



**129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Committee Minutes  
Town Building, Lower Meeting Room #101  
Wednesday, January 29, 2014  
7:00 P.M.**

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

**Not Present:** Bernard Cahill; Ron Calabria

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

Mr. Estabrook called the meeting to order.

**Review and Approval of Minutes:**

Mr. Estabrook suggested the minutes of January 22 not be voted on until the next meeting due to the absence of two members and the significant discussion contained in the minutes. The Committee members were in agreement.

**Update on Issues Since Previous Meeting:** Mr. Smith provided a map of the 129 Parker site from 2004 indicating the potential groundwater locations. Mr. Estabrook stated this is good information but not something this Committee will need to deliberate on as the Conservation Commission will be doing their own review. He stated it does confirm that the developer will not be able to go much beyond the current asphalt line.

Mr. Smith stated he met with the Fire Chief and he discussed 0.88 or 0.92 calls per unit for an independent living facility. He is reaching out to other fire chief's with these types of facilities in their towns to determine how many calls for service they have and how many units they have.

Mr. Smith discussed a fiscal tool prepared by Dr. John Mullen of U. Mass Amherst. He stated the first cell of the tool is development value. He stated for the project as proposed last year estimated tax dollars based on the assessor's report was \$1 million and in the Collins report the value was \$2.3 million. Mr. Depietri stated the assessor value is closer to how properties are valued in Maynard and surrounding towns and the U. Mass report construction costs were overstated and estimated tax income was overstated, it was not based on local data and how the Town of Maynard is assessing buildings. Mr. Estabrook stated any fiscal impact that is done should not be done on some theoretical modeling but based on consultation with the Maynard Board of Assessors to get their perspective.

Mr. Jennings stated the Committee had requested that a table be added to the draft recommendation under scale of uses and he did not have time to do this, however, he did provide information from the Collins report with a list of allowed uses and square footage information. He provided the Committee with a handout from the town of Lynnfield development agreement which shows 3500 square feet of space for the town. He stated the retail portion in Lynnfield was just under 500,000 square feet and there were 180 multifamily rental units.

Mr. Depietri stated he provided a handout with information on housing.

Mr. Estabrook stated Mr. Cahill will not be available for a significant part of February and he had suggested having a meeting next week to update the Planning Board on the project. This meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 4 at 7:00 p.m. He will provide an update with the understanding that the Committee has not completed its recommendation.

**Committee Recommendations:** Mr. Jennings provided a redline copy of the draft recommendation document which incorporated the comments and discussion from the last meeting. Written comments received from Mr. Cahill were passed out to the Committee.

Mr. Smith stated that the previous Scenario 2B Plan had shown the residential buildings closer to Field Street, as it went parking and then buildings. Then the newer Scenario 2B Plan provided to the Committee has shown the building locations moved in front of the parking, with the parking areas now closest to Field Street. Mr. Smith suggested this matter should be discussed with the Committee and the Field Street abutters. Mr. Estabrook stated at a previous meeting comment was made that the Fire Chief would prefer to have access all around the building. Mr. Jennings stated an area could be made that looks like grass but is concrete beneath and can support the weight of a fire truck. Mr. Estabrook stated the assumption being made is that it is better to have the building in that area rather than parking, however, a building is permanent and residents will have to deal with noise from occupants, rather than just cars coming and going.

Ms. Thayer asked if the height of the residential buildings has been determined. Mr. Depietri stated the three story buildings would be approximately 36 feet and the four story would be approximately 48 feet in height. He stated the roofs will probably be hip style, not flat, and the AC units will be on the ground.

Mr. Estabrook asked the residents present who live in the Field Street area what their preferences are in terms of what is on the other side of the property line from them.

Michelle Booth, Field Street – She stated when this site was previously in full operation there was a parking lot and building in that location. She stated she would not want to see a four story building moved closer to her property line.

Karen Grimes, Field Street – She asked what path the children in the apartments will take to get to walk to the schools. She expressed concern with safety and walkability for students. She stated she is used to a parking lot being closer to her property line.

Mark DeCastro, Cutting Drive – He asked if a visual aid, such as a balloon, could be placed on the property indicating the height of the proposed buildings.

Paul Chiodo, Cutting Drive – He stated that people are familiar with the sound associated with a parking lot but a building running 24/7 is something people need to understand and appreciate.

Ms. Hart stated if the proposed medical building on the right side of the assisted living could be moved over to the green space on the left side then the open green space could be expanded to make it more useable. Mr. Dipietri stated this will be incorporate in the next set of plans, along with other recommendations being discussed. Ms. Hart suggested the green space could include a pavilion, basketball courts, a gazebo. She recommended the developer look at Snowfield in Stow, Massachusetts for ideas. She stated having the green space would get people excited about the whole place and gain their support.

Mr. Estabrook reminded Mr. Jennings that a paragraph should be added to the beginning of the document to address the history of the Committee, and perhaps an executive summary depending on the length of the document when it is completed.

Mr. Jennings reviewed the changes made to the draft recommendation document. He stated he was unsure if the Committee wanted to include a recommended number of housing units. Mr. Estabrook stated opinion varied widely on this from between 150 to 250. He stated this number should be driven by objective data and the document should state the Committee believes strongly that complete evaluation of this would need more objective data, using a range of 150 to 250.

Mr. Smith stated the studies show two bedroom units have 0.2 school children per unit and three bedroom units have 0.65 children per unit, so he would be uncomfortable with going with bedrooms alone, as the more bedrooms a unit has the more school children there are. Discussion was held on what number of housing units to include in the recommendation. Mr. Jennings reminded the Committee the affordable component would represent a public benefit and reducing the number of units would affect the cost to the developer.

Ms. Thayer stated she based her decision on the number of units on the fact that the state considers 200 units to be a large scale project. Mr. Estabrook stated the Committee does not have enough information to determine the number of units. He indicated whatever range is set may be changed during the concept plan if more objective data is available. He stated this may also be reduced more during the site plan review process. Mr. Smith stated although 200 units is a large scale number every town does have the right to provide an increase. It was agreed to remove the language referencing the total number of bedrooms and to discuss this again at the next meeting.

Mr. Jennings referenced an email received from Mr. Cahill indicating four specific recreational uses. Mr. Estabrook stated he is somewhat bothered by a town committee's recommendation specifying commercial ventures. He was in favor of using generic language regarding the recreational use. Mr. Jennings stated some of the uses are not allowed so language has to be crafted to say there are things in this use category that may not be allowed.

Mr. Jennings stated he included language to address the PK2 building and why it is not included in the recommendation. Mr. Estabrook stated he liked the wording of this section. Discussion was held on whether to include specific examples of town uses for a building within the development. Mr. Redner stated the town could use a building for multiple purposes such as a senior center and school administration. Mr. Jennings recommended adding wording along the lines of "such as inclusion of a dedicated amount of square footage within the overall project that is specifically reserved for public uses." Mr. Estabrook expressed concern with recommending a portion of the commercial space, which has already been reduced, be used for town purposes. Mr. Jennings stated

any such square footage should not be taken away from the proposed 250 square feet of commercial space.

Mr. Depietri stated based on the analysis done last year 20,000 square feet would be needed for the senior center and school administration. Mr. Estabrook asked Mr. Jennings to propose some language that can be reviewed at the next meeting.

Discussion was held on whether the Committee would like to make a specific recommendation on drive through windows. Mr. Estabrook stated the definition of fast food in the zoning bylaw would probably preclude the use of a drive through.

**Public Comment:**

Ellen Duggan, Park Street – She stated in May this project was soundly defeated because of the 250 apartments and now there are still 250 and assisted living has been added. She stated she does not think 250 is going to be favorably responded to at town meeting. She asked what the developer wants to do to sweeten the pot. She stated just because the school department asked for 10,000 square feet does not mean that's what they need.

Karen Grimes, Field Street – She stated she has in front of her the Wayland multiuse overlay district and they used gross floor area for residential.

Peter Falzone, Dettling Road – He asked for clarification of a statement made earlier that the assessors report uses conservative values and there would be a net loss to the town in taxes. Mr. Smith stated this information has to be looked at more closely.

Trish Saunders, Dettling Road – She stated she appreciates the Committee giving consideration to many people's belief that a senior center is needed in the town. She stated she is perplexed by the idea that they would try to accomplish that goal by making what is already a very dense development more dense when there is so much empty retail and office space in the town.

She stated because this development will draw in people from many communities it does not seem likely that a green space would be a place where people would choose to bring their families for a picnic given the amount of traffic and noise at the site. She would prefer to use that green space for bigger setbacks and bigger buffers for the established residential neighborhoods that abut the property. She pointed out that the plan has much bigger buffers between the rental units and the retail than it provides for the established homes in the area.

Paul Chiodo, Cutting Drive – He stated if the development is not too dense they should be able to try and reconfigure so the buildings are not sitting on top of the Dettling Road residences.

Peter Falzone, Dettling Road – He asked if they know who is going to fill the retail space, aside from the supermarket. He stated in Wayland half the retail space is still empty. Mr. Depietri stated the reason some of the Wayland space is empty is the design. He stated the design has to work. He stated at this point they have more people who are interested than they have space for in this development and unless a building is leased they are not going to build it.

John Kulik, Field Street – He stated he feels this project is too dense. He stated 200-250 units of housing is too much and it is tough getting around as there is not much parking shown on the plan. He would like the plan spread out more with more green space.

Nancy Matesanze, Crane Avenue – She stated she feels what the state would recommend for this size is an important consideration relative to the residential. She stated 250 residential units will be hard to sell at town meeting.

**Discussion of Next Steps in Process:** Mr. Estabrook stated the Committee has meetings scheduled for February 5 and 12, but not February 19. He asked what the members would like to discuss at the next meeting.

Mr. Smith stated the assessors are meeting on February 4 but he is not likely to have any information to present on February 5. Mr. Jennings stated the Mullen report model is great but will not be definitive until the third party fiscal impact report is done. He recommended selecting a date further out with a goal of having all information done.

Mr. Estabrook reiterated that the Committee's role is to make a recommendation and the Planning Board is going to do studies based on these recommendations and a proposal that comes forward to them from the developer. Ms. Thayer stated it was her understanding the Committee would be provided information on which to base their recommendations and she feels there are still a lot of questions unanswered. She stated one of the toughest things for the residents last year to accept was that there was not information provided for them to make an informed decision.

Mr. Smith stated having this fiscal impact tool is something that the Committee can look at. Mr. Estabrook stated he appreciates Mr. Smith wanting to create this report, however, he does not want the Committee to meet for the next five or six weeks in order to try to do the Planning Board's job. He stated last spring there were many questions left unanswered, in part because the Board of Selectmen did not get the information out and set a date for town meeting before there was a proposal for the Planning Board to consider. He stated he laid out a vision on how this Committee would go forward and he thought there was agreement that they would come to a set of recommendations, however, if the Committee as a whole wants to do something different that's great.

Mr. Redner stated he would like to go through the recommendations and make the recommendations to the Board of Selectmen so the process can continue. Ms. Hart asked if this Committee is done after the recommendations are made or would there be a point at which they might have to reconvene. Mr. Estabrook stated once the Committee makes its recommendations they are done.

Ms. Thayer asked Mr. Jennings for his opinion on what the Board of Selectmen will do with the recommendations the Committee makes. She stated when the idea of this Committee was presented the Board of Selectmen were given the option of taking on this role and they chose to form this Committee. She stated she does not see the Board going through this information to the extent she would hope.

Mr. Jennings stated one of the issues going on at that point was there was not a real development program on the table. He stated it would have been impossible to have professionals reviewing the plan at that point. The Board of Selectmen hoped this Committee would engage the public and it was designed to represent a range of people who could come up with a 90 percent vision plan which would come back to the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board so they would not have to start from square one. He stated he and Mr. Smith are supporting this Committee as well as supporting the town process in thinking of the next steps.

Mr. Estabrook stated the Board of Selectmen will take the Committee's report and take certain actions. Their primary action is going to be to commission a fiscal impact study. He stated this is what did not happen the last time. Ms. Thayer stated she asked several weeks ago for preliminary numbers from the Board of Assessors based on what is on the plan so the determination can be made whether putting the assisted living facility was the right move, however, if this is just going to the Planning Board as Mr. Estabrook is saying then there is no more information to get. Mr. Smith stated the Assessor's information she requested should be available to the Committee on February 12.

Ms. Thayer recommended the Committee come back next week and continue to discuss the recommendations.

The next Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 5, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

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