



Prior to the meeting, the Board reviewed the request for a covenant approval from Old Grove Partners.

**On a motion made by Mr. Podolski, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, it was resolved to approve the covenant approval request regarding 146, 188, and 216 Lowder Street. A roll call vote was conducted. Motion carried unanimously.**

**3. PUBLIC MEETING  
530 PROVIDENCE HIGHWAY – ROSEMARY AND HYND VALES, MINOR SITE PLAN MODIFICATION**

The Chair noted that the property owner of 530 Providence Highway was in litigation with the Town of Dedham and sought an opinion from Town Counsel whether it would be appropriate for the Planning Board to consider the application.

**On a motion made by Mr. Podolski, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, it was resolved to defer the review of 530 Providence Highway, pending the advice of Dedham Town Counsel. A roll call vote was conducted. Motion carried unanimously.**

*ACTION – Mr. Rosenberger will contact Town Counsel and will advise the Board of their recommendations regarding how to proceed with the minor site plan modification application for Rosemary and Hynd Vales regarding 530 Providence Highway.*

**4. PUBLIC MEETING  
95 EASTERN AVENUE, SREG MANAGEMENT**

**SREG MANAGEMENT LLC REPRESENTATIVES:**

Kevin Hampe	Attorney, representing Saletin Real Estate Group
Cris Crecelius	Principal, Saletin Real Estate Group
Jeff Saletin	Principal, Saletin Real Estate Group
Joe Penny	Engineer, DiPrete Engineering
Rolf Biggers	Project Architect, BMA Architectural Group
Bernie Guen	Senior Traffic Engineer, Vanasse and Associates
Jeffrey Dirk	Managing Partner, Vanasse and Associates

**GUESTS:**

Steven Findlen	Senior Project Manager, McMahon and Associates
John Sisson	Economic Development Officer, Town of Dedham
Michael Sinesi	Director, DSK Architects and Planners
Jason Mammone	Director of Engineering, Town of Dedham
Michael d'Entremont	Police Chief, Town of Dedham

**Mr. Crecelius** presented a summary of the revised proposal for 95 Eastern Avenue and highlighted some of the changes that have been implemented since the last public meeting. The current site consisted of a three-acre parking lot in poor condition. The proposal included building a five-story hotel at a height of 54 feet. He noted that the height had

been reduced by one floor and fourteen feet. The applicant had several meetings with the Conservation Commission, which noted that the proposal would reduce the impervious surfaces by 14,000 square feet, improve landscaping by using native shrubs, and improve stormwater and drainage. Approval from the Conservation Commission was expected to be received on November 18, 2021.

The Applicant had been working with Dedham police to draft a public safety management plan, and there will be no restaurant or bar facilities in the hotel, thereby reducing the probability of loitering and public intoxication in and around the hotel. The hotel is projected to generate approximately \$406,000 in tax revenue for the Town of Dedham, in addition to one-time benefits such as building permit fees and sewer fees that total over \$300,000. He also noted that the proposal includes significant improvements to the pedestrian crossings around the property, and a shuttle will run 24/7 to Dedham Square. The Applicant engaged two international hotel advisory firms to explore the feasibility and profitability of a new hotel in Dedham, and it was determined that that a new hotel was economically viable at this location. The hotel would be a business-class Marriot or Hilton.

**Mr. Findlen** presented the findings and recommendations of the peer reviewer. The purpose of a peer review is to evaluate the site plan, identify any issues to the Applicant and to ensure that any issues are resolved. He affirmed that site plans meet the requirements of the Town of Dedham's bylaws and there were no further issues to report.

**Police Chief d'Entremont** stated that he had been consulting with the Applicant to ensure the safety of the community and the hotel's guests. Some of their discussions included access controls, surveillance cameras, payment options, staff training, and hotel rules. These conversations were ongoing.

**Mr. Crecelius** outlined the draft public safety plan. All rooms would be accessed through the lobby only where guests would be greeted by staff. Key access would be required to enter the rooms and fitness center, and elevator access may be restricted during certain hours. Pre-paid cards would not be accepted for payment, and all guests must have a valid credit card. All areas besides the guest rooms would be under video surveillance, including the exterior areas.

**Mr. Sinesi** affirmed that his review also failed to identify any issues with the site plan.

**Mr. Findlen** presented the results of the traffic study and review. He affirmed that the traffic study meets the town's bylaws and requirements. The traffic study concluded that the proposal would not generate significant traffic disruptions to the surrounding roadways. He noted that a hotel does not typically generate significant traffic relative to other commercial uses.

**Mr. Mammone** stated that he reviewed the proposed changes to the pedestrian crossings at Eastern Ave and Providence Highway and concluded that the proposal is a significant improvement from current conditions.

**Mr. Sisson** stated that the parking lot would generate approximately \$400,000 per year in tax revenue to the Town of Dedham. The proposed hotel would likely generate \$4,000,000 in revenue over ten years, which is a significant benefit to the town. The

Board inquired regarding potential negative economic impacts. Mr. Sisson stated that the hotel could potentially have negative impacts on public safety; however, such impacts are difficult to predict and quantify.

The Chair opened the floor to comments from the public.

**Resident Jason Brogan**, of 5 Ware Street, stated that residents have not seen a benefit from the tax revenues of other projects, and the occupancy rate of hotels in Dedham had decreased in recent years, which has led to an increase in crime, such as drug use and human trafficking, and public intoxication.

**Mr. Crecelius** responded that occupancy rates of similar hotels were sustainable in both the high and low season. He also stated “similar hotels” does not include any hotels currently in Dedham, as they are older and do not attract the same clientele.

**Mr. Sisson** added that Legacy Place is the top tax generator in town, at approximately \$2 million per year, and staff would be trained to identify human trafficking.

**Resident Mike McShay**, of 1018 East Street, stated that Hilton and Marriott products already exist in Dedham and should be considered “comparable” products. He added that the residents understand that the development would add tax revenue.

**Resident Maryanne Martin**, of 15 Holmes Road, expressed concern that the proposed hotel may take business away from the existing hotels and noted that existing hotels have access to rail stations and the highway whereas the proposed hotel does not.

**Mr. Sisson** answered that there are many factors that consumers consider when choosing a hotel, and although there is value in being close to the highway, there is also value in a new hotel.

**Resident Bobby Shaw**, address unknown, inquired about the timeframe for project completion and the Applicant’s contingency plan if they cannot obtain the necessary materials.

**Mr. Crecelius** answered that construction to grand opening was estimated at approximately 18-24 months, and they would monitor supply chain issues.

**Mr. Bobby Shaw** inquired about the impact on traffic during construction.

**Mr. Crecelius** explained that the construction entrance would be on the old “Lechmere Road”, would not disrupt Eastern Avenue, and no curb cuts were proposed.

**Resident Kathleen O’Neil**, of 25 Woodlawn Street, voiced her support for the project, but inquired about pedestrian crossings at Route 1.

**The Chair** answered that pedestrian infrastructure would be updated.

**Resident Susan Butler**, address unknown, inquired if guest rooms would ever be used as residences, and whether a bylaw should be required for enforcement purposes.

**Mr. Crecelius** answered that they will not be used as residences.

**The Chair** explained that a bylaw is not required because the Board can impose such a condition on the Certificate of Action, should the project be approved.

**Ms. Susan Butler** commented that small businesses in Papa Gino’s Plaza, which is owned and managed by SREG, did not have power for three weeks, and asked how they intend to earn the town’s trust.

**Mr. Crecelius** stated that SREG only recently acquired the plaza and made significant efforts to restore power as quickly as possible. The building had been neglected for 25 years, and SREG invested in providing significant upgrades.

**Resident Patricia Hornblower**, of 111 Village Ave, expressed disagreement that older hotels should be redeveloped to make way for a new hotel, and opined that hotel guests would likely consume alcohol in or around hotel property. She also expressed concern that the construction would increase traffic and would not be completed within 18 months, questioning the hotel's profitability.

**Resident Carla Foley**, 92 Old River Place, commented that Dedham Center lacks parking.

**Resident Ann Gentile**, 181 Vincent Road, expressed concern that the location of the hotel is close to the playground and the sports fields, which could pose a safety concern.

**Resident Barb Gula**, of 211 Curve Street, stated that the old "Lechmere Road" is very busy and using it as a construction entrance would pose problems.

**Resident Jean Zeiler**, of 59 Woodleigh Road, and **Resident Heather Springer**, of 57 Circuit Road, expressed their support for the project.

**Resident Denise McCarthy**, of 14 Westney Street, stated that she did not support the project because of its proximity to schools and its impact on traffic.

The Chair thanked the public for their comments and opened the floor to questions from the Board.

**Mr. O'Brien** noted that the Applicant did not discuss plans to improve the state of "Lechmere Road".

**Mr. Crecelius** explained that "Lechmere Road" would be repaved from Eastern Avenue to the end of their property line. The Conservation Commission also requested that measures be installed to mitigate runoff.

**Ms. Porter** stated that she received a message from Nathan Gauthier from the Conservation Commission expressing support for the proposal. She inquired if there have been any changes to the materials used since the previous hearing, and noted the appearance of the portico seems to have changed on the latest renderings.

**Mr. Crecelius** stated that there was a minor change to glazing on the panels, at Mr. Sinesi's request. There was no material change planned for the portico, and any change in appearance may be the result of a cropping error.

**Ms. Porter** inquired if there had ever been any conversation regarding adding a diagonal pedestrian crossing.

**Mr. Guen** answered that a diagonal crossing was not part of the discussion.

**Mr. Drew Pepoli** asked whether the Applicant had ensured that the project would be profitable and asked what percentage of tenants have not been able to pay rent in the adjacent Papa Gino's Plaza.

**Mr. Crecelius** stated that SREG studies the market and hired consultants and experts to ensure that the hotel would be profitable and successful. He also stated that all tenants at Papa Gino's property requesting an agreement have entered into one, and that SREG Management has invested in the property during the pandemic.

**Mr. Pepoli** commented that the traffic studies were conducted and reviewed by experts, and they have concluded that traffic would not be significantly impacted. He stated that as a parent, the hotel being close to the school did not worry him, and that the tax revenues would benefit the town.

**Mr. McGrail** stated that the project had been in discussion for over two years, before the pandemic even began. Many of the questions brought up by the public had been brought up by the Board at some point during the discussions. He thanked the Applicant for putting together a thorough presentation that addressed every concern and for working with the Board and the town.

**Mr. Podolski** asked if the hotel would be leased out.

**Mr. Crecelius** answered that SREG Group would continue to own and run the hotel, and no third-party company would take on a lease.

**Mr. Podolski** asked if the Applicant was aware that they would be responsible for creating a construction management plan, should the proposal be approved.

**Mr. Crecelius** answered that the Applicant was aware.

**Mr. Podolski** asked if length-of-stay restrictions would be imposed on guests.

**Mr. Crecelius** answered that they would; however, corporate clients may be subject to exceptions.

**Mr. Podolski** commented that all larger construction projects result in significant tax revenues for the town; however, the Planning Board does not have the authority to determine how these revenues are spent.

**Ms. Porter** noted that consumers consider different factors when selecting a hotel and inquired how often hotels typically renovate to stay relevant.

**Mr. Crecelius** answered the proposed hotel does not have a direct competitor in Dedham, and that Hilton and Marriot both have high standards to be able to use their name—including new linen every year and new furniture every three years.

**The Chair** expressed agreement with his colleagues in that the Applicant worked hard to address the Board's concerns. However, he said he was historically critical of a hotel of this size on the site. He recommended that the hearing enter the deliberative stage to give the Board some time to make their decision.

**Mr. O'Brien** thanked the Applicant and the public for their participation in the discussion, and acknowledged the public's concerns regarding preserving Dedham's quaintness. He reminded the public that the Board frequently negotiates with developers to ensure that Dedham can grow, but that the town's best interests are preserved.

**The Chair** requested a motion to close the public hearing.

**On a motion made by Mr. Podolski, seconded by McGrail, it was resolved to close the public hearing regarding 95 Eastern Avenue. A roll call vote was conducted. Motion carried unanimously.**

The Chair explained that the Board was moving into a deliberation phase and instructed the Applicant to work with Mr. Rosenberger to schedule another meeting.

**5. PUBLIC MEETING  
120,124, and 293 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD – DEDHAM COUNTRY AND POLO CLUB,  
MAJOR SITE PLAN REVIEW**

**DEDHAM POLO AND COUNTRY CLUB REPRESENTATIVES:**

Peter A. Zhaka	Attorney, representing the Applicant
Robert Olsen	Architect, Robert Olsen and Associates
Fred Keylor	Civil Engineer, HW Moore Associates

Mr. Zhaka presented the Applicant's proposal for a major site plan review, which included clubhouse renovations, replacing the existing paddle building, parking lot modifications, and a new golf instruction building at Dedham Country and Polo Club. The renovations would increase accessibility, expand the kitchen, refurbish the existing dining room, create one entirely new building, and add accessible entrances and walkways. It would not expand seating nor parking capacity and was not intended to increase club membership. The Design Review Advisory Board reviewed the proposal and issued a letter of recommendation on the condition that landscaping was increased. Mr. Zhaka indicated that the Applicant was seeking approval from the Planning Board pending an updated landscaping plan.

The Chair opened the floor to questions from the Board.

**Mr. Podolski** inquired if the paddle ball courts are ever rented out to the public. **Mr. Zhaka** responded that the paddle courts are not rented to outsiders.

The Chair opened the floor to questions from the public. There were none.

**On a motion made by made by Mr. McGrail, seconded by Mr. Podolski, it was resolved to approve the major site plan review for Dedham Country and Polo Club, subject to the addition of an updated landscaping plan as required by the Design Review Advisory Board. A roll call vote was conducted. Motion carried unanimously.**

**6. PUBLIC MEETING  
5 BRYANT STREET, CITIZEN'S BANK, MINOR SITE PLAN REVIEW**

The Chair reported that the Applicant requested a deferral of the minor site plan review to December 8, 2021.

**On a motion made by Mr. McGrail, seconded by Mr. Podolski, it was resolved to defer discussion of the minor site plan review of 5 Bryant Street to December 8, 2021. A roll call vote was conducted. Motion carried unanimously.**

**7. PLANNING INITIATIVES UPDATE**

Mr. Podolski requested a vote of confidence for the proposed public green at the former police station site in advance of members of the Dedham Master Plan Committee's presentation to the Board of Selectmen on November 18, 2021. He noted that a vote of confidence would simply assert that the Planning Board endorses the idea of a public green in the space and does not imply approval of the plan or its budget.

**On a motion made by Mr. McGrail, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, it was resolved to endorse the idea of repurposing the former police station as a town green, with all other details to be determined at a later date. A roll call vote was conducted. Motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Rosenberger reported that a celebratory event will be taking place on December 8, 2021, for the Master Plan. Residents may attend in person or over Zoom.

**VFW/Providence Highway Corridor Action Plan:** Mr. Rosenberger reported that the final report will soon be revealed. Throughout the consulting process, there was strong public support for an additional recreation area. Additional community meetings will be scheduled in early 2022.

**8. MEETING MINUTES**

**On a motion made by Mr. McGrail, seconded by Ms. Porter, it was resolved to defer the review of the minutes from July 14, 2021, July 17, 2021, August 24, 2021, and August 25, 2021 to a later meeting. A roll call vote was conducted. Motion carried unanimously.**

**9. OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. O'Brien mentioned a recent article in the Dedham Times reported that Dedham was ranked the third best small city in which to live by an outside organization.

**10. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Planning Board was scheduled for December 8, 2021, at 6:00 p.m.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

**On a motion made by Mr. Podolski, seconded by Mr. McGrail, it was resolved to adjourn the meeting at 9:44 p.m. A roll call vote was conducted. Motion carried unanimously.**