

## WATERTOWN PLANNING BOARD

DATE: January 11, 2017 PLACE: Town Council Chamber TIME: 7:00PM COMMENCED: 7:05PM

PURPOSE OF MEETING: Regular Meeting

PRESENT: John Hawes, Chairman, Fergal Brennock, Jeff Brown, Janet Buck; Gary Shaw  
Steve Magoon, Director/Assistant Town Manager; Ingrid Marchesano, Clerk to the  
Planning Board, Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner; Andrea Adams, Senior Planner  
(*First part of Meeting only*)

### ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

Jeff Brown motioned to approve Minutes of 10/13/2016 & 12/14/2016.

Janet Buck seconded the motion.

Vote: 5-0 in favor.

### CASES PENDING

**44 Piermont Street;** Briana & Sabrina McDermott – Special Permit Finding/SPF- ZBA-2017-01

Brian McDermott, the house is non-conforming with regard to the front yard setback. We are proposing to build straight up on the existing footprint of the house to add additional bedrooms.

Andrea Adams, the lot is non-conforming in size and its frontage, while the structure is non-conforming for front yard setback, and the north side yard setback. The property abuts a mix of one and two story single-family residences. The request is for a Special Permit Finding to build a full second story with an attic on the existing single-family house. The proposed second story and attic will be built upon the main body of the house, not including the north side addition, and will conform to all the District-required setbacks, except that it will also maintain the existing non-conforming 21-foot front yard setback from Piermont Street, where 25 feet is required. The permit history consists of Building Permits, none of which materially affected this request for approval. Staff recommends to the Board that the new massing will be in keeping with the massing of abutting homes, and the neighborhood. The roof shape is consistent with that of a Cape-style house, with a dormer on the front elevation that mimics the updated front entry. In terms of parking, the site can accommodate at least three cars parked side by side, which conforms to the Watertown Zoning Ordinance. DCDP staff recommends that the project will not be substantially more detrimental than the existing non-conforming condition.

Gary Shaw suggested the Petitioner consider using something more energy efficient than vinyl.

Janet Buck stated that she has done the same thing with her house to accommodate her children.

Jeff Brown motioned to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance with conditions set forth in the staff report.

Fergal Brennock seconded the motion.

Vote: 5-0 In favor.

**330-350 Pleasant Street;** – SP/SPR – PB-2016-06

Attorney Terrance Morris, introduced the project team: Douglas Annino, the project architect, Ken Cram, traffic consultant, and Joe Porter, civil engineer. The Community Meeting had been held about a year ago. The key points are as follows: Pleasant Street Corridor District (2), Special Permit for increase in the Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The Petitioner is also seeking development credits to allow the increase in FAR. The project meets zoning minimums for open space and lot coverage. At 3 stories, it is substantially lower than most of the other residential projects along the Pleasant Street Corridor. The area coded as “bike shop” might not ultimately be used as such. The project has also been reviewed

by the Watertown Housing Partnership, and the units conform to zoning, and will be comparable in fit and finish.

Doug Annino, project architect, presented the project design using a series of plans and drawings mounted on foam core. We would like to thank Gamble Associates for the Design Review. The building has retail on the first floor and two levels of residential on the second and third floor. The central alley, with the roundabout at the end. It is sized appropriately for Fire Department apparatus. Parking is on either side of the alley and covered parking on either side. The various parking areas, including enclosed and gated areas for resident parking. The second floor levels are residential, with views from some units to the Charles River, with landscaped courtyards. The perpendicular orientation of the buildings is to reduce the massing on the Charles River side. The third floor are residential units. The public pathways to the River, co-planer pavers for parking areas and pedestrian walkways. The retail spaces and proposed restaurant space along the Charles River. The exterior cladding is colored metal panels with a brick base. Areas for retail signage on the building and a proposed view into the central alley, the connecting bridge on the third floor. Street views along Pleasant Street and site landscaping and street trees on Pleasant Street was shown.

Andrea Adams, the proposed development will support several goals and implementation strategies in the 2011 Pleasant Street Corridor Study, the 2011 Strategic Framework for Economic Development, and the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. The project had undergone a Design Review in November 2015 by Gamble Associates, and the project had been substantially redesigned based on this review. In addition, the Petitioner further refined the proposed site layout and architectural features as a result of comments from DCDP and Fire Department staff. The four Special Permit criteria have been met, and staff recommended that it be conditioned to conform to the criteria. The Petitioner is seeking to increase the FAR from 1 to 1.23. Section 5.16(d) of the WZO allows the SPGA to approve a higher FAR up to 2.0 as part of a Special Permit for achieving development incentive credits in accordance with §5.16(h). The redevelopment qualifies for two Development Incentive Credits: Connections to the Department of Conservation and Recreation trail system along the Charles River, and because it has the majority of parking under the onsite buildings. The 10 Site Plan Review criteria have been met, the Department staff had reviewed the project in a meeting on August 2, 2016. The transportation, sewer management and stormwater management criteria was addressed in detail, DCDP staff recommended that the project be conditioned. The Watertown Housing Partnership had reviewed the project at its September meeting, and described how the project would conform to the Inclusionary Zoning requirements

Gary Shaw, the alley to the Charles River is undermined by the connecting bridge. This element could be removed, and allow for greater connectivity to the River, and a larger roof top open space area. I suggest that Gamble Associates review be updated, as the project evolved. This would be helpful for the Board, particularly the connecting bridge. I am asking Architect Annino to point out the HVAC equipment enclosures. Split systems are very energy inefficient. I am asking the architect to describe the metal panel systems and to confirm the project would achieve 40 LEED points.

Steve Magoon, there had been two meetings with DCDP staff, Gamble Associates and the Petitioner since the initial design review in 2015. Gamble Associates was generally satisfied by the project's design intent and components. Gamble Associates can be contacted again to produce an updated design review.

Architect Annino, using Plan A1.4, indicated the area devoted to HVAC equipment. Every unit would have its own split system. There was discussion of a combined system, but the Petitioner has found that split systems cause fewer complaints. The HVAC screening would be integrated into the roof elements as needed. The exterior would be a non-insulated sandwich panel. The first floor would be masonry with relief bands. The project would probably exceed 40 LEED points.

Janet Buck, the overall design is quite good. However, about 12 units had bedrooms without windows. I am concerned these units might not be marketable, the units most affected should not be the affordable units. My focus on the affordable units is that they would be similar to the market rate unit.

Architect Annino, the Petitioner had ideas of how to bring daylight into these rooms. I have done number of projects with similar configurations that rented. One of the affordable units is a three-bedroom unit that had a windowless second bedroom.

Attorney Morris, the affordable units have been reviewed by the Watertown's Housing Partnership. Interior and exterior finishes will be comparable between the market and affordable units.

John Hawes, 26 of the 99 proposed units have a windowless second bedroom or potential bedroom. I do not object to "studies" not having windows. Conversely, I had never seen bedrooms without windows, expect for loft style units.

Architect Annino, we have discussed options to provide daylighting to the 26 units cited by Chairman Hawes. Those on the top floor could be switched to an outside wall, and given new windows or transoms. Those on the lower floors could have the proposed bedroom switched with the study. There was a proposal to use more clear story windows and skylights. The proposal will add a light well.

Attorney Morris, deferred in part to Chairman Hawes' experience as an architect. However, a space designed or labeled as a bedroom could in fact not be used as a bedroom.

John Hawes, the lack of daylighting into bedrooms is a concern, particularly for successful marketing. The project overall is excellent, I question the areas for storage lockers on the second and third floors. I suggest the corners be used for storage, and put units in the middle of the West Building, to take advantage of more exterior windows. Six (6) units are a particular problem, and I suggest the plan could be reconfigured to put units in the "dead" corners. I am asking the Petitioner to look carefully at this issue.

Architect Annino, I am asking for feedback on the third floor with respect to use of skylights and transoms?

John Hawes, I think including skylights is a good first step, but moving the spaces around to provide more opportunities for outside walls, and opportunities for windows, is a better option.

Jeff Brown, what was on the property before? I suggest the bridge should be more porous, and recommend something be done to ameliorate the long corridors.

Architect Annino, the fence around the site is for safety, and prior uses on the site were a construction company. How to shorten and/or widen the long corridors.

Fergal Brennock, Gamble Associates asked that the building elements be simplified. I suggest perhaps this had gone a bit too far, and suggest the deck areas at the second and third floors should have an 18-inch offset. This is not a criteria of approval, but rather a suggestion.

Paul Pavone, Business Manager, Union construction workers. I recommend that the Petitioner should seek out and use appropriate union construction jobs.

Dan Campagna, Watertown, Carpenters Member Union 275, I echo the request by Mr. Pavone. Residents of Watertown should have an opportunity to make a good wage on a safe job site.

Brian Wyncoop, 46 Rosedale Road, I feel that the project will negatively impact the Town and the neighborhood in terms of traffic impacts. There has not been a second Community Meeting to discuss the project, as the Community Meeting had been held almost a year ago. What were the results of the 21-E study? Why was stacked parking eliminated from the proposed project? With respect to adjustments to traffic signal timing, does the Town has a written commitment from Newton that they would allow and/or participate in the installation of a GRIDSMART system? What would occur if the traffic signal timing was not accomplished, as the \$10,000.00 commitment in lieu for a Police detail would not be sufficient. I am confused about whether the cross walk would be installed or not? What would happen if Newton would not participate? I have contacted the Police Department for crash records in the area. I suggest illuminated STOP signs were not requested by the neighborhood. The project site would result in a 10-12% increase in traffic, and the intersections in the study area were at Level of Service "E". The proposal will adversely impact the neighborhood.

Attorney Morris, the stacked parking was recommended be removed, meaning parking spaces using lifts. These were car lifts in the garages. The diagonal crosswalk was not going to be installed based on the recommendation of the Town Engineer, Mr. Shuman. The same was true of the flashing STOP signs: These were physical improvements. These were appropriate mitigation measures.

Ken Cram, Bayside Engineering, there had been a series of meetings with the Watertown DPW. Mr. Pompilli, from WorldTech was present, and WorldTech was the Town's Peer reviewer. The so-called GRIDSMART system, there had been discussions with both Watertown and Newton. The two signals don't "talk" to each other, which causes traffic to get trapped between the signals. The measures would allow better flow through the area. The money for a Police Detail was always designed as an interim measure, and would not be used.

Brian Wyncoop, is there a definitive commitment from the City of Newton? I am concerned that if there was not a commitment from Newton, there was no traffic solution, other than perhaps the money for a Police detail that had now been withdrawn by the Petitioner. The improvement has to be made. There was now really nothing to address the traffic congestion. I am concerned that any alternative would be after the project had been occupied and generating traffic. Could mitigating traffic be made a condition of approval? How could things "get done" after the fact?

Mr. Pompilli, WorldTech, Watertown has spoken about this to the City of Newton, and I have also done so. They would be happy to get any other improvements at California Street and Bridge Street. They understand that they need to get the traffic flow over the bridge improved. The road sensors had been replaced with video detection. There is no formal, signed agreement, but I suggest Newton would be happy to implement the solution.

Steve Magoon, I understand Mr. Wyncoop's concerns. The Town has been working cooperatively with Newton, and I suggest there is no reason why Newton would stand in the way of signal coordination. If this does not happen, the mitigation for this project would be re-visited. If this did not work out, the Town would re-enter the negotiations with the Developer to find an alternative. There is a commitment to make the improvements. It is then incumbent on the Town to make sure that happens.

Brian Wyncoop, the illuminated STOP signs be eliminated from Acton and Rosedale, consistent with what the neighborhood wants, and with what Chief Deveau had discussed, which was a non-illuminated STOP sign in 2012.

Councilor Dushku, does the Developer on this project had experience working with organized labor? Subcommittees of the Council has been working with DCDP to develop a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance and Regulations. It would be good to bring some of the ideas and measures into the conditions of this approval.

Andrea Adams, the Petitioner has a variety of different measures that are being required by Zoning, but also can serve as TDM measures, such as bike racks. The proposed condition that requires the Petitioner to augment the existing TDM measures to conform to the requirements of a TDM plan in the Zoning Ordinance, which includes measurable goals, a plan for data collection, and measures to achieve their goals.

Councilor Dushku, Athenahealth was required as part of its TDM plan to monitor. This should also be included with this project, and penalties if the goals are not met. I am excited about the car lifts, because it would potentially reduce the amount of the site dedicated to surface parking. A resident could choose to not own a car. It's too bad that this element of the parking was removed. Unbundled parking should also be considered. The staff report said the LEED requirement was "almost there." Based on the inefficiency of the HVAC, and the lack of a solar assessment, why should the project be allowed to go forward?

Andrea Adams, the Petitioner's draft LEED checklist showed the project was a 39 LEED points, where the requirement was 40 points. As such, I suggest the Petitioner would have little trouble meeting the requirement in zoning. A condition requires submission of documentation of 40 points LEED prior to the first Certificate of Occupancy.

Councilor Dushku, this settled the LEED issue. The project had not had a second Community Meeting, and the zoning allowed this to be discretionary. The neighborhood could always request a second Community Meeting.

John Hawes, asked the members whether the project was ready to come to a vote, or should be continued to the next meeting in February? I propose the plans related to "daylighting" some of the units was not a zoning issue, but at the same time, there were enough outstanding issues that more work needed to be done.

Gary Shaw, it would be helpful to have the Petitioner respond to the Board's comments: Elimination of the bridge, "daylighting" the units, and other issues.

Jeff Brown moved to continue 330-350 Pleasant Street to the Planning Board's meeting on February 8, 2017.

Fergal Brennock seconded the motion.

Vote: 5-0 In favor.

**485 & 615 Arsenal Street;** Boylston Properties - Master Plan Special Permit/PB-2016-03

Jeffrey Heidelberg, Boylston Properties, the proposed cinema had been removed from the original building. Other project changes included a Peer Review on traffic and the mitigation measures being worked through. There was back and forth with the Town DPW, DCDP, and WorldTech, and there is now a resolution satisfactory to all parties. The last item was the treatment of the right in/out entry, and views into the site.

Mark Eclipse, Architect for the Petitioner wanted to respond to a question about the civic nature of the connection to the green. The plan in front of the Board shows active frontage and service entrances. The bulk of uses along the roadway are storefronts. Service entries are internal to the facades. I suggest this was not "the back" of the building. A street view mockup, showing a view of the green and on to Arsenal Park.

Gideon Schreiber, the Staff Report Addendum is a summary of some of the changes to the decision to accommodate the agreed-upon mitigation package, and the design updates. The square footages were reduced by reducing the second floor cinema, the parking calculations had also been updated, a new condition for DCDP review of the shared parking analysis, and garages have a first floor that could

be converted over time. Amending the Master Plan to allow this reuse and parking reduction was included in the decision. The contribution for sewer analysis and infiltration/inflow mitigation. The transportation Peer Review and the agreed upon mitigation, where allocations of funds can be shifted around the corridor as needed. The various agreed upon transportation improvements. Gamble Associates completed a further design review, which indicated the design is sufficient at the Master Plan stage, acknowledging that further review would come at the Phase level. Several conditions had been added, to allow updating of the Control Documents, and to allow the Petitioner to adjust the shared parking analysis with DCPD review as the Phases were built out.

John Hawes, asked if staff would present the Gamble Associates design update, and whether Mr. Pompilli would provide further updates on the transportation issues? I suggest the Peer Review was an important component of the project.

Gideon Schreiber, Gamble Associates had looked at various features of the project, and found that it met the test of sustainability, LEED, energy efficiency and affirmed that the design is transformative.

Michael Pompilli, WorldTech, our firm has conducted the Peer Review, and had been working on the project since April 2016. The transportation study area had been expanded, and trip generation had been reviewed. Based on this, the Petitioner had been required to provide site counts of similar uses, such as a cinema, rather than using ITE data. Issues were resolved, and the impacts on the corridor were gauged relative to background traffic and traffic expected from other developments. The mitigation was looked at as a package along the corridor, relative to what was also being done to mitigate traffic in the corridor. The package proposed would mitigate the project's impacts, with traffic similar to No Build conditions.

Steve Magoon, one of the important things to the Town was the interlocking studies going on in or around the Arsenal Street corridor, including the Massachusetts Department of Transportation study. An important item included in the Petitioner's measures was the ability to adjust the funding and where it is expended. For example, if the Corridor Study suggested a different arrangement, the moneys could be better targeted.

John Hawes, I am fascinated by the references to Maplewood Street. Potential for an eleven minute delay. I questioned the increase in the delay during rush hour to over an hour, and why this street was included in the report.

Mr. Pompilli, the Petitioner had been asked to study Maplewood and School Streets, because there is a significant amount of cut-through traffic on Maplewood. It's an idiosyncrasy of the model that delay can become infinite, so the projected hour long delay would not happen in reality.

Gary Shaw, if the analysis to project delays has this quirk, how can it be useful at other intersections? The commentary by Mr. Pompilli was helpful that there was reassurance that the project impacts would be addressed. I and Janet Buck also had a meeting with Mr. Pompilli in terms of how the analysis had been done. I felt reassured by the meeting, in terms of the factors and assumptions that go into a traffic study, including the work and mitigation flowing from other developments on Arsenal Street.

Michael Pompilli, yes, because the unrealistic delay is at a STOP sign that is over capacity. What happens is that drivers accept shorter gaps, and a potential safety problem arises. The Petitioner had been asked to address the potential safety issue.

Jeff Heidelberg, Mr. Pompilli's memorandum summarizing the Peer Review noted that the proposed off site mitigation measures coupled with mitigation underway from other projects would result in No Build conditions.

Gary Shaw, traffic is increasing and development is happening, and Arsenal Street can't be widened. However, what's being done is a practical solution in a challenging environment.

Janet Buck, in the meeting with Mr. Pompilli that the amount of traffic headed to retail at the Arsenal Mall had decreased. The redevelopment also staggered the uses; it was not all retail. As such, the traffic would be staggered too.

Michael Pompilli, the mitigation would not exactly result in No Build conditions, in that there would be some additional delay. At the same time, Arsenal Street can't be widened, and the non-auto share could be larger. The overall balance, taking into account safety improvements, make it comparable to No Build, allowing for a relatively minor impact and delay.

Jeff Brown, what would the next project do? If this project adjusts signal timing, and the road can't be widened, what could the next project do to mitigate traffic? What input does the Petitioner have on the Arsenal Park design? He also asked about project phasing.

Michael Pompilli, you'd have to wait for the next project. This was being looked at in part by the MASSDOT corridor study.

Steve Magoon, Arsenal Park is Town-owned. The Petitioner was proposing a significant presence on the Park. He'd been in discussions with the Conservation Commission to develop a way to discuss Park improvements. It's not under the Petitioner's purview to dictate what happens to the Park.

Jeff Heidelberg, the first Phase would be demolition, and then would move into construction, probably with Buildings B and F first. Next phases would follow.

John Hawes, Building G is fine for a Master Plan, but it will need further review.

Gary Shaw, we appreciate the attempt to follow through on Gamble Associates comments. Potential to change the paving materials, to provide more of a cue about the pedestrian zone.

Paul Pavone, Union representative for construction workers., we hope that the Petitioner will utilize Union labor. A long history of Union workers to develop the Arsenal Mall, and to remove the nuclear reactor at the Arsenal on the Charles.

Dan Campagna, Watertown, Carpenters Member Union 275. affordable housing is a good thing, but the workers constructing the project need a living wage. I would hope that Union workers would be used.

Mark Sideris, Town Council President, I thank the Planning Board and staff for their work on the project, to represent the interests of Watertown. Traffic mitigation is significant. Made great strides. Traffic is coming from areas outside of Watertown. Affordable housing requirement when the Petitioner bought the project was at 10%. There is discussion about the height of Building G. I suggest Watertown can be proud of the proposed redevelopment. The project was transformative.

John Donahue, 11 Standish Road, restaurant owner. The project has five restaurants, but still supports it. It's key for the future of Watertown.

Aaron Dushku, Town Councilor, the TDM plan that first came out needed a lot of work, and commended the DCDP staff and the Petitioner for making significant changes to the TDM plan. The plan looks great, and the measures are forward thinking. However, it lacks in potential penalties and monitoring. There needs to be more of an incentive to follow through. There is a precedent in the athenahealth project. The project should submit ongoing monitoring reporting, similar to what's being

considered in the TDM Ordinance and Regulations being developed. The proposed language would be a better option than the proposed language in the decision.

Gideon Schreiber, the most recent TDM plan for this project has the same language as athenahealth's TDM plan. The monitoring language is actually in the TDM plan, not just a condition of the decision.

Councilor Dushku, I acknowledge this, but the language does not require reporting and changes to the plan to achieve goals, it's discretionary.

John Hawes, this was approval of the Master Plan, and that additional details could be followed up as the phased development began. I urge Councilor Dushku to remain involved, and provide more feedback as the phases went forward.

Gary Shaw, I understand the TDM plan was amended 12/9/16. The TDM plan does not seem to have requirements in it.

Gideon Schreiber, the plan would be conditioned to require review, monitoring, and amendments, as the project moves forward.

Councilor Dushku, why not acknowledge that the Town can require monitoring, and financial penalties as needed? The monitoring should be ongoing for the life of the project, and can be relaxed if the monitoring shows that the project is in compliance.

Gideon Schreiber, the TDM provisions need to be reviewed by the property owner in this case, as the development proceeds. Arsenal Yards in this way was different from Athenahealth. Some things might not work, especially as the project leases up.

John Labadini, Beechwood Avenue, I thank everyone for their effort to get to this point. Thanks to the Developer for their patience with this process. Echo Council Sideris' remarks to approve the project. Interest rates are moving up. Developer is being responsive. I urge the Board to make a decision.

Jonathan Bockian, pleased to see the project approved with mitigation. Monitoring and enforcement of the TDM plan is key. Should be in the TDM plan or in the decision conditions. Don't think there is a substantive difference in the two projects. Both need a strong program, and a lengthy monitoring period. Also need to make a specific commitment to the MBTA service on the corridor. In the past, the mentality was just to build new roads to solve traffic congestion. Now making a shift to reduce traffic generation, and need a stronger commitment to transit. Help mitigate the impacts by committing a specific dollar amount to MBTA improvements when they are proposed. I suggest the DCDP could determine how to allocate this funding, with the potential that the contribution be waived after a defined period of time. Also need to look carefully at the impacts of Building G on Arsenal Park. This helps mitigate the impacts of the building on the Park, and the decision should include a specific dollar amount for this.

Bill Bloomer, Herndon Avenue, assisted the Police Department close to the Arsenal. Tremendous investment in Watertown. Transformational potential for this area of Town.

Steve Magoon, the traffic mitigation can be re-allocated. It's possible that the Corridor Study could indicate that mass transit was a priority, and the decision gives the DCDP the flexibility to adjust funding.

Renee Gaudette, 14 Piermont Street, I support the project. Mall has been depressed for years. Need to transform it into something that is a benefit to Watertown.



Mark Peterson, School Street, I second Mr. Bockian's remarks concerning funding the MBTA. The Department of Conservation and Recreation is studying the Fresh Pond Parkway and Mount Auburn Street intersection. MBTA busses are the most economically way to move people.

Roberta Miller, Arsenal Center for the Arts, we are close neighbor to the project, and I served on the Watertown Arsenal Development Corporation. Arsenal Street is transformed. There is a feeling that Arsenal Street would never be a pedestrian area, and yet this project is part of making this happen. Seeing this street become pedestrian and used for bicycles is welcome. I hope that the property will have a profound transformational effect, with an eye towards addressing the transportation impacts.

Steve Corbett, 14 Erving Park, I echo prior comments, I support the project. Beneficial for the Town in terms of economic development and tax base. Streetscape improvements also key. The hotel and The Gables will provide a new streetscape to the Corridor and the Town.

Michelle Cokonougher, I urge the Board to consider Councilor Dushku's suggested language on the TDM plan. Also supported a defined contribution to Arsenal Park. What will be the estimated Public Safety costs? Public Works costs from wear and tear on the road and the Park? Educational expenses from additional students in the public schools? General government expenses? Estimate of other costs for public services?

Fergal Brennock, the people who lived in the development would be Watertown residents, with taxes paid by them and this property. I suggest it would be an offset, or a benefit.

Steve Magoon, the project would be on balance an economic benefit to Watertown relative to its required services.

Len Holt, I own property on Arsenal Street and I am in support of the project.

Angie Kounelis, Town Councilor, this is an exciting and challenging time for Watertown. There proposed benefits to the Town and impacts. The project would have economic development and expenses. The Town has a defined budget which is well over \$100 million dollars. This has to be borne by all tax payers, including this property owner. The mitigation is warranted. The Town has not denied the Developer a dense project, six story buildings on Arsenal Street and a tall building. Other properties on Arsenal Street would be developed, too. The Planning Board needed to achieve a balance for the future of Watertown. The massing and volume of the project was extreme. The project is impressive, and I support the proposal, but not the massing, including the tall building at the rear, and the six story buildings on Arsenal Street.

Sarah Ryan, Paul Street, Watertown has experienced significant change in the past 20 years. Need to preserve the high quality of life in the Town. The project will improve this particular site. A scary element to the project is its overall size. As such, the transportation impacts and mitigating them is key. Idea of long term monitoring and corrective action for transportation impacts is very appealing and key to success. I agree that improvements to MBTA service is also key.

Tony Palomba, Town Councilor, knows public opinion is important to the Planning Board. I recommend three concerns and conditions. Town should have the option of financial penalties if the TDM goals are not met, that the DCDP have the discretion to extend TDM monitoring periods, and require a commitment to contribute to MBTA improvements. I understand that the transportation mitigation can be adjusted and moved around. Contradictory that the mitigation plan describes certain activities, and does not make a commitment to MBTA bus service. Add and expand the Petitioner's support to MBTA service. Another issue is to permanently disallow any plans to connect to Greenough Boulevard. SI support the hope that the Developer will use organized labor in the project construction. Believes this may be the largest development project in Watertown. Designed to be a regional destination. As such,

it will have impacts, including an increase in tax revenue. Town residents will have access to new entertainment and shopping opportunities. Will also expend more monies on public services. What Watertown won't know is how Watertown will be impacted by becoming "a regional destination." How will it impact the "feel" of Watertown and its character? Hope to find ways to maintain what residents most value.

Mary Chochos, Belmont Street, in support of the project, it is very exciting. This is a place that keeps trips and shopping in Watertown. My grandfather bought a house in the project in 1920's and my father is in support of the cinema.

Elodia Thomas, I acknowledge the disagreements about the density of the project, and the scale. I have looked at the architect's prior projects, and they appear of quality. I suggest the Developer has a commitment to the community and has a vision. I acknowledge that the project is potentially scary, but suggest that things could be worked through with a Developer who has pride of place.

Vinny Piccirilli, Town Councilor, Watertown has come a long way from 2009, which began with a vision of this area being changed into a mixed use district. Long discussion of ways to knit this area back into Watertown. The Comprehensive Plan and Regional Mixed Use District zoning processes. Lots of public input. This project will forever transform the East End of Watertown. Similar to the Army deciding to put the Arsenal in Watertown, and later the de-commissioning of the Arsenal. A lot in the project and the Developer for a vision. Acknowledge that traffic, massing and design are key issues. The Town Council has a Transportation Committee looking for solutions. It will take time to find a workable solution, but a start has been made. Urged Master Plan approval.

Lisa Feltner, Town Councilor, I am excited about the project but concerned with the Town – more planning is needed. Use the Comprehensive Plan to provide an overall vision. Need a re-use Committee for Arsenal Park. I encourage citizens to be involved in crafting a vision and appreciate everyone's hard work.

John Hawes, I appreciate the comments on possible conditions. I understand that this is and will be an on-going process, and could be revisited at the time of the first Building Permit. I acknowledged the issue of the MBTA buses and Petitioner support. I ask Board Members for any possible conditions?

Steve Magoon, DCDP staff recommended approval of the project with specific conditions that were in the draft decision presented to the Board. I suggest any additional conditions are up to the Board.

Jeff Brown motioned that the Planning Board approve the project for a Master Plan Special Permit to be known as Arsenal Yards based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance with conditions as proposed by DCDP staff.

Fergal Brennock seconded the motion.

VOTE: 5-0 In favor

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:35PM MINUTES APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

For more detailed Minutes see the DVD dated 1/11/17 available in the DCDP office.