



**129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Committee Minutes
Town Building, Lower Meeting Room (101)
Wednesday, December 4, 2013
7:00 P.M.**

Committee Members Present: Eric Smith, AICP; Ron Calabria; Ken Estabrook; Amy Hart; Eugene Redner; Lynda Thayer

Not Present: Bernard Cahill

Others Present: Angus Jennings, Bob Depietri

Mr. Estabrook called the meeting to order.

Mr. Estabrook reviewed the goals of the Committee and the steps it is following in this process. He explained what a concept plan is and the site plan review process. He stated at the last meeting the Committee decided that 40R did not look like it was something it could pursue but would prefer to look at the NBOD and modify the zoning. The developer was asked to come in with some very high level conceptual ideas which will be reviewed and discussed this evening.

The Committee members and consultant introduced themselves: Angus Jennings, Planning Consultant; Eric Smith, Maynard Town Planner; Amy Hart, Resident; Ken Estabrook, Chair and School Committee Member; Eugene Redner, Finance Committee; Lynda Thayer, Resident; Ron Calabria, Resident.

Mr. Estabrook stated the Committee has scheduled meetings for every Wednesday between now and February 12, 2014, excluding the holiday weeks. He stated all meeting materials will be posted on the Town website. Mr. Smith announced there will be a separate web page for this Committee on the Town website.

Update on Issues Since Previous Meeting: Mr. Smith announced the Planning Board did approve the preliminary plan subdivision that was filed by the 129 Parker developers. He stated this approval allows them to go to the definitive plan where they will address the issues in more detail. Mr. Jennings stated although not directly in its scope, he feels that part of the goal of this Committee is to be a forum for any questions. Mr. Smith stated he will provide information on this decision to the Committee and post it on the website.

Bob Depietri, the developer, stated their engineer met with the Conservation Commission last night in regard to establishing the actual wetlands for the property, however, he has no detailed information at this time.

Working Session Physical Planning for the Property: Mr. Depietri provided an overview of a plan showing the existing conditions on the site. He provided a brief overview of the concept plan approved at 2007 town meeting which included a series of retail buildings totalling 175,000 sq. ft., the 400,000 sq. ft. building on the site which was going to stay, and 100 residential and multifamily units. Mr. Calabria asked if the plans being brought forward by the developer are economically viable and Mr. Depietri confirmed that any of the plans would work.

Mr. Depietri reviewed a plan which included housing along the Field Street side of the property with a retail layout designed after the Derby Shoppes in Hingham, Massachusetts, on the south side of the property. He stated this retail design would not be a viable alternative as most of the tenants are small, upscale shops and the retailers would not consider Maynard for this type of project as there would not be enough traffic. Rich Rankin, architect, stated one recurrent theme in these layouts is the fact that retailers have no exposure to the street and they would not even consider locating in the rear area of the site.

Mr. Depietri reviewed the site plan that was approved by the Planning Board in 2009 showing the PK2 building, a retail building, a one acre park, and supermarket, with retail placed away from the residences. Another plan reviewed showed the retail toward the front of the property, the PK2 building which could be used for medical offices if they could find a tenant, an assisted living facility, and for sale residential units, with residential in the southeast corner of the site.

An additional plan was reviewed with retail on the Field Street side and two levels of screening, residential, and assisted living. Another plan indicated a main road with stores running along in a village type concept with larger stores in the back. Mr. Depietri stated this type of plan would have an adverse impact on Maynard's downtown area. He reviewed a plan which had retail in the Vose Hill area and parking in the front, the PK2 building would be torn down and a sports center constructed, and a senior living area. He presented a similar plan with the building near Vose Hill broken into two smaller building to create an outside eating and pedestrian area between the buildings to reduce the scale of the buildings.

Mr. Jennings stated at the last meeting the Committee had requested a neighborhood scale map and he will be providing this for the next meeting.

Mr. Depietri reviewed a plan which retains the PK2 building as some type of medical office with parking in the front of the site. Another plan provided 205,000 sq. ft. of retail space, apartments in the southwest corner, and 61 for sale residential condominiums in the northwest corner. An additional plan showed retail and on the south side of the property, an assisted living facility with a senior independent living facility and multifamily rental property. He stated they have met with multiple groups and there is interest in the assisted living and independent living and this type of use would reduce the traffic impact.

Mr. Depietri reviewed a plan with 237,000 sq. ft. of retail and 86 for sale town homes on the south side of the property rather than the assisted and independent living. He reviewed another plan with 254,000 sq. ft. of retail space toward the front of the project, an assisted living facility, and

independent living facility, apartments, a sports center and community building. Another plan showed 110,000 sq. ft. of retail space on the left side of the property, on the south side an independent living facility and for sale town homes, with multifamily residential in the rear and space for a community building on the northwest side of the property.

Mr. Depietri reviewed a plan with 207,000 sq. ft. of retail space with 173 units of for sale housing on the south side. He reviewed another plan with 241,000 sq. ft. of retail space toward the front of the property, a sports center and medical building on the northwest side, a park behind the retail area, and rental units on the southwest side. An additional plan showed a main retail building going through the property, eliminating the through boulevard, with a ring road around the property with assisted living in the northwest, and apartments in the southwest. Another plan showed 260,000 sq. ft. of retail, assisted living, community space, multifamily residential and for sale townhouses.

Mr. Depietri reviewed a plan showing a village downtown with storefronts along the main boulevard and multifamily rental units, for sale town homes, and independent living in the rear. Jennings stated the last two plans are not normally done in this region, but are constructed in other states and shows another geographic region's look at how to do multifamily. Mr. Depietri stated the last concept shows 237,000 sq. ft. of retail, 100 units of townhouses and 100 units of multifamily, and 100 units of for sale property. He also provided the plan which was presented at town meeting in May with 328,000 sq. ft. of retail, the PK2 building, and 250 apartment units.

Mr. Estabrook stated the NBOD specifies what can be developed and there has to be a concept plan approved at town meeting for each one of the properties. He stated under the 2009 site plan there was no housing approved. The concept plan in 2007 had 100 units and when the site plan was approved only the retail on the northern portion of the property was approved.

The Committee discussed the plans that were presented. Ms. Thayer stated the plans seem to be all retail and residential but there is no other component such as a medical facility. Mr. Depietri stated if they can find some of those uses they can incorporate them. Mr. Smith pointed out that the residential component does address a need that Maynard has for elderly housing. Mr. Redner stated he would like to filter the uses rather than go through each plan in detail. Mr. Estabrook stated he would like to discuss the features that the Committee members like and the features they do not like to help filter down the plans presented down to a few.

Mr. Calabria stated he would like to see less than 200,000 sq. ft. of retail. He liked the assisted and independent living components. He stated 100-200 units of multifamily residential would be okay, but anything more would make him nervous. Mr. Redner stated he liked the assisted living and would like to see a medical building. Mr. Estabrook stated he has concerns about internal traffic and reliance on the road next to Field Street and one central entrance road. He would like to consider how to get traffic along Parker Street and into the property in an effective way and get the traffic going around the property and then start to put the buildings in. He stated right now they are doing the opposite so there are both external and internal traffic impacts. He expressed concern that every plan builds further back on the site and encroaches on the wetlands. Mr. Depietri stated that any plan they set forward would rely on the current setbacks and buffers that are already contained in the NBOD.

Mr. Smith stated when considering a potential additional roadway toward the south of the property they have run into wetland concerns. Mr. Estabrook stated he likes the idea of a town common

and would like to hear from the Field Street residents on how they feel about having this located in the northwest where PK2 is currently located in order to reduce impact, provide an amenity, and connect with the school. He stated he likes the idea of using assisted living or age targeted housing as part of the development and would not want to see more than 200 residences. Ms. Hart stated she likes the idea of running the residential street along Field Street. She likes the idea of a park or common area and sports facility or community center, as well as the assisted living as opposed to town homes. She feels the pond would be important. She is unsure how she feels about a hotel but likes the idea of a medical facility if there is a market for it. She would like the retail kept to 200,000 to 250,000 sq. ft. She expressed concern with having one entrance for the retail portion.

Public Comment:

Mary Grimes, 4 Field Street – She expressed concern that grocery retailers need to remain open all night to allow trucks to deliver stock and trucks will be running all night. She expressed concern with the sound level if there is only one entrance serving the retailers.

George Healey, 6 Field Street – He stated the original buffer zone for Field Street was 50 feet, then it went to 20 feet, then 40 feet. He wanted to ensure the builder is using the 50 foot buffer zone. He asked if mixing use is allowed under the NBOD. Estabrook responded that a property owner by right can subdivide their property when they are on a public way. He stated the property is currently divided into two lots and the developer is proposing dividing it into four lots. He stated they could develop one lot under industrial and another under NBOD, but they will still have to go through an approval process in order to do this. Mr. Healey stated he does not recall this being discussed and the town would have to ensure this is legal.

Paul Grimes, Field Street – He asked if Mr. Jennings would recommend what he would like to see on the site given his experience with the site. Mr. Jennings stated he is not a designer.

Michelle Goode, Field Street – She stated she shares many of the concerns of the Board. She asked when the peer review will be happening. Mr. Estabrook stated the concept plan requires a preliminary traffic study be done. He stated the detailed studies would be done as part of the site plan review and before approval of the site plan by the Planning Board. She asked why peer review studies would not be done prior to changing zoning. Mr. Calabria stated whether they are required to do these reviews or not it may be prudent to do so in order to convince the voters. Ms. Goode stated she would rather have residential units behind her than retail units with dumpsters, deliveries, snow removal, and tractor trailer storage, etc.

Marie Gunerson, Parker Street – She noted almost all the plans showed the creative uses going to the south side of the property and back into the wetlands, with the north side being retail and giving her property zero buffer. She liked the idea of a medical facility and assisted living.

Terry Morse, 30 Brook Street – She appreciated all the hard work being done. She liked the senior living and assisted living facilities, as well as recreational areas. She questioned if there would be room for the retail space on the northern side of the site.

Sandra Mallou, 15 Court Street – She stated she likes the village layout and is not convinced it will impact the downtown, but rather will give the residents in that area the benefit of having a downtown type area to utilize.

An audience member stated he agrees with the recommendation of determining the traffic pattern and impact prior to determining what is developed on the site.

Ms. Thayer stated she likes the housing along Field Street which was included on Plan No. 5. She appreciates the other uses being considered such as the community space and senior independent living units and assisted living.

Mr. Estabrook stated for the next meeting he would like to look at ways to incorporate housing along Field Street and a village layout with pedestrian access, taking into account the comments received from the Committee. He asked Mr. Depietri if he would be able to bring back to the Committee a smaller set of perhaps three proposals that would incorporate this information. Mr. Depietri responded he would be able to do this.

Establish Date for Committee Site Visit: Mr. Estabrook stated Mr. Smith proposed the Committee conduct a site visit. The Committee was in agreement they would like to do this. A site visit was scheduled for Saturday, December 7 at 10:30 a.m.

The next Committee meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, December 11, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

Adjournment: *Motion made to adjourn. Motion seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*