



**129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Committee Minutes
Town Building, Lower Meeting Room (101)
Wednesday, December 18, 2013
7:00 P.M.**

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

Not Present: Lynda Thayer

Others Present: Angus Jennings, Bob Depietri

Mr. Estabrook called the meeting to order.

Review and Approval of December 4, 2013 Minutes: The Committee reviewed the minutes and made changes.

Motion made to accept the minutes of December 4, 2013 as amended. Motion seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Update on Issues Since Previous Meeting: Mr. Estabrook stated the terms for the Committee member appointments expire December 30. He has contacted Kevin Sweet, who indicated this was not the intention, a template was used and he will have them reissued. He will be asking the Town Clerk if the members will have to be sworn in again.

Mr. Estabrook stated he was reviewing the guidance provided from the Board of Selectmen and they had requested semi-regular updates. He wrote to the Chair suggesting that the Committee was at a point where an update could be provided and requested he be put on the Board of Selectmen's January 7 agenda. He stated he will go and provide a report and encouraged any members who can attend to do so to provide their perspective. He stated the Committee may go and provide a final report on January 21, depending on where the Committee stands at that point. He stated this timeline can be adjusted at any time if the Committee is not ready.

Mr. Estabrook explained that this Committee does not prompt the next step in this process, the developer and property owner will have to submit a plan. He stated this Committee may make a recommendation but the developer is not required to submit a proposal that includes the Committee's recommendation. He stated the Committee also does not have to come to an agreement with the developer on a recommendation. He stated the Committee may also have input into amendments and the development plan, although it will not write these documents.

Mr. Estabrook provided the Committee with a list of items which he would like to discuss to determine if it feels they have accomplished these items and are ready to go the public for input. These issues included scale of the retail and residential and restrictions on uses. He stated the Committee is the first of four parts. The Committee will make its recommendations, the Planning Board will make its recommendation to Town Meeting, there will be a vote at Town Meeting, and then there is the site plan review process. Site plan review is where most restriction will be done.

Mr. Smith stated he, along with Mr. Jennings, met with Kevin Sweet today to provide an update on the process and in an effort to get the department heads and fiscal team involved. They will be attending a department head meeting on January 14 to begin to introduce the plan and continue their engagement in the process. Mr. Jennings stated they will be asking the department heads directly what types of information they will need in order to give qualified opinions. He stated on the fiscal side they want to make sure that as the fiscal impact analysis is updated in the new year the town finance staff are engaged and the assumptions are things they find reasonable.

Mr. Estabrook asked that the department heads understand the distinction between the different phases of this process. He stated what they need during the concept plan in order to provide input is very different then what they will be providing later one once the Planning Board has a definitive site plan that it is reviewing.

Review of Neighborhood-Scale Based Map: Mr. Jennings stated he has provided two maps, one is a site scale and one a neighborhood scale. He reviewed the site scale map, which is similar to maps the Committee has seen before. He stated it is primarily illustrating setbacks and buffers using the current rules. He provided close-ups of the two abutting residential areas to the north and south.

Mr. Jennings stated the second map is the neighborhood scale, in which he made an effort to get the sidewalks mapped in the immediate vicinity of the project. He provided an overview of the map. He stated everything highlighted in pink is an existing sidewalk, however, there are sidewalks that go further up Route 117 and further up Parker Street that are not included. He stated he was not able to get the sidewalks on the internal drive for the schools, but these will be included in the future. He stated both maps can continue to be built on as the process moves forward. He stated he will add an index and provide updated maps to the Committee members via email over the next few days.

Presentation of Modifications to Concept Drawing 6: Mr. Depietri reviewed the preferred option plans. He stated the first plan looked at during the last meeting had the retail on the south side and housing on the north side. He reviewed this with the retail people who were not happy with the location of the assisted living building as they felt it would block the retail. They reconfigured the assisted living building and pushed it away from Parker Street toward the middle of the property and put more common space in the front which could include a water feature. They added a two-story medical office building into this scheme. They developed some of the pedestrian accesses in and around the property. They added behind the retail buildings the retention area which has to be worked into the plan. The parking represents 4.5 cars per thousand on the retail space. This plan represents 250,000 total retail.

Mr. Estabrook asked how traffic will move through the main entrance. Mr. Depietri stated in the final plan there will be a restriction of a left turn. They would want to bring people into the center of the property so they do not backup onto Parker Street. Mr. Jennings asked what is being used for

setbacks for the buildings. Mr. Depietri stated the plan will be compressed at the next level because this plan is using too much land for the buildings.

Mr. Calabria asked about the possibility of a roadway through the School property to Route 117. He stated this would introduce more traffic, which is not a good thing, however, good traffic control might mitigate the current problem. He stated this might also facilitate the residences in Cahill Court being integrated into downtown Maynard. He stated he was considering if the developer donated a piece of land the administrative headquarters for the schools could be located there. Mr. Estabrook stated his concern is that people will take a right and try to zip through the high school drive and parking area to get over to the shopping area through Cahill Courts instead of dealing with traffic at Route 117 and Parker Street.

Mr. Cahill stated he is against this idea as not only will the people from Cahill Court be coming in, but everyone living on North Street, South Street, B Street, Vose Hill Road, Dettling Road, etc. will be driving through Cahill Courts in the mornings and afternoons.

Ms. Hart stated she is not a big fan of the retention pond in the back corner because it could potentially be a hangout spot and if there is a walking trail no one is going to want to go to the back of the supermarket to walk around the pond. She is not sure she likes the retention pond or open area in the front of the site. Mr. Redner stated what looks like a pond in the northeast corner could just be green space. Mr. Calabria stated he feels this is a really good plan.

Mr. Depietri reviewed the second plan. He stated this has the assisted living closer to the back of the property and brings the pond up as a focal point. He stated it adds back in the green space that was on last week's plan and moves the medical office building to the front. He stated this plan has the entrance road relocated slightly to the south, which may create its own set of issues with the turning lane. Mr. Jennings pointed out moving the entrance drive to the south will impact the trees on either side of the entrance drive.

Mr. Estabrook stated what he does not like about this plan is all the loading docks are in the back and in view of the residences, and in the first plan those areas are not abutting residential areas. Mr. Calabria stated he likes the first plan and feels the layout works better. Mr. Redner stated he likes the retail layout on the second plan. Discussion was held on truck traffic circulation to the retail and various configurations that could be considered.

Ms. Hart stated she likes option 2 the best. She likes the layout of the retail and the fact that it is closer to the main street. She likes the common area, although she sees the problem with it being out back. She likes the location of the assisted living facility so they will not be in the midst of all the traffic and looking out onto the backs of buildings and apartment buildings. Mr. Estabrook stated his concern with the assisted living in the back is how much it will start to encroach on the wetland area. Mr. Cahill stated he is willing to wait and see what the assisted living people have to say about the two plans. He stated there are points he likes on both plans but may need more time to review the plans. He likes the fact that there is more green space on the second plan.

Mr. Estabrook stated there is more green space on the second plan because there is less parking and he wondered how realistic this amount of parking would be. Mr. Smith stated he does not think the loading area being visible is very attractive and he would not like the assisted living to be isolated.

Mr. Estabrook asked if the Committee would like to leave both plans on the table until feedback is received from the assisted living people, or would they like to move forward with a specific plan.

Mr. Calabria stated he prefers plan one. Mr. Redner stated he prefers plan two. Mr. Smith suggested creating a summary of each plan so the public can provide input and the Committee can make their decision.

Mr. Estabrook stated he feels there is enough consensus that the Committee would like to see both plans going forward for now. He would like to see both plans done to the same scale with encroachment on the back side of the site minimized as much as possible. He would like ballpark figures on sizes of retention ponds for properties this size. He stated he has concerns about the traffic on the second plan and would like the developer to look at getting the traffic onto the property and through the property. Mr. Cahill asked that clarification on the number of pads be included.

Public Comment:

Marie Gunnerson, 119 Parker Street – She stated she did not like the logic of the first plan. She stated there seems to be residential leaning people and retail leaning people based on the comments. She stated she would like a nice distinction between the residential with the assisted living or independent living integrated. She stated the assisted living is really isolated in the back and looking at the back of a supermarket. In the second plan there will be some trees and excitement of the lights and the residential on the other side. She feels the medical facility is nicely placed.

Bill Cranshaw – He stated the Committee has spent a lot of time discussing retention ponds and asked if they would consider storing water under the pavement. He stated this is what is done on most of the projects he works on. Mr. Depietri stated this project will incorporate both.

Discussion of Next Steps in Process and Goals for Progress by January 8 Meeting:

Mr. Cahill recommended the Committee reach out to the public to get more attendees so they can hear more input from the public and stakeholders in town to look at the two plans and provide feedback upfront. It was recommended that Mr. Jennings be prepared to write comments on a flip chart. Mr. Cahill asked if Mr. Depietri could provide large plans that could be displayed for the public.

Mr. Estabrook stated they will spend time taking into account the Committee's thoughts, public comments, and ask for refinements. He stated at the end of the meeting on January 8 the Committee will have to decide if they want to go one more week asking for public commentary. He stated it would probably make sense to do that and then on January 15 see if the Committee can come to closure on its recommendation. It was recommended to reach out to the Beacon Villager to do an article on the Committee's work to date.

Mr. Jennings stated a suggestion was made at the last meeting to provide a perspective view of what the site view would be from Dettling Road. He stated he found in the 2009 decision there were a couple of documents referencing this and he went to Dettling Road and took a panoramic picture and will put something together. He stated as they get closer a quick model may have to be done to give people a better perspective on what the site will look like.

Mr. Depietri asked if the Committee would like to have the residential and retail representatives come in to present their perspective. It was recommended this be done at the January 8 meeting.

The next Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 8, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

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