

## **Tuesday, May 13, 2008**

### **Planning Board Meeting**

PRESENT: Andy Rodenhiser, Bob Tucker, Chan Rogers, Karyl Spiller-Walsh, Tom Gay, John Williams

ALSO PRESENT: Susy Affleck-Childs, Planning Board Assistant  
Gino Carlucci, PGC Associates (7:20 pm)

Andy Rodenhiser called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

#### **CITIZEN COMMENTS -**

Jan Fish – just to say hello – rep from the FINCOM

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Invoices

VHB – \$1,014.55 construction observation – evergreen meadows, ice, country view and broad acres - motion by chan, karyl – all yes

PGC Associates – plan review services for Marian Community Retreat center and Daniels Wood II - 1068.75 – chan, bob – all yes

PGC Associates - \$525 – consulting services and contracted services – master plan, zoning articles, affordable housing, PB meeting – motion by bob, chan – all yes

Daniels Wood – CO estimate – karyl, chan – all yes - \$3,597.30

Chan – elected as distinguished member to ASCE – honor to about 1 in 7,000 members – vast majority are academics – with PhDs, - my was straight civil engineering –

Andy – congratulations

Motions to approve PR fees for Murphy Insurance agency – we will start PH on 5/27 – Bob, karyl - - fee estimates from VHB and TTR

Sign Country View Estates Plans – for Lot 34 – reendorse plans – mylar versions that are needed for the Registry – andy, karyl, bob,

## **PUBLIC HEARING – John’s Auto Body Site Plan Modification**

7:17 pm

Andy’s comments -

A motion was made by Bob Tucker, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh to dispense with the reading of the public hearing notice. APPROVED>

Rick Merrikin Merrikin, Merrikin Engineering, Millis, MA as applicant’s official representative

John and Caroline Solari, applicants

Rick Merrikin – This is an application for an addition to an existing building at 27 Jayar Road for John’s Auto body. The existing structure is about 5,000 sq. ft. It is a metal building with garage doors with a paved area around the building. The rear is natural vegetation. There are wetlands back there. Mr. Solari has received permission from the CONCOM for what he is proposing. We propose to put in a single bay addition on the left side of the property, a metal building of similar character. Grey. It will look exactly like the existing structure. I venture to say you won’t notice it. The size is 22’ by 50’. It is going in an area that is already paved where he presently stores vehicles.

The business uses include metal fabrication, auto body repair, auto repair and truck repair. He has an active towing business. The vehicles waiting to be repaired are presently stored where the bay will be, so we are putting a roof over the space where vehicles are presently stored.

The property has been there for quite a number of years. There is a paved area in front. There are no lined spaces on the property itself. Typically, cars are parked in front where the bays are. The building inspector has determined this is a minor modification to an existing site plan.

We will line the parking area.

Since the area being roofed is already paved, we are asking to not have to do any drainage analysis or installation. There will be no additional drainage needed.

We have proposed to do some landscaping at the entrances to the site. We can spruce up the area some more. We have shown snow storage here and there is vehicle storage on west side of the building.

We have decided to approach it as a minor modification and not redo the entire site plan.

Gino Carlucci’s review comments dated 5-9-08

– direct roof runoff of the building to a drywell

- unclear how many parking spaces are needed. Ask Bob Speroni.
- more landscaping suggested to match on both sides

Rick Merrikin – slow growing

6. waivers list – including lights

Bob – direct downward and minimal illumination at the property line –

Andy – it looks like it is washing the door area

Bob – safety – also consider business neighbors in the area . . gym next door?? - I don't have an issue at all with the lighting

Karyl – the scruffy gravel area in the front – and the crummy curbing – what else could it be – do they drive over it?

Rick Merrikin – today it is grassy

Andy – generally people pull up right in front of the bays

Rick Merrikin – very large

Andy – the adjacent lot is just a big gravel

Rick Merrikin – we could make it a legitimate plant strip – we would be willing to do that . . .

Cha n- some of the equipment that seems to be stored and not used –

Rick Merrikin – repair type – I think some of them are is used on an occasional basis - they tow for medway and millis police –

Use variance 1993 -

Get a copy of this . . .

Any comments or questions from the public?? NONE

Any thoughts on waivers – any problems

Ok- bob, karyl, andy,

Bob – existing business,

Motion to continue to may 27 at 8:30 pm

Nice presentation –

Andy – thanks for investing in medway . . .

### **Discussion on Affordable Housing bylaw – revisions**

**Gino** – Susy and I met - generally same themes as we discussed with Paul - - if you remember the confusing sheet that I distributed to you last week – we have integrated it into so I hope it is less confusing –

Added a definition of equivalent affordable housing unit – how to determine the difference between a market rate unit and an affordable unit – Paul suggested using 36 months prior to the application coming in vs. fiscal year or calendar year – suggested it be only for arms length transactions –

Karyl – I am transposing into what he is saying – in my mind I am coming up with different ages – where in the town

Gino – the whole town -

Karyl – such a variation throughout town – big discrepancy

Andy – the idea is to look at the transactions occurring all over medway – by having an average you wont have things pinned too high – we want to create a diversity of housing types

Gino – also, the other major change relates to this – this calculation would be used to figure out the payment in lieu – we have built in the incentive – by having the density bonus only count if you build the units and not apply to the payment in lieu of

John – didn't we strike from the wording the difference between – what is the difference in the new calculation given the new wording?

Gino – the affordable price varies - it is the difference between the affordable price and the median sales price over the past 36 months –

Karyl – I like to play it out in several ways . . .

Andy – they participated – as state continues to thumb at towns re: 40B –

Chan – I am in sympathy

John -0 what I am struggling with – to get an actual cash payment the town would get in lieu of – is there a calculation we could do –

Gino – while it does vary – the cost of an affordable house – somebody who has 80% of the median income – it comes out to \$66,000 for a family of four – and then they have to be able to afford the house by paying no more than 30% of their income for housing and that limits the price – and it depends on the interest rate –

Andy – the AH Committee has a list of people who need affordable units –

Gino – to simplify it a bit – let's say you take - \$175,000 for an affordable unit – let's say median price is \$330,000 – the developer would have to put in \$155,000 payment to the AHTF –

Karyl – for a person who is doing a 3 lot subdivision there is a big burden - you end up changing the look of neighborhoods – it has a certain simplicity to it

John – if you had a 3 lot parcel in a half acre zone area, would we be asking for smaller lots – how do we determine what is an acceptable way to build that 4 lot – and what rules are we using – are we allowed to vary things so dramatically – it doesn't seem like this is holding the planning board to – wouldn't we want to maintain a certain minimum standards – I don't see anything specific that would prevent a proposal that would –

Eric arrives

Gino –

Karyl – I struggle with the premise that the Affordable units

Karyl - what does that do to open space in a subdivision if we are adding a unit – vistas, views, etc. – we haven't taken into consideration such things as whether the land can handle additional septic

Tom – are you going to get into a bone of contention –

Andy – if you are able to make a 3 lot subdivision into a 4 lot subdivision to get the density, john would like to not be able

Andy – if we talk about a 40,000 sq. ft. lot in ARI – and – what type of reduction are we looking at

John – natick's standard – there is no real guidelines in here on some guidance – what is acceptable to us –

Andy – in ARII – with minimum lot size of 22,500 – how could we establish a minimum – what would that look like

John – sticky question . . did you want to just be able to allow a single duplex within a single family development considering it might be an add on – concern about the appearance

Karyl – what it will look like, what it will be

John – I think this is a good thing to get this passed – but I think we need to have something to work with . . . I think this might be a little too open – I think we need to provide more language –

Andy – for example – if you have 3 lots and you want to make a 4<sup>th</sup> – take 15% of each . .

John – we might want to say the lots in a subdivision

Karyl – open space

Eric Alexander – former, member – 3 Phillips Street – karyl, I think what you are talking about is more appropriate within the subdivision regs – don't you want that everywhere? You can do density in an aesthetically pleasing manner -

Andy – this is ultimately a byproduct of the subdivision –

Eric – concern about the additional lot deviating so much in some significant way from the standard lot – I would think you could – the additional lots should not deviate more than 50% from the other lots

Gino – I would hate to see too much flexibility lost because each site is different – I think we could come up with something – maybe it would vary by zoning districts – you might need a higher percentage in ARII and a lower percentage in ARI –

Bob – I think we would be overlegisating here . . I am a little concerned about taking away their creativity

Karyl – I am the only one who is creative . . .

John – are we comfortable leaving the decision on that with the PB without any framework in there, we are leaving it up to us to decide what is acceptable – by doing a site specific decision, it starts to set a precedent . .

Karyl- thoughts – go back to a 3 lot subdivision – and one of those is a million dollar house –

Chan – they aren't going to make more inexpensive properties

Karyl – let say you have 2 houses at a million dollar each – and the other one has the basic architectural premise so it fits into the neighborhood but it is divided into four affordables

John – would that mean they would get even more a density bonus –

Gino – the density bonus is only to balance the affordables

Karyl – are there negatives to doing multipole units of affordables in one area

Eric – you don't want to concentrate – part of this bylaw is to spread out, all over town – in that sense you do want to disperse them – it is my understanding that the PB have the discretion

Karyl – what is that amount

John – reading the off-site option, one of the things - off site bonus might concentrate duplexes in ARII

John – suggest the off-site affordable would have to match the onsite bonus

Gino – one of the other changes in here is to totally put the bonus to incentivize onsite – No density bonus for payment - and half bonus for off-site . . .

Karyl – this would be very rigor

Eric – add another criteria re; underlying zoning . . on page 5 –

John – I want to reiterate – the town needs this and it is great . . and preparing for tonight and looking at what some other towns have done

Page 1 – under definitions –

In terms of the AH restriction, why 30 years? We end up havng to requalify

Eric – there are a lot of markets where petpetuity works – but when you are marketing an AH unit to a household, sometimes a deed restriction in perpetuity can keep some folks awy – concern I would have is if you

John – how about in perpetuity for rentals?

Eric – I think that would be extremelyh appropaito to require perpetuity for rentals

Eric – there are some state programs that only require 15 year deed restriction – that is not to say the town could not be more restrictive –

Bob – why would we do this for anything less than perpetuity

Eric – the deed restrictions severely limits equity growth – there is a real marketability issue if the deed restriction is too severe - if you tie yourself to perpetuity you may have some affordable units that may sit vacant – they may serve to count on the SHI

Andy – let me pose this philosophical question – if we are crating an affordable unit and try to give somebody a leg up, shouldn't we allow the person to move on but keep the unit for the next person who needs a leg up –

Eric – I am not advocating for abandoning perperutyi – the only towns I have seen do the perpetuity – wayland, Lincoln, certain neighborhoods in boston – it just not extrememely common to see that . .

Tom – maybe some of htose deciosn are made because of build out limitations -

Andy – if we are going to protect the community by keeping the perpetuity intact –

Eric – form a developers perspective, it doesn't matter how long the deed restriction is, they sell lit and are out . . . this is a town's perspective

Andy – how does this board feel

Karyl – I think I like the idea . . . of perpetuity and then the buyer jumping off into a market rate -

John – this dovetails to what I was concerned about concentration – if you know you are not going to be able to cash in on your investment after 30 years, then you might not be as likely to take care

Eric – I am just trying to explain the philosпой behind perpetuity – the affordable units are going to be very deeply discounted on the initial sales price – I don't think the notion that going in perperutyi is bad, but . .

Eric – what they can make is tied to CPI –

John – the advanatage to keep it in perperuity . . .

Karyl – does perpetuity encourage people moving in and out,

Eric – people stay in a house based on whether it meets their needs, job situation, size, etc.

Chan – that is the ulitamte objective, to help peole buy up later on

Andy – how do you feel about the perpetuity –



Eric – the type of deed restriction we are looking at would require that the owner would have to be the primary occupant -

Bob – the other approach, if we leave it as it is written, as a board we can have a policy that we are looking at perpetuity but not have to be tied to it

John – . . . you may not get the same investment in the upkeep of the property –

Eric – there is a lot backing it up . . .

John – I guess it is up for debate – keeping

Andy – keep in perpetuity? Or what

Tom – I am ok with it

Chan – fine

Karyl – there are pros and cons . . . but I think I am in favor of perpetuity

Bob – perpetuity

John – would we need to require that they show us how the number of units

Andy – probably in rules and regs

John – still concerned about standard limits . . .

Karyl – when developers come in early for discussion . . . it always about what they can carve out of the land – it has to be figured in as part of their plans – all the infrastructure

John – I appreciate all the hard work that has gone on before to get us to this point – there is a lot of it . . .

Andy – are you getting what you need – it is important that you get the info

John – it has been a helpful discussion – I have gotten to all my highlighting

Karyl – in my opinion, the way this is shaping up, with the small subdivisions, I think it will discourage small single family subdivision because of the overall costs – I think we will see other kinds of development - they may result in a moratorium

Chan – I think I remember the threshold being higher –

Karyl – we linked it to our small subdivision standard –

Chan – I think it solves a problem by allowing the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> unit as a duplex as a solution, but

Andy – that was actually a request from the builder community

Karyl – it changes the character of the neighborhood –

Tom – we are trying to talk about spreading things out – you can walk down streets in older parts of medway that are 2 family homes . .

Eric – if the DRC is doing its job, I don't think it changes

Andy – we need to change the way we are doing this – land costs – we need to do something about it – this is a good time to try it now

Karyl – I would like to see an open space concept – agricultural conditions – competitiveness for land – as we develop and work on AH, there needs to be a balance to allow smaller working farms – we need to encourage that as well –

Andy – are we discouraging that thru this?

Bob – I think you are mixing apples and oranges now

Andy – when we talk about our goals for next year, let's talk about this some more – in terms of open space – I am not sure

Karyl – there is one in Walpole – agricultural element to it – crops – gardens – 5-6 acres each . . .

Andy – an OSRD type of development

Andy – a book was given out on streamlining permitting and take a look at it – study transfer of development rights . . . that comes after – we have to make a new agenda for ourselves and what we want to do . . . we are doing great things as a board – we can get a lot done next lyear – lets choose what you want to take on – setbacks, and

Karyl – I don't see them as separate issues – I see them as distinctly locked together

Andy – we risk overengineering . .

Karyl – I think we are flushing out things . .

Andy – how much support was there for eliminating setback requirements -

Chan – John, were you thru?

John – once we reach our state 10% threshold, would we then adjust the AH requirement??

Susy - a long way off to get to the 10%

Andy – 600 acres

John – AH comes at a density cost – if we meet our requirements, is there something set in place to peel it back?

Chan – I want to move the question – I would move that we approve the document as presented and amended . . . seconded by Tom

Any more discussion –

Page 7 – c (4) – about size dimensions . . .

Paul Yorkis – suggested a range -

Eric – I looked at DHCD’s minimum guidelines – they are very small

Eric – I was wondering if there is a minimum square footage that is imposed for a residential development?

John – why would we allow a multi family unit to have less square footage than a single family detached? This would drive developers toward the multifamily units –

Bob – the expectations

Susy – developers need some direction

Karyl – something that popped into my head . . when you think about properties that have been developed that have gone from single family homes that have converted to condos, one of the visually successful formats is the carriage house in the back that contains

John – if you don’t set an expectation, we will run

Karyl – a smaller unit might be great for a single person . . .

Eric – perhaps provide some direction without . . . “in general”

Chan – I think these numbers are small enough . . .

Gino – if someone does decide to do a payment in lieu of – instead of requiring it all up front, it would be easier if they could pay over time - then what about a development that takes a

Moiton has been made and seconded –

Karyl – no  
Andy – yes  
Bob – yes  
Chan – yes  
Tom – yes

John – I am concerned about overpopulating the school system . .

Andy – I used to think that way . . and it is still a concern of mine – but I remember Eric saying one time . . .

Eric – it is disappointing to me that we turn our backs on families – we aren't as welcoming as we should be . . . we need to find a way to hosue people who want ot live here

Andy – fabric of a community, where we can have old people, and my kids can live here .

Saturday – may 31<sup>st</sup> – 9 am – andy, chan, karyl - Plan B - Tom cannot attend

Friday – may 30<sup>th</sup> – andy, chan, tom, karyl could attend . .- Plan A – 7 pm

Bob is not available at all that weekend at all

Motion to adjourn – 10 pm –