that if the PRD were to be approved, it would be exclusive to Mr. Joyce and no other entity, and the thirty (30) proposed dwelling units were reduced to twenty-six (26) units. The issue of the potential donation of land was brought forward.
- The Planning Board recommended Town Meeting to treat this project as a zoning article with a public hearing in April 2020.
- The Town Meeting was supposed to be in May 2020 but was delayed to July or August 2020, when the Town decided to hear only budgetary items. As a result, this project was put on the November 30, 2020, Town Meeting agenda, and the concept plan was voted on with ninety-eight (98) percent in favor.
- Before the Board tonight, the project was filed in the form of a site development plan following the procedures for the subdivision regulations. That is the second public hearing.

Ms. Regan Andreola, Associate, Beals + Thomas, worked with the applicant in hosting the two community meetings, one in July 2019 and one in October 2019, the latter of which was specifically for those who were away on vacation in the summer. Over 50 notifications went out to abutters, and approximately 40 attended in both cases.

Mr. McGrail stated that he appreciates the comments from Mr. Hooper, and the traffic issue on Lowder Street does not lie only with this project. There is a much larger issue at play. As discussed at previous meetings, Lowder Street, through the use of technology, has become a dangerous cut-through of the Town. It affects those in the neighborhood and the residents who walk this street.

Mr. McGrail stated that this was a dangerous situation before the pandemic and is still challenging due to those without regard to speed. He inquired what will happen when the Town returns to normal and cars start coming through because an application told them Lowder Street was the best path to travel off the highway. Mr. McGrail added that Mr. Mammone's proposed five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) to be paid by the applicant for traffic mitigation is an effort to address this issue.

Mr. McGrail suggested that the cut-through status of Lowder Street end, which cannot be achieved through widening the sidewalk or implementing signage but could be achieved

through placing an island in the middle of Lowder Street. Mr. McGrail stated that there must be separate meetings to discuss the traffic issues in this neighborhood, as they must be resolved. Mr. McGrail added that Ursuline is interested in being a part of the solution on their property; however, he does not speak on their behalf. Mr. McGrail concluded that the pandemic would soon be over, and the traffic will considerably increase.

Mr. Bethoney stated that there had been discussions surrounding cut-through traffic and pedestrian safety, speed, access, and volume over the past one and a half years. One of the impediments to resolution is the engineering department stating that this was too big of a problem to be resolved in-house and would have to be sent to an external engineering firm. Mr. Hooper had noted that the solution needs to be collaborative, and Mr. Bethoney agreed it should be collaborative, including DCD and Ursuline. They have committed to assisting with the answer.

However, this is a money problem related to a study to resolve what will be most effective and least intrusive. One hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) is needed for an external engineering study, which would then be brought before the TAC for a favorable recommendation to the Select Board. This is beyond the PRD's scope, but the Board, neighborhood, applicant, and Town should commit to these goals.

Mr. Hooper thanked Mr. McGrail for his creative solution to the problem. He stated that he is on a school board, and schools want to do right in their neighborhood; therefore, DCD and Ursuline will likely be great collaborative partners for these conversations. Mr. Hooper stated that this project had aligned interests, including Mr. Joyce's future customers, who will not want their driveway to be located on a superhighway.

Mr. Bob Honeywell, 978 High Street, Dedham, MA, stated that he attended both public meetings in 2019, expressing his concerns about traffic. Mr. Honeywell noted that the Town, Mr. Flanagan, and the DPW worked on the intersection here before because of its width. As a result, the roadway was narrower with more significant curbs, a collaborative effort with a solution. Mr. Honeywell stated that he had witnessed five or six accidents at this intersection with varying depths, one of which resulted in a car driving into the living room of a nearby house. Mr. Honeywell concluded that this issue would not be made better by an additional 70 cars on this roadway. There could be a younger demographic as prime candidates for these condominiums.

Mr. Jim Kaufman, 248 Highland Street, Dedham, MA, has lived near the Lowder Street, Highland Street intersection. Mr. Kaufman suggested that the schools institute buses to minimize vehicles on Lowder Street or a robust ridesharing program if they would like to be part of the solution, as they are currently contributing to the problem. Mr. Kaufman stated that when the Board approved The Rashi School, buses were mandated.

Mr. Bethoney stated that everyone at the meeting tonight could agree that there is a significant traffic issue related to speed, volume, access, cut-through, and pedestrian safety. The conversation this evening has been productive, but going forward should relate to traffic as it pertains to the proposed project.

Mr. Steven Schultz, 212 Lowder Street, Dedham, MA, stated that the project would likely go on for five years, and during that time, large construction vehicles will be traveling down Lowder Street leading to the project site. Mr. Schultz suggested a staging area on the property so vehicles can unload without making several trips, which would eliminate some safety concerns, as the heavy-duty equipment could injure people walking down the street and turning onto it in a vehicle.

Mr. Zhaka responded that if the project is approved, there would be several standard conditions, including a construction management plan that requires stagings, with trucks to be on the subject property and not on Lowder Street. In addition, the Planning Board has specific items that must be addressed in the construction management plan. Mr. Bethoney added that the vehicles, construction equipment, and materials will have to be staged on site and the comings and goings of vehicles will only be for deliveries within the construction management plan.

Mr. Bethoney stated that the last time Mr. Schultz attended, he expressed concern about the screening between his property and the access roadway, and Mr. Joyce had committed to discussing mitigation with Mr. Schultz. Mr. Bethoney inquired whether that had been done. Mr. Schultz confirmed that Ms. Andreola attended on the property, was very responsive, and came back with a beautiful plan for plantings that mitigated his and his wife's concerns.

Mr. Zhaka stated that Ms. Andreola would be updating the plans to be submitted to the Board to indicate the changes for Mr. Schultz and another resident regarding the curb cut. This will also go to Conservation again, as it is a change to the initial submission.

Ms. Eileen Kiley, 1031 High Street, Dedham, MA, stated that the speed on High Street concerns her, as people are driving forty miles per hour or over. Ms. Kiley questioned the efficacy of the blinking light at Lowder Street and Westfield Street when people are going at this speed and stated that there are many children and persons with disabilities in the neighborhood that could be hit by a vehicle. Ms. Kiley added that the proposed commitment of \$500,000 could be carried out over the five-year project to perform the studies, and the proposed project would add a lot of open space value to the Town. Ms. Kiley requested more information about the efficacy of a blinking light. Mr. Bethoney agreed that a blinking light is not the same as a stop sign.

Mr. Bethoney clarified that the \$100,000 is to perform a comprehensive study of the area, including the project, to determine what measures would best serve the situation. The additional \$400,000 was for the mitigation efforts. Mr. Bethoney stated that Mr. Zhaka has relayed that the money should go to a study rather than the blinking light, and the applicant will pay \$100,000 to be used for this purpose. Once that study is completed, reports are provided, mitigation is considered, and the report is then sent to the Select Board for consideration and approval. Mr. Bethoney stated that the mitigation payment would be made sooner rather than later.

Mr. Pepoli stated that a blinking light crossing was recently added at the intersection for Sprague Street and Greenlodge Street and proposed that Ms. Kiley could view the intersection to see its effectiveness.

Ms. Lee Slaine, 199 Lowder Street, Dedham, MA, stated that she borders the PRD approved last year that has since been completed, and she was not aware that there was a construction plan for that project. However, the trucks were staging next to her bedroom for 12 to 18 months at 7:00 a.m. Ms. Slaine stated that her primary concern with the construction plan is that the trucks will be arriving at the same time as cars going to DCD and Ursuline. The street is very narrow for incoming and outgoing traffic traveling the roadway simultaneously.

Mr. Bethoney responded that the Board would consider these concerns as they deliberate the project. Ms. Slaine answered that she has raised concerns at every meeting and is told that her comments will be taken into consideration; however, nothing is done.

Mr. Bethoney requested that Ms. Slaine send the Board an email outlining her concerns and stated that they would be considered when making determinations on the project.

Mr. Jamie McCleary, 228 Lowder Street, Dedham, MA, inquired what the next steps might be in creating solutions that could assist in mitigating the traffic concerns vocalized tonight and in the letter sent to the Board.

Mr. Bethoney responded that, according to the engineering department under Mr. Jason Mammone, these issues could only be addressed if a study were to be funded either by the Town or through private funds. That is the reason Mr. Mammone has requested that the Planning Board work to negotiate the funding of the study in the amount of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000). A study must be performed, and data must be collected, then mitigation measures must go through the TAC and be recommended to the Select Board. The study is expensive because the area is significant, and there are two (2) academic institutions, cut-throughs, and narrow roadways involved.

Mr. McCleary inquired whether these efforts will stand independent of the approval process of the PRD.

Mr. Bethoney responded that if Mr. Joyce's project were approved, he would have to pay \$100,000 of mitigation payment before the timeline would be determined. Therefore, the study will not be funded unless Mr. Joyce receives approval to ultimately yield a building permit.

Mr. Bethoney presented the issues outlined in the neighborhood letter. Outstanding matters were highlighted:

- Regarding re-pavement of disturbed areas, the applicant has stated that they will do everything required by the Town. However, the neighbors feel that the requirements are not sufficient, and the applicant should go beyond what is just necessary. Mr.

Bethoney stated that this would be addressed in the certificate of action should this project be approved.

- Neighbors expressed concern regarding where sidewalks are needed for pedestrian safety and to slow traffic. Mr. Bethoney stated that this would be addressed through the traffic mitigation study.
- Mr. Bethoney stated that any blasting would be done within the confines of State, local, and federal requirements, and the applicant cannot be asked to do anything further than that. However, this can be addressed further under the order of conditions.
- Mr. Bethoney stated that the staging of vehicles and materials needed on site will be thoroughly taken up through the construction management plan.

Ms. Hooper stated that the neighbors are requesting that the applicant pre-resolve the mail issue, given the conversations this evening about the narrowness of Lowder Street and the traffic issue. Mr. Zhaka responded that postal services would be engaged; however, they will not have comments until they have a street to comment. Mr. Zhaka added that the applicant would be pursuing individual mailboxes for the PRDs.

Ms. Barbara Emery, 85 Glenridge Road, Dedham, MA, inquired whether the Town would be willing to pay the \$100,000 for the mature traffic study, as the applicant paying for the study could be a conflict of interest, and the intersection remains very dangerous.

Mr. Bethoney responded that Mr. Joyce is not paying for the study but proposing to give the Town \$100,000, and the Town would accept it for the Town's use to perform a traffic study. The money would go to the engineering study, and Mr. Joyce would have nothing to do with the traffic study, its findings, or the recommendations.

Mr. Steven Findlen, Senior Project Manager, McMahon Associates, stated that a comprehensive peer review was performed for the traffic study, supplemental information, and site plans submitted by the applicant for this project. McMahon Associates submitted a letter to Mr. Rosenberger and the applicant on March 16, 2021, and is still awaiting a response from the applicant. The letter included seven identified issues related to vehicular site circulation and clarifications on the plan.

Mr. Bethoney stated that discussion on the issues from McMahon Associates would be tabled until the applicant responds to their letter. Mr. Zhaka noted that the applicant responded to all items mentioned by the peer reviewer. Mr. Findlen will provide a response at the next meeting.

Ms. Porter inquired about what the timing of a traffic study would be and how it would impact this process. Mr. Bethoney responded that he did not know before this evening that the applicant would provide the Town \$100,000 to be used toward a traffic study. Mr. Bethoney will speak to Mr. Mammone on March 25, 2021, to relay that the mitigation payment will be received and will ask him for a timeline from the engineering department.

Mr. Zhaka stated that Ms. Andreola sent in responses to McMahon Associates and that many of the issues identified by the engineering department were procedural. Mr. Bethoney asked whether the applicant will do everything the engineering department has requested. Mr. Zhaka responded that there were discussions on the traffic mitigation with sidewalks but other than that, the applicant is willing to adhere to all the engineer's requests.

Ms. Andreola stated that Mr. Findlen had asked for a stamped photometric plan; however, the firm does not typically stamp these documents, as they are more of a lighting plan. Mr. Bethoney inquired who drafted the lighting plan. Ms. Andreola responded that Omnilight did the plan and has stated that they do not stamp these documents. Ms. Andreola noted that she does not want to send multiple drafts of revised plans to the Boards and Conservation; therefore, everything is being changed in bulk before it is sent out.

Mr. Bethoney asked whether the fire department has opined on the plan. Mr. Zhaka responded that the fire department opined during the conceptual phase, and the fire chief stated he reviewed the plan and it met his specifications.

Mr. Bethoney sought alternate dates for the meeting that was to be held on April 28, 2021, as he cannot attend that evening. Ms. Andreola stated that the Conservation Commission meeting is on April 14, 2021, so the applicant will be ready to speak following that. The Board, applicant, and peer reviewer agreed to April 29, 2021, for the next meeting date.

**A motion was made by Mr. McGrail to continue the public hearing to April 29, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Podolski. A roll call vote was taken:**

<b>James McGrail:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Jessica Porter:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>James O'Brien:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Michael Podolski:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>John Bethoney:</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**Motion passed unanimously, 5-0. The public hearing is continued to April 29, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

Mr. Bethoney requested that residents send their comments via email so that they are memorialized regardless of whether they were discussed verbally during this meeting.

**3. 464 AND 470 WHITING AVENUE – JAMES BONITO**

Mr. Bethoney stated that all Board members received the proposed subdivision plan from Mr. James Bonito regarding 464 and 470 Whiting Avenue in the Dropbox.

Ms. Mary Bonito Gaetani stated that the family is looking to sell the house at 464 Whiting Avenue. There were two (2) sheds in the backyard, and the property line had jutted around the sheds. Ms. Bonito Gaetani stated that the shed at the property line has since been

removed, and the request is for the owner of 470 Whiting Avenue to straighten out the property line at the back of the yard accordingly.

Ms. Tinger stated that she provided a staff report pertaining to the A&R for the two (2) properties, which are located in the General Residence Zoning District, and each has a single family on the lots. The applicant is seeking endorsement for approval that is not required to square off the property line on the small piece of the back right of the property near the formal rail tracks. Four hundred and fifty-six (456) square feet of 464 Whiting Avenue is to be combined with 470 Whiting Avenue. Ms. Tinger stated that both properties meet the frontage and lot area requirements set forth by the zoning bylaws, and therefore staff would recommend that the subdivision plan of land be endorsed as approval, not required.

**A motion was made by Mr. Podolski to endorse the plan as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Brien. A roll call vote was taken:**

<b>James McGrail:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Jessica Porter:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>James O'Brien:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Michael Podolski:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>John Bethoney:</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**Motion passed unanimously, 5-0. The plan was endorsed as presented.**

**4. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT FACILITIES**

Mr. Bethoney stated that, in the past, there were discussions on zoning related to gun shops and other potential uses that could be acted upon. Such uses are proposed by the public to be considered tattoo parlors and substance abuse and treatment facilities.

Ms. Tinger stated that the Town currently regulates zoning for substance abuse facilities by only allowing them by special permit in the following districts as per the bylaws: Planned Commercial, Residential Development and Office, Limited Manufacturing Business, and Highway Business. Dedham currently has two (2) known substance abuse treatment centers, and both provide a variety of other medical and health services.

Mr. Bethoney requested that the name of whoever is to speak on matters during a Planning Board meeting should be put on the agenda going forward.

Mr. Bethoney inquired whether the Board is satisfied with the four zoning districts in which the substance abuse facilities are allowed. Mr. Bethoney requested confirmation that the building currently proposed on Washington Street is in a Highway Business Zoning District and Mr. Rosenberger confirmed this.

Mr. McGrail stated that it works in concept to take these buildings away from residential areas; however, the building being proposed now is direct across the street from a person's

home in a Highway Business district. Mr. McGrail proposed that a map be drafted for discussion at the next meeting to determine where residential homes are located within these districts. Mr. Bethoney stated that he was thinking along the lines of an overlay district, and he believes the zoning should be tailored more carefully so that these buildings are not directly across from or next door to a residential property.

Ms. Porter stated that this is an issue that impacts many residents of Dedham and Dedham has higher rates of substance and opioid abuse than surrounding communities. Ms. Porter would like to be thoughtful of neighborhoods in Highway Business districts; however, she cautioned the Board not to overly restrict the ability for these kinds of treatment centers to open up. Ms. Porter stated that there have already been three overdose fatalities this year, and stigma should be avoided surrounding these conversations.

Mr. Podolski agreed with Ms. Porter and stated that the Board had already set up a substance abuse zone in anticipation of these issues down the road. Mr. Podolski stated that the initial bylaw was approved by Town Council and the Attorney General, and if too many carve-outs are included, the process could be seen as exclusionary.

Mr. Bethoney stated that this issue would be discussed further once there is a clear map of these zones and recommended that further discussions on carve-outs or overlay districts be in concert with Special Council Mr. Grabowski, the author of the current substance abuse bylaw.

## **5. DESIGNING DEDHAM 2030 MASTER PLAN**

Ms. Porter stated that there would be an open house on governance, community facilities and services, and land use on Tuesday, March 30, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. This will be interactive, with short presentations and breakout rooms with residents discussing what they would like to see in Town over the next ten (10) years.

## **6. PLANNING DIRECTOR UPDATE**

Mr. Rosenberger stated the following development projects are active:

- Lower Street (PRD)
- 95 Eastern Avenue (Hotel)
- 480 Sprague Street (Amazon)
- 337-339 Washington Street (Mixed Use)
  - This project is for approximately eleven (11) units and, following the zoning amendments, the applicant would like to come before the Board for potential changes to this plan.
- Stergis Way (Commercial Subdivision)
  - This is for the reallocation of property lines; however, it will likely be rescinded given the zoning amendments. Nothing has been filed as of yet.
- Dedham Plaza (Site Plan/Exterior Improvements)

- Dedham Plaza has asked for additional time to work through their issues, as they are working with commercial real estate tenants to reallocate space. This would be a rebranding of the site, which would require a tenant mix change. They hope to be before the Board in the Summer of 2021.

Mr. Rosenberger stated that the following are potential future development projects:

- 80 Bridge Street (Mixed Use)
  - A filing will likely be received in late April 2021, pending Conservation Commission.
- Legacy Place (Traffic Improvement)
  - Legacy Place would like to alleviate some crunch points in their circulation.
- 750 Providence Highway (Restaurant)
  - This was subject to a 2016/2017 approval by the Board and is a retail space that has not yet come into fruition. There will perhaps be fast food use in addition to the T.G.I.Fridays on site.
- 355-359 Washington Street (Mixed Use)
  - This is near Dedham Square and Town Hall and is for sixteen (16) units as a mixed-use development. The owner and legal counsel are looking to file now that the bylaw has been changed.
- 124 Quabish Road (Mixed Use)
  - This was subject to an age restriction and did not come to fruition. The owner is interested in a mixed-use project in the area, likely in 2021 or 2022.

Mr. Rosenberger stated that the Planning Department is working tirelessly to ensure residents have access to all information on active developments before the Planning Board.

Ms. Porter thanked Mr. Rosenberger for the active projects page on the website, which links to the documents and is extremely helpful. Ms. Porter stated that she assumes records will continue to be kept on Dropbox and inquired how hybrid meetings could be conducted when in-person meetings are allowed in the Fall of 2021 to keep up the level of public participation over the last year. Mr. Rosenberger responded that the Town Manager has a team of folks discussing this. There are new conference rooms that provide the technology needed for hybrid meetings, and steps could be taken to facilitate hybrid meetings based on the will of the Board.

Mr. McGrail stated that he hopes he does not have to wait until Fall of 2021 for the Board to hold in-person meetings, as April 2021 should be a banner month for vaccinations. Mr. McGrail stated that he is not looking to do anything unsafe or irresponsible, but people need to get out of the house, and if full in-person meetings are not back until September 2021, the Town has failed. Mr. McGrail added that it would be fantastic to hold hybrid meetings, but residents should be allowed to also attend in person.

Mr. Podolski supported Mr. McGrail in his statement.

**7. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

**A motion was made by Mr. O'Brien to defer approval of the minutes to the next Planning Board meeting to be held on April 29, 2021. The motion was seconded by Mr. Podolski. A roll call vote was taken:**

**James McGrail        Yes  
Jessica Porter:        Yes  
James O'Brien:        Yes  
Michael Podolski:     Yes  
John Bethoney:        Yes**

**Motion passed unanimously, 5-0. Approval of the minutes was deferred to April 29, 2021.**

**8. OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. McGrail stated that an Open Space Committee Meeting was held on March 23, 2021, and the Committee is breaking down the list of priorities. The Committee intends to split into sub-committees to be more responsive to some of the things that people want to see move forward. The Open Space Committee is meeting again on April 27, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Bethoney stated that for the TAC to review traffic issues, the resident has to submit an application and describe the situation, a hearing is held, and the Committee makes a determination on whether or not a Town performed study is to be completed by the Engineering Department.

**9. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held on April 29, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Mr. Podolski to adjourn the meeting at 9:51 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Brien. A roll call vote was taken:**

**James McGrail:        Yes  
Jessica Porter:        Yes  
James O'Brien:        Yes  
Michael Podolski:     Yes  
John Bethoney:        Yes**

**Motion passed unanimously, 5-0. The meeting was adjourned.**

**DISCLAIMER**

The above minutes should be used as a summary of the motions passed and issues discussed at the meeting of the Board of the Planning Committee. This document shall not be considered a verbatim copy of every word spoken at the meeting.