

Wayland Real Asset Planning Committee

May 16, 2016 – 7:30 PM

APPROVED 6/6/16

Present. Colleen Sheehan, Anette Lewis and Gretchen Schuler.

Also Present. Sarkis Sarkisian, George Bennett, Steve Correia, Jean Milburn, Kevin Murphy, Andrew Reck, Nicole Riley, Tom Sciacca, Bill Sterling, Molly Upton and Suzanne Woodruff.

Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 PM by Colleen Sheehan who introduced the Community Forum and stated that the two forums held by WRAP (last Wednesday and this evening) will follow the same format and presentation. Ms. Sheehan also noted other community forums relevant to municipal property are the library forums with the designated architectural firm on May 17<sup>th</sup> and June 8<sup>th</sup> and the Community Housing Forum on June 21<sup>st</sup>.

Community Forum. Ms. Sheehan thanked those in attendance for taking the time to participate in one of the WRAP community forums. She stated that the agenda is to inform the community of WRAP's progress in fulfilling the four key points that are in WRAP's charge. She noted that the discussions have been and will be focused on municipally-owned lands. Ms. Sheehan talked about the work of WRAP to date and directed attendees to a hand-out of the PowerPoint used at the meeting that also is available online. The presentation was in four parts following the same format and discussion points as the May 11<sup>th</sup> forum:

*GIS* – introduced by Ms. Sheehan with site maps discussed by Ms. Schuler.

Tom Sciacca, Rolling Lane, stated that there is a unique and significant characteristic found at 195/207 Main Street that he did not see in the site map and considerations. It is the walking distance to and from a populated area of town that would make services – particularly fields – an asset to young users. He noted that he believes a small field would be more appropriate than a major large field.

*Cataloguing Needs* – introduced by Ms. Sheehan with comment about anticipated capital needs by Ms. Lewis who explained the way in which WRAP reached an understanding of needs with September community forum, meetings with each commission/board/committee that generated responses to a specific set of questions and the Finance Committee's 5-year Capital Plan. From this came the list of anticipated major capital projects over \$500,000. She explained the importance of all groups using the same definition of "long-term" planning.

Tom Sciacca, Rolling Lane, stated that for the last 10-12 years, the School Committee has been asked for its plans for Alpine Field and Orchard Lane (both properties under jurisdiction of School Committee). To date there are no plans nor is there the notion that the SC would give up those lands. Mr. Sciacca wonders if it would help for some assumptions to be made (such as population, build out) and given to all groups to use in defining needs over the next x number of years.

*Compilation of Plans* – Ms. Sheehan noted that this is the intersection of land and buildings and discussed the gathering of information from boards, commissions and committees. Ms. Lewis presented commonalities in programs and needs found in comparing responses to questions posed by WRAP. Her examples were a need for rooms with good acoustics or small rooms for private meetings.

*Evaluation Criteria* – presented by Ms. Sheehan for site selection and project evaluation, with information gleaned from other communities for ranking. She noted the need for objectivity and neutrality.

*Recap of Key Findings.* Ms. Sheehan reported on key findings that also include recommendations of WRAP. Members have noted that administrative and technological changes may help to reduce overlap and create efficiencies particularly in use of spaces. She noted that many of us, even when serving on boards, are not aware of capital requests which may be improved with a town-wide long range plan. She also noted that the campus concept emerged from some of these findings and is something that WRAP believes should be explored to know how residents would respond to the concept.

Ms. Sheehan opened floor to comments and questions from attendees.

Lynne Lipcon, Audubon Road, speaking as a Library Trustee explained that the Library State Fund can be used for Library use only; thus could not pay for infrastructure for other uses on a particular parcel.

Jean Milburn, Concord Road, asserted that she believes that there is no leverage using a state grant at 202 Old Connecticut Path. She questioned synergies identified by WRAP stating that perhaps there is no difference in building an acoustics room for 40 people, but there is a difference in utility where some programs must be paid for and others not and that utility is not effective by having buildings next to each other. In her opinion it is better to have spaces throughout town and that the town should use technology to help efficiencies.

Bill Sterling, Morse Road, followed up on the synergies discussion a term that he believes WRAP uses. He stated that there are no synergies – that the notion is a “myth.” He pointed out that Recreation programs are fee based while the Library has a policy that there will not be a charge for any program at the library site. Mr. Sterling also noted that “unintended consequences” should be a criterion when measuring projects. The example used was that there is nothing in criteria of what to do with the old library should the library be moved to a new site. He said that COA cannot move to the Library that it needs more parking and a large 2,000-3,000 square foot multipurpose room that can be broken down to smaller rooms. He believes that WRAP should add criteria to accommodate negative effects.

Kevin Murphy, Sears Road, asked why Loker Conservation and Recreation Area is on the maps, but not discussed or featured in the GIS part of the program. He also believes that community goals of maintaining open space should be included on project evaluation sheets.

Steve Correia, Glezen Lane, stated that WRAP should also be working with Economic Development Committee and that the economic effect should be one of the evaluation criteria. Also Mr. Correia wondered if there was some danger in asking people to locate programs knowing that many of the groups working on projects (COA, Library, Recreation) have done in depth analysis of site locations. Ms. Sheehan responded that this was an important point and that of course WRAP had looked at all the studies and is trying to develop a level planning field for projects and programs in the absence of town-wide criteria.

George Bennett, Old Connecticut Path, asked to enter his same comments from May 11<sup>th</sup> into the record (refer to May 11<sup>th</sup> minutes). He also pointed out that there is no physical access to the river from 202 Old Connecticut Path.

Attendees were invited to come forward and place color coded dots on parcels (on the large aerial view map of town with town owned parcels under discussion outlined in red) where one

would like to see facilities located. Dots for “library” “COA/CC” “fields” “boathouse” were made and also blank labels on which one could write any other use. Mr. Sarkisian introduced the maps explaining the red outlined parcels and orienting all to be able to engage in the exercise of where to locate facilities.

The tally was as follows:

Commonwealth Road, Loker Conservation – Athletic Field (1)

195 Main Street (former DPW site) – Athletic Field (3)

5 Concord Road (present Library site) – Library (4)

202 Old Connecticut Path (municipal parcel at Greenways) –Affordable Housing (2),  
Land Bank (1), Athletic Field (1), Permanent Conservation (1)

400 Boston Post Road, (municipal pad at new Town Center) – COA/CC (3), Boathouse (4),  
Athletic Field (1)

41 Cochituate Road (Town Building) – Affordable Housing (3)

Next Meeting. Ms. Schuler will email members with dates: Week of May 23<sup>rd</sup> (no for Ms. Sheehan); week of May 31<sup>st</sup> (no for Ms. Lewis); Week of June 6<sup>th</sup>

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 PM following a 3-0-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gretchen G. Schuler