



**129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Committee Minutes
Town Building, Lower Meeting Room #101
Wednesday, March 5, 2014
7:00 P.M.**

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

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.

February 12, 2014 - *Motion made to accept the minutes of February 12 as amended. Motion seconded. The motion passed by a 6-0-1 vote (Cabill abstained).*

Update on Issues Since Previous Meeting: Mr. Jennings stated as this process moves forward there will need to be additional reviews in the area of fiscal impact, infrastructure, and possibly legal. He stated a state grant program has been identified that may be helpful to support some or all of these costs and he and Mr. Smith met with the Board of Selectmen who authorized a grant application submittal.

Discussion of Committee Recommendations: Mr. Estabrook stated he would like to focus on new material, or items that have changed since the Committee's last review.

Mr. Jennings reviewed the recommendation document. Mr. Estabrook stated he would like to discuss later in the meeting the allowed use table because there is information that was discussed but is not reflected in the table.

Mr. Jennings stated last week the State issued a two page policy indicating in order for the State to recognize affordable units, whether 40B or not 40B, some portion of the units in the project have to be three bedroom. Mr. Estabrook stated he recalled there was a general feeling the Committee might be open to the idea of three bedrooms if that would assist the Town toward its affordable housing goals and he would like this included in the document, along with the number of housing units and number of bedrooms. He recommended including language indicating the Committee

recommends a maximum size of two bedrooms plus den as proposed by the applicant but would be open to the idea of modifying this if it would help the Town get to its affordable housing goal.

Discussion was held on how to modify this recommendation language. Mr. Cahill recommended eliminating the more specific mathematics that Mr. Smith recommended, keep the more general statement that Mr. Jennings wrote and include it as a footnote. He stated he would also recommend the 10% affordable remain, which will be worked out as the Planning Board goes through the public hearing process. The Committee was in agreement with this language.

Mr. Jennings asked how the Committee would like to address whether the bedrooms in the independent living and assisted living facilities would count toward the Town's inventory. Mr. Cahill recommended striking the structured paragraph and adding a footnote that reads "if the assisted/independent living units are counted as year-round housing units under the subsidized housing inventory the number of affordable housing units should be set to achieve at least 10% affordable units for the overall project as a whole. If affordable units are not included in the assisted/independent living portion of the project achieving this standard would require an increase in the percentage of affordable units within the multifamily housing component." The Committee was in agreement with this language.

Mr. Estabrook referenced language addressing the traffic analysis. He stated there are places where there are no left turn signals and this was going to be changed under the site plan review done on this site in 2009, however, he does not recall discussing timing of the signals. Mr. Jennings stated the scope of review of the traffic study is going to be prepared between the Planning office and engineering and will need to be responsive to issues raised here.

Mr. Estabrook stated Mr. Smith and Ms. Thayer had indicated the Use Table was not correct and will have to be addressed. Ms. Thayer stated live-work dwelling units are not allowed in industrial or NBOD. Mr. Jennings stated anything that needs a Town meeting vote before applying for a permit is not by right, but it is called by-right in the NBOD. Mr. Estabrook referenced the use on the 2B concept column. He stated in the by-right there would be yes and no for what is allowed and not allowed and on the 2B column the same should be true. Ms. Thayer clarified a bank or financial institution is not allowed under the NBOD. Mr. Estabrook noted the two uses the Committee discussed as being okay are banks and offices, however, they are not allowed under NBOD. Mr. Smith noted a medical office is also not allowed, nor are assisted/independent living facilities.

Mr. Jennings stated Maynard's Table of Use is currently unclear under the present zoning bylaw and the Building Commissioner has to make a determination when a project is proposed. Ms. Thayer recommended the Committee stick to the uses they have agreed on recommending going forward. Mr. Cahill agreed and stated their recommendation to the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen would be they recommend that these uses be changed to a yes under NBOD.

Mr. Estabrook recommended removing the Table of Use and instead include a paragraph discussing the list of uses the Committee supports including under NBOD. These would include bank, medical office, business professional office, assisted living, independent living, and drive through as an accessory use. He further recommended adding a paragraph stating the Committee has not reviewed any comprehensive list of uses that may be proposed and only the ones that are currently being proposed under plan 2B. He would also like to state they do not want to see vehicle repair uses on the property.

Mr. Cahill presented to the Committee an idea he had relative to Building D. He stated the idea was to help the Dettling Road residents by moving the delivery vehicle access to the other side and to have a grand entrance for visibility from the road. Mr. Estabrook stated he likes this idea and if the Committee likes it they should encourage the Planning Board to consider this. Mr. Redner stated he would be reluctant to make a recommendation on a concept that the builder cannot accomplish. The Committee was in agreement to move forward with the current wording in the document, noting that Mr. Cahill could present his concept to the Planning Board.

Public Comment:

Bill Cranshaw, Mockingbird Lane – He asked for clarification if the Committee wants a public building on the site or elsewhere in Town. Mr. Estabrook stated the Committee would like the Planning Board to consider including this on the site.

Name Not Given – She asked about previous discussion of the timing of the light at Routes 117 and 27, as she remembers discussion of the left turn. Mr. Jennings stated the document does include under the discussion of traffic analysis that both improving and coordination of existing traffic signals in Town was identified as one need in addition to others. She stated she does not understand the distinction between drive up and fast food. Mr. Estabrook provided an explanation. The speaker commented it appears the four and five houses on Dettling Road get greater consideration than the Parker or Field Street residents.

Ms. Thayer expressed concern that there could be a lot of things put into the development agreement and she asked that they consider strengthening zoning to allow the Town to continue to have some oversight on their own vision. She expressed concern that down the road the Board of Selectmen could renegotiate the development agreement. She stated in Wayland three years after a development was approved and the Town voted to support it based on certain negotiations a new developer went back to the Board of Selectmen and renegotiated some pretty strong points.

Discussion of Next Steps in Process: Mr. Estabrook stated the Committee could vote on the document as amended subject to the changes being made and sign the document at the next meeting, or hold the vote when the final document is presented. Mr. Estabrook stated Mr. Depietri still has to provide clarification on the square footage. The Committee was in agreement to wait for the final document before proceeding to a vote.

Mr. Jennings stated he could have the final document available to the Committee on Monday, March 10. The Committee planned to meet again on Wednesday, March 12 to review the document, vote, and sign the document.

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