

Oak Grove Presentation
**Joint Meeting – Medway Board of Selectmen, Planning and Economic
Development Board and Economic Development Committee**
Medway Senior Center – 76 Oakland Street
Tuesday, February 5, 2013

Planning and Economic Development Board:

PEDB Members Present: Andy Rodenhiser, Bob Tucker, Tom Gay, Chan Rogers, Karyl Spiller-Walsh, and Matthew Hayes.

Also Present: Susy Affleck-Childs, Planning and Economic Development Coordinator
Dave Pellegri, Consulting Engineer
Amy Sutherland Recording Secretary

Andy Rodenhiser, Chairman of the Planning and Economic Development Board, asked for a motion to open the meeting

On a motion made by Chan Rogers and seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, the Planning and Economic Development Committee opened the joint meeting with the Board of Selectmen and the Economic Development Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

Board of Selectmen:

BOS Members Present:

Chairman Andy Espinosa, Dennis Crowley, Rick D’Innocenzo, John Foresto, and Glenn Trindade

Also Present: Town Administrator Suzanne Kennedy

Chairman Espinosa asked for a motion to go into a joint meeting with the Planning and Economic Development Board and the Economic Development Committee.

On a motion made by Dennis Crowley and seconded by Glenn Trindade, the Board of Selectmen voted unanimously to open the joint meeting with the Planning and Economic Development Committee and the Economic Development Committee.

Economic Development Committee:

Members Present: Ray Himmel, Ann Sherry, Ken Bancewicz and Chan Rogers.

Chairman Ray Himmel asked for a motion to go into the joint meeting with the Planning and Economic Development Board and the Board of Selectmen.

On a motion made by Ann Sherry and seconded by Ken Bancewicz, the Economic Development Committee voted unanimously to open the joint meeting with the Planning and Economic Development Board and the Board of Selectmen.

Also present: Economic Development Director Claire O’Neill

Also present at the joint meeting were:

Mike Mitchell: Mass Development

Cynthia Wall: Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)

Russ Burke: BSC Group

Andy Rodenhiser from the Planning and Economic Development Board welcomed all parties and gave a brief introduction.

This presentation was prepared for the Town of Medway and Mass Development by the BSC Group in cooperation with Ninigret Partners. They were asked to conduct a study of the Oak Grove/bottle cap lots area back in 2011.

The study was done to determine the viability of a business park at the Oak Grove site. This area has been identified as a priority area for “smart” redevelopment. The Town was been able to receive financial support from MassDevelopment to perform the Economic Development Feasibility study.

The site includes 1018 mini parcels. 365 are owned by the Town. 376 are owned by a single private owner. Combined this equals 741 parcels which is 73%. 183 remaining parcels are owned by over 94 owners. Some of those are unknown.

The site access on the base plan was determined to be Routs 109, West Street, Alder Street and Trotter Drive.

One of the key features of the site is that there is excellent access to Route 109. The water and sewer capacity needs to be looked since the town is at their limits with withdrawal permits. There are restrictions for the types of uses.

The map of the existing zoning was shown.

There is split zoning at this site. This includes the Agricultural Residential II district on the east side of the area and the Industrial District III zoning on the west side. There are also 15 acres in the Groundwater Protection Overlay District. With the ARII zoning, there is a required 200 ft. buffer between manufacturing/industrial uses and any pre-existing residents. The Industrial III

District would have general industrial, warehouse/distribution and office space. A site plan would be required for 2,500 square feet or more.

A plan of the estimated development was shown. This does not take building height into consideration. This is for a one story footprint. The plan shows ownership by colors and the plan identified clusters which would be developed. There were eight clustered areas. There are out parcels not owned by the Town or the Williams family. This was used as the base of showing what can currently be done with minimum acquisition. The next step would be to have the Town determine the priority parcels which need to be pursued.

There are some constraints on the site. This includes specific zoning setback requirements along with a wetland buffer which is 25' from the no disturb zone. The capacity of sewer is another constraint. The current residential abutters do hinder this development.

The opportunities which are presented for this site include the fact that this is a relatively undeveloped site. It is positive that there is frontage on Route 109. The access to I-495 is also an advantage to this site.

The assembly of this area is can be done through the urban renewal. The process is available and could be done for Medway. The map shows the problem with assembling the land. This could be solved with special legislation. This should be reviewed as potential.

The estimated development potential would be 31.1 acres.

There was a market analysis completed. The major finding included uses and sizes which met favorably in the market place. An out-parcel cluster design was shown. The development components from the market analysis showed 70-110 housing units. It could also include a 150-200 bed hotel with a conference space. This could be a mixed plan with retail and office space. This could be easily subdivided space. The industrial lot design would allow tech businesses on site.

The next step was to look at the concept for the planning process and how is this optimized. The Town would need to try to build on massing properties relative to the type, location, and size. Also consider Non Bottle Cap Out Parcels which would optimize the use of site.

The framework of site planning was reviewed. This included limiting some of the access points. The parking would need to be addressed and changes to the existing parking bylaws may have to occur. The Planning Board will have to work on new zoning for the site.

Building Typology: The various types of building typology were reviewed. This was broken up into three areas:

Residential: The residential section might include attached and detached townhouses with mixed flat and townhouses.

Commercial: The Commercial building types would include retail, hotel, office, and specialty retail.

Industrial: The Industrial building type would include pharma/biotech, manufacturing, flex space and research and development.

The site analysis plan was shown. The design principles were reviewed.

The following plans were shown.

1. All the properties in area would be developed. (This plan was abandoned since there was no transition to abutting areas)
2. Include the area which the power company and another owner have. The Town should consider this as a priority and strategic importance and created a quad approach with larger buildings and two story retail first floor office retail and office. Possible a three story hotel.
3. Avoid the out parcels: Concept 3 – three story hotel with residential with town houses units and small two story office uses on easterly side. Avoid the out parcels.

This would be best management practices. The design principles would employ low impact development. It would also promote internal pedestrian circulation and minimize ingress and egress points.

The members looked at the summary of alternatives. There were four options compared. The concepts were provided from comments provided at the public forum on March 28, 2011.

Chairman Rodenhiser indicated that the Town we will need to determine what we want to see in the future. This information will be gathered at a future meeting. The Town is currently working on zoning with Cynthia Wall.

There was a suggestion that a better way to do this is through the establishment of a master plan. This can be done in sections and will need to adhere to the plan. This could be done in a single lot with multiple buildings.

The Concept Plans were noted:

Preferred Concept A was with no out parcel participation.

Preferred Concept B was with full participation.

There was a comparison plan provided of preferred Concept A and B. The dotted lines are pedestrian network for circulation and this remains constant. This was done purposefully conservative to give magnitude to scale.

A cost estimate was provided using a very rough evaluation method for the fiscal impact for two of the options. The education cost formula was explained.

No traffic impact study was done, but this would need to be done if one of the options is explored. The Planning Board is currently looking to revise the Town's parking standards. There probably would need to be a signal light at Trotter Drive and Milford ST. Proper signalization would provide an opportunity to fix the current problem with traffic.

This development would all need to be phased. This will take many years to complete. The analysis for the number of units would be for empty nesters. It was suggested that back-up analysis be completed. This is not a detailed fiscal impact study. There needs to be a cost estimate for the taking of properties.

The next step would be to have a project launch. This is the critical path to take. This involves finalizing of the plan. The second step would be to raise the initial project capital. This would be to get grant money or town funds. The Town would need to be proactive and secure site control and then secure the permitting and proceeding with the development approach.

The cost implications would need to be determined for acquisition. There would need to be a cost, feasibility and fiscal impact assessment. The land assemblage would be getting a handle on what strategy do you want to pursue.

The development approached would be looking at if the town serves as developer or is a master developer hired through an RFP/RFQ process.

The last item discussed was land pooling and land re-adjustment. This is the willingness to cooperate with the residents and having an agreement to work together. There would be shared objectives and there would need to be agreement on the development plan. This type of dialogue tends to break down. With land pooling, all agree to a master development plan and focus on selling shares in a development entity. All share in the risk and reward. This is probably not impossible but it takes the how much is my property worth out of the picture. All are on same page and all will share equally.

The urban renewal plan provides a way of for municipalities to dispose of property in a controlled and planned context. This is a powerful technique. It allows the town to acquire land with an approved plan which is vacant and eligible and blighted and underutilized. The town can negotiate with developer and have more control. This also puts the agencies on notice that you have done a planning process and provides a leg up with state grants. With Urban Renewal the power of the plan is critical. This is a dc-good leveraging tool. This is a vehicle for the town to go through the assemblage process. It cannot be assembled for free. The taking does require full compensation. The town may or may not consider this.

Claire O'Neill wanted to know how we project the costs and take the next step.

If the Town decides to put together an Urban Renewal Plan, there will be some upfront cost.

One would need to look at the land sales and take the residential piece off and fund the whole thing.

Cynthia Wall suggested as an option leasing the land since it creates a cash stream for the Town.

The Town would need to have a master plan to know where drainage and water is going. The Town could do this one section at a time.

Chairman Rodenhiser thanked all parties for their attendance.

NOTE – The PowerPoint version of the presentation is attached.

On a motion made by Karyl Spiller-Walsh and seconded by Tom Gay, the Planning and Economic Development Board voted unanimously to adjourn their meeting at 9:15 pm.

On a motion made by Ann Sherry and seconded by Ken Bancewicz, the Economic Development Committee voted unanimously to adjourn their meeting at 9:15 pm.

Adjourned at 9:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Sutherland
Recording Secretary

Edited by,

Susan E. Affleck-Childs
Planning and Economic Development Coordinator

Edited by,

Claire M. O'Neill
Economic Development Director

