

**Economic Development Committee  
August 14, 2013**

**Minutes**

Present: Jean Milburn, Sam Potter, Nick Willard, Becky Stanizzi

Guests: Kevin Giblin of Brendon Associates, Michael Sullivan or Sullivan/Connors Eng., Gordon Cliff, Molly Upton, Cynthia, Gretchen Schuler

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Town Building.

Public Comment: Gordon Cliff, Highfields Road, Resident and member of the Audit Committee. He submitted a one-page document and asked that it be included in the minutes of the meeting. (It appears at the end of this document)

Gordon described each of the points appearing in his document. He stressed that he thought that we should strive to exceed a 2/3 supporting vote, striving to get at least 80% of the voters supporting the project.

Becky Stanizzi invited our guests to speak. Kevin Giblin, who is building condos in Wayland now, mentioned that he had spoken on the phone with Sam Potter at length. He is interested in the municipal site that we may develop. He spoke about the range of projects that he has built in his 40 years in the construction industry. His company recently built a Wegman's, has built thousands of houses and many apartments. He has never done an unfriendly 40B project since he does not like the idea of having an adversarial relationship with the leadership of a town in which he is building. He's looked at our concept drawings and feels that it is too big and does not fit the site. He mentioned that he was a selectman in Northborough at the age of 30 and knows a lot about the challenges that town leaders face. Kevin is interested in the site. His vision for it is a three story rental complex with traditional design, porticos, nice landscaping; with 150 to 160 units. However, a building that is 66% = senior is not attractive to his company. He would prefer a building that was 25% senior + 25% affordable + 50% market rate; and 1 Br and 2 BR units only.

Becky asked Mr. Giblin about unit sizes and characteristics. He thinks that the 2BR could go up to 1100 sq ft. He thinks that 9 foot ceilings, granite

counters and better-quality finishes would be appropriate. He would encourage high standards for leasing, heavy landscaping, and inclusion of a gym. He thinks that other amenities would not be necessary. He does not think that the project could carry a concierge. When he was asked why no more amenities, he replied that while he did recognize that the convenience of amenities contributes to longer-term rentals, he thinks that the proximity to hiking, biking, shopping will address those needs.

Cynthia suggested that perhaps by working with Con Com an elevated walking path could be installed in the area.

Becky asked if he had a picture available of a building similar to what he envisions for the site. Kevin did not. She asked about the River Road site and his opinion of its suitability. Kevin indicated that a back road site is poor for leasing and that it is an inferior site.

Sam Potter asked Mr. Giblin if he was aware of the dirt piles on site and provided a description of the piles, their contents, and the tests done on those contents to this date, indicating that the compaction qualities were potentially quite high. He also mentioned that the cost of demolishing and removing the treatment plant would be passed on to the developer. Kevin indicated that he estimated that there was approximately \$500K in site preparation and demolition needed to make the site ready for building.

The discussion turned to concerns regarding school-age children residents who would add to the school census. Kevin felt that one- and two- BR units would not attract families with children to Wayland. Single professionals and divorced people would like the property. He mentioned that his recent project had 42 units and housed only 7 children who attended the public school.

Committee members indicated that not all Wayland residents could afford to buy condominiums in Wayland when they downsize and that apartments create an option for those residents. Mr. Giblin believes that townhomes similar to those he has recently built would rent readily. However, he indicated that he was very interested and “would do anything we want” if we were looking for true apartments at a lower price point. He suggested that EDC consider creating a lower percentage of senior units and use deed restrictions and conveyance documents to create a few units which would be offered to Wayland-resident applicants first before non-residents.

The discussion turned to parking. Mr. Giblin estimates 1.7 parking spaces per unit. He felt that residents of such a project would want to own cars even if Zip Cars were available on the lot.

We talked about the anticipated RFP process in which we allow proposals that offered as little as 25% senior units, even though the planned zoning is 66% senior. If we failed to find an acceptable developer for a primarily-senior project, but received an otherwise attractive bid at a lower senior occupancy level, we would return to TM and present the option to the voters.

Gretchen Schuler, who was a leader on the Nike Site Project, suggested that we ask for zoning at 25% Senior and then use a point-system to evaluate proposals and give “lots of weight” to those proposals which include a greater percentage of seniors.

Kevin indicated that he'd like to do a quick study of the site for EDC and Sam offered to make sure that he has access to our drawings.

After Kevin left, we quickly touched on a few more topics. Becky indicated that we can expect to see some more information from JCHE. We hope to have more information about wireless consultants at the next meeting. Becky is working on suggested changes to the language of the two articles.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Milburn

August 14, 2013

Economic Development Committee

While I am a member of the Audit Committee the views expressed below are solely my own.

1. EDC has done a great job on the River's Edge opportunity so far
2. But there is real work left to do.
3. At Fall Town Meeting I think you should present 3-5 options and prose and cons of each. Options could be:
  - a. Do nothing
  - b. Commercial (U store it?)
  - c. 150 apts no restrictions (with required level of 40B)
  - d. 150 apts (scaled down version of the prior 216)
  - e. 216 (prior proposal, updated if you committee?BoS sees fit)
4. While the legal requirement is 2/3rds, we should be aiming for a proposal that we think will significantly exceed that. For something of the size and potential impact it would be much better to have a project that has overwhelming support than a (bigger) project that just sneaks over the legally required threshold.

Gordon Cliff  
Highfields Road