



**129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Committee Minutes  
Town Building, Lower Meeting Room (101)  
Wednesday, January 15, 2014  
7:00 P.M.**

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

**Others Present:** Angus Jennings; Bob Depietri

Mr. Estabrook called the meeting to order.

**Review and Approval of Minutes:**

The Committee reviewed the minutes and made changes.

January 8, 2013 - *Motion made to accept the minutes of January 8 as amended. Motion seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

**Update on Issues Since Previous Meeting:** Mr. Smith stated he and Mr. Jennings met with department heads, including the fire chief, police chief, conservation agent, building commissioner, assessor, DPW director, town accountant, and the town manager. The purpose of this meeting was to bring them up-to-date on the process since town meeting vote. Mr. Jennings stated this was a good two way dialogue, not only providing an update but inviting their input going forward.

Mr. Jennings stated the continued ANRAD hearing with the Conservation Commission will be held on Tuesday, January 21.

Mr. Depietri stated Mr. Rankin has updated the plan drawings. He stated the layout is the same but the setbacks are included and everything is to scale. He provided a brief overview of the plans. Mr. Jennings stated what was shown as open area with a water feature is now shown as a landscape open area, the location of the medical office has shifted, and the parking for residential is now shown on the Field Street side of the buildings.

Mr. Estabrook stated it would be helpful to know what can go within the setbacks. Mr. Smith explained the zoning bylaw as it relates to the setback and buffer. He stated you cannot build any structures in the 100 foot setback. Mr. Estabrook asked if parking is allowed in the setback area. Mr. Smith stated in a typical zoning bylaw parking is allowed in the setback area. Mr. Estabrook

stated the Planning Board will look at a detailed landscaping plan, however, the 45 foot buffer is clearly not reflected on this plan. Mr. Cahill stated the Committee's recommendation should request the buffers and setbacks be included on the plan.

Ms. Thayer asked if there are provisions for a sound barrier in the plan. Mr. Estabrook recommended the Committee could indicate the buffers should have fencing and trees in order to address as much as possible issues of site, noise, etc. He stated the specific construction of that would come up at the definitive site plan review.

Ms. Hart asked if the building pad, shown on the January 8 version of Concept 2B, near the green space could be removed and the green space expanded to be more useable. She stated what is lacking in this development is family oriented space and she feels the public wants to see this type of space. She stated an indoor pool would benefit the town greatly, as well as an indoor type sports facility. Mr. Cahill stated he sent an email out to the Field House in Sudbury, Sports Zone in Derry, New Hampshire, and For Kicks in Marlborough to see if they would be interested in speaking with Mr. Depietri.

Mr. Estabrook asked if Ms. Hart is proposing to reduce the retail in order to expand the green space. She stated she would prefer to reduce the residential space. She does not feel the plan they are reviewing now is serving the town the way it wants to be served.

Ms. Hart provided information received from Dawn Capello who has heard from the Council on Aging and others who are surprised that PK2 has been dismissed. Ms. Capello indicated this building is in good shape and she has paperwork detailing on the work that needs to be done and the developer had previously agree to repair the building and build a gym. The Council on Aging, the Boys and Girls Club, and the school administration all have interest in PK2, which would keep operating costs down. In addition the Community Center Committee completed their own review last year which indicated a lot of resident interest.

Mr. Depietri stated one of the main transformers on the street at PK2 failed requiring NStar to come in and replace it. He stated they discussed this with NStar and the decision was made to drain all the systems out of the building until a decision was made on the building. He stated there was no flood in the building. Karen Grimes, Field Street, stated on December 29 when the transformer blew for a second time she was very concerned with the explosion, smoke, etc. She expressed concern that there is live gas going to the building and asked how this building is going to be made safe. Mr. Smith stated he will contact the fire chief and try to resolve this concern.

Ms. Thayer stated in the Collins Center peer review there was information on PK2 which stated it could be \$150,000 to \$250,000 to operate PK2 per year. She stated a decision has to be made on what is a want versus what is a need. Mr. Estabrook stated the property owner originally proposed giving the town the PK2 building in exchange for a large development. The town has asked that the development be scaled down so they have to choose whether they want PK2 or not. He cited a report from Greg Lefter, Facilities Manager, indicating the state of the building. He stated he interprets this to mean this is not a building that would be easily upgraded.

Ms. Thayer stated when the Committee discussed moving the residential component toward the Field Street side there was one retail building on the southern side of the property and now there is more retail. She stated she would like to revisit some of the items discussed in December. Ms. Hart stated in December the developer had a suggestion that the building that abuts Dettling Road and

Vose Hill could be smaller with restaurants and a pedestrian walkway to make it more neighborhood friendly and eliminate truck traffic and dumpsters behind the building.

Mr. Estabrook stated if they are going to ask Mr. Depietri to redo the plan the Committee will have to provide input on what they want. Peter Falzone of Dettling Road stated when they bought their houses they had a parking lot near them with a building 100-200 feet away, and they bought knowing that and were okay with it. He stated no one on Dettling Road would want a building abutting them as opposed to a parking lot. He stated he would like to see Building D put across from Building C and then put a parking lot or water retention on the Dettling Road side. Mr. Estabrook stated this would put all the parking away from the buildings which would not work for the customers.

Discussion was held on how to configure the retail space in order to have the least possible impact on Dettling Road, while maintaining a useable parking configuration. Mr. Estabrook asked the residents of Dettling Road if they would prefer to have the parking lot near them and the building farther away and they responded yes.

Ms. Thayer stated she would like to reduce the retail and the residential and find another use such as an indoor trampoline park or something similar to supplement what has been lost by removing the commercial space. Mr. Estabrook stated he is unsure how to reconcile what the Committee would like to see with what the developer can sell in the development.

Mr. Redner stated the drawings presented this evening do not vary much from the plans they have already been discussing. Ms. Hart stated as a way to decrease the residential she would recommend reconfiguring the residential so there is assisted living and independent living for the elderly, or removing one of the residential units in favor of a community center. Mr. Estabrook stated removing a building would remove a significant number of units. Ms. Hart stated the feedback she has received is that residents are concerned with having an apartment complex as there is a certain stigma people have. She asked if the rental units could be for sale units or condos rather than rental apartments. Ms. Thayer stated for sale versus apartment does not reduce or increase the potential for children and impact on services.

Ms. Hart stated she would like an answer as to what the difference in tax impact would be between for sale and rental units. It was stated the Assessor would have to provide that information. Mr. Smith stated he may be able to provide a report that shows the tax impact and the impact on school enrollment for rental versus for sale.

Mr. Cahill emphasized the Committee can recommend what it wants and the property owner may or may not accept those recommendations. He stated the Committee is at the point where it needs to start visualizing recommendations and getting them on paper. Mr. Smith stated there needs to be some give and take and if they are asking the developer to cut down on the residential it has to be increased with something to make it work.

Mr. Jennings stated rental housing is desperately needed in metro-Boston and there is a lot of documentation to that effect. He stated one of the dynamics in a town like Maynard is most of the people who show up at town meeting are homeowners that is where they are self-identifying. However, for younger residents coming out of school, older residents who want to downsize, or those going through a divorce rental housing is a really important part of a healthy community mix. He stated the Committee should look at what the existing mix is in Maynard. He stated from an economic and fairness standpoint there is a need for rental housing.

Mr. Jennings stated relative to retail, the reason the buildings were shown along the spine road was partly to create that boulevard or main street type feel and to have a place that is walkable. He stated having smaller buildings in the foreground as you drive into the space will enhance the aesthetic of the development. He stated to get the type of high amenity development that the town wants with nice construction materials, detail on landscaping, and thoughtful open spaces the scale would have to be larger. He stated reducing the scale is going to potentially cut the quality.

Mr. Calabria stated he was disappointed last week with the two experts who spoke because he does not feel they provided enough information. He stated no numbers were provided. He stated to overcome this for town meeting they need to explain to people the rationale for having a development that is 60% larger than any residential development in Maynard.

### **Public Comment:**

Jack MacKeen, Country Lane – He stated he was a member of the Community Center Study Committee and as a committee they also got caught up in keeping PK2 to a point where it literally bogged down the committee. He stated they finally had to step back and say their job as a committee was to determine whether or not there is a real need for a community center in Maynard. He stated he senses a little of that with this committee. He recommended the committee should keep in mind their role to come up with a development that is feasible for the developer and also viable for the community. He recommended the Committee review the Community Center Study report which determined there is an interest for a community center, but did not document there was a need for a community center.

Claire Saunders, Dettling Road – She thanked the Committee for their willingness to further tackle the impact on the Vose Hill neighborhood. She stated the idea of an adequate buffer is a very subjective standard and she is sure there are industry standards that the town could call upon to have more specific in the zoning to protect the residents. She stated if one looks at the apartment building that is closest to any of the retail buildings the buffer and the setback is twice what is being afforded the abutting properties on Dettling Road, which indicates to her that the developer recognizes the importance of buffer zones and setbacks and the quality of life for a residential neighborhood. She hopes that the existing residents' commitment to the town is honored in reverse.

Marie Gunnerson, 119 Parker Street – She stated what the Dettling Road residents have said about their neighborhood is true about the Field Street neighborhood. She stated originally there was mostly parking behind there with buildings set toward the middle. She stated it is unreasonable to expect one area to have zero impact from this. She stated if they are going to have this development there is going to be impact on everyone.

Fred DeGrappo, 74 Parker Street – He stated this plan has changed so many times. He urged residents to look at their tax bills and realize the town needs tax money from somewhere. He asked where the money would come from to pay for a swimming pool. He stated he feels the town has enough fields and green space to keep kids busy.

Pam Leahy, 33 Brooks Street – She stated as a community member she is about having something more for the families and community. She recommended doing a combination community/senior center so everyone will feel they have a part of this deal.

Karen Grimes, Field Street – She stated in 2005 when this discussion was first started there were a lot of impact studies done and if the Committee wants any knowledge at all about how it was determined two bedrooms and a den bring more children and two bedrooms and a loft, go and read the studies.

Bill Cranshaw, Mockingbird Lane – He stated it is his hope that the Committee's recommendation be as specific as possible about uses.

John Kulik, Field Street – He stated he does not recall what the original buffer zone was under the NBOD. He stated it may be 50 feet. Mr. Estabrook stated 45 feet was the buffer zone and the setbacks were 100 feet. Mr. Kulik stated in some areas the setback is 30 feet which seems low. He stated at the last meeting the developer mentioned there would be four fast food restaurants and he stated this will have an impact on the existing downtown restaurants. He suggested using something else and reducing this number to two.

Peter Falzone, Dettling Road – He asked when the traffic study will be done. Mr. Estabrook stated the Committee is providing a recommendation to the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen and the actual process will start with the property owner putting forward their concept plan. He stated the NBOD requires a preliminary traffic impact analysis to be done and reviewed by a peer reviewer. This study is done based on scale. If the concept plan is passed by town meeting a detailed site plan is done where specifically the buildings and scale are laid out and at that point a detailed traffic study is done.

Nancy Matesanz, 32 Crane Avenue – She stated there should be some way to get some objective data to go along with the Committee's recommendation.

Victoria Mangus, Waltham Street – She stated from all the plans that have been presented there is really not a sense of unification. She stated if she lived in that complex she would not want to drive to the paths or the retail. She stated this could be more of a complex where people would feel free and happy to walk around in the area. She stated there is a place in Sudbury on Route 20 where there is retail with parking in the rear.

*Name Not Given* – He asked how much comparison would be done to Wayland Town Common development. He stated this is similar acreage and the town and developers there reached an agreement to move forward. He stated the housing is approximately 100 and it is much less dense. He stated he has not heard feasibility rationale on why certain aspects of this plan cannot be scaled.

**Committee Recommendations:** The Committee discussed recommendations for the plan. Mr. Jennings wrote these recommendations on a flip chart using a color coded system.

Mr. Cahill recommended the following: 1. That zoning include clearer buffer and screening performance standards for noise and site lines. 2. The 45 foot buffer be shown on any site plan submitted to the Planning Board or Board of Selectmen. 3. Sport center/recreation use be added to the NBOD uses under 9.3.5. 4. 175 to 200 residential units maximum, with a 10% minimum affordable. 5. He is comfortable with the current retail size. 6. Third party peer review for traffic for the Planning Board. 7. Use of green roofs and/or gable roofs be included in the zoning and/or development agreement for retail adjacent to residential.

Mr. Redner recommended the following: 1. Reducing the proposed 250 housing units. 2. He expressed concern that Price Chopper is not a widely recognized supermarket name. 3. He is comfortable with the 250,000 square feet of retail.

Mr. Calabria recommended the following: 1. Reducing the housing units to 175 to 200. 2. Board of Selectmen provide the Planning Board with funding for special counsel and any other technical support needed. 3. Board of Selectmen engage special counsel or the right technical resource within the existing counsel for the development agreement and not just use general counsel. 4. Traffic studies should include all the intersections that were in the original proposal. 5. The size of the development should be mitigated by whatever town services studies and traffic studies determine. 6. Mitigation needs to be firmly in the development agreement and be bonded for a specific number.

Ms. Thayer recommended the following: 1. Appropriate professional and legal support be provided to the Planning Board. 2. 100 to 200 residential units, depending on supporting data.

Ms. Hart recommended the following: 1. Is comfortable with the amount of retail proposed. 2. Remove one retail pad in order to expand the open community space to make the site more family friendly. 3. Include a recreational/sports center. 4. 150 to 200 residential units.

Mr. Smith recommended the following: 1. 200 residential units, including an affordability component. 2. Include a commercial recreational element which could be part of the community use. 3. Design buildings to create a setback and Main Street walkable boulevard. 4. Outdoor community space. 5. Restriction on use to minimize the amount or size of restaurants.

Mr. Estabrook recommended the following: 1. He is satisfied for the most part with Option 2B. 2. Investigate whether it is possible to reduce the impact by the Dettling Road properties, possibly by moving the building. 3. He is comfortable with the 250,000 square feet of commercial. 4. Residential units of 175 to 200, but is comfortable with 250. 5. Would like the development agreement to include traffic mitigations that were agreed in the 2009 site plan approval and the timing of those mitigations. 6. Preliminary traffic impact analysis that goes with the concept plan to include the external and impact traffic. 7. Study the impact to Vose Hill, including the properties that overlook 129 Parker Street. 8. Design the rear of buildings so there is minimal visual impact.

Mr. Jennings stated he will prepare a report incorporating all of the Committee's recommendations and put forward his own assessment of where they are in the process and what would be the most productive way to move forward. Mr. Estabrook stated he is not comfortable going forward stating this is the kind of map we like but we do not like the building up against Dettling Road. He stated the Committee has a responsibility for saying where they do want the building.

Discussion was held with Mr. Depietri about moving the retail building near Dettling Road, or creating an L-shaped building. Mr. Depietri stated the back of a building cannot be along Parker Street because the visibility of the remaining retail will be blocked. He stated they cannot look at one building they have to look at the entire picture. He stated he had provided other plans that did not have a building in that location.

An audience member asked if the amount of parking has been determined. She stated it looks to her that every truck that comes in to deliver to any of the buildings is going to have to go by their neighborhood. She asked if there are ways to limit delivery times in the site plan or development agreement. Mr. Estabrook stated within the site plan approval those types of limitations can be imposed.

Mr. Estabrook recommended they continue this discussion at their next meeting and the Committee members were in agreement.

**Public Comment 2:**

Bill Cranshaw, Mockingbird Lane – He stated when they did the first NBOD they had a limit of 100 housing units. He recommended the Committee figure out a way to fix the zoning so the max the entire 58 acres can see is 200 units. Mr. Estabrook stated if the concept plan has a determined number of housing units the developer cannot subdivide and use that same concept plan, they would have to come back with a new concept plan.

*Name Not Given* – He asked if they are going to talk about moving Building D anymore. Mr. Estabrook stated they were but he does not have a solution to present tonight.

Marie Gunnerson, Parker Street – She stated she noticed on the plan that there is a second sidewalk that will be going across her property at the top. She stated this project will bring taxes into the town, but they have to look at the cost, not just the tax side, so the site is at least revenue neutral.

**Discussion of Next Steps in Process:** Mr. Estabrook stated at the next meeting they will continue their discussion of recommendations. He recommended the agenda include approval of minutes, update on issues, continued committee recommendations, and public comment.

Mr. Estabrook recommended Mr. Jennings put together a cohesive recommendations document that would incorporate all the Committee's comments in a way that is in the form that they would use to make the recommendation. Mr. Jennings stated he will do this and provide a draft to the Committee members for discussion at the next meeting.

Mr. Estabrook asked that members keep January 29, February 5, and February 12 open should additional meetings be needed.

The next Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 22, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

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