

Information on Article 32

Committee Report

22 Pleasant Street Change of Zoning Classification Study Committee

May 6, 2015

Report to Spring 2015 Town Meeting

Town Meeting Members;

The Pleasant Street Change of Zoning Classification Study Committee (the "Committee") has prepared this report under Article 32 of Spring 2015 Town Meeting pursuant to the votes of Town Meeting under Article 40 of Spring 2014 Town Meeting and Article 13 of Fall 2014 Town Meeting.

The Committee reported to Fall 2014 Town Meeting on October 27, 2014 and subsequently met on December 2nd , January 14th , January 28th , February 4th , March 4th , March 12th , March 18th , March 23rd , March 25th , March 30th , April 6th and May 6th . A working group subcommittee meeting was also held on March 27th .

The Committee's report is organized as outlined below and is contained on the following pages.

Tables of Contents

I. Review of Committee Purpose (Pages 2-3)

II. Committee Tasks and Activities Since Fall 2014 Town Meeting (Pages 3-4)

III. Report on Open Issues (Pages 5-10)

IV. Pros and Cons of Articles 33, 34 and 35 (Pages 11-14)

V. Highest & Best Use and Recommendations (Page 14)

VII. Acknowledgements and Appreciation (Pages 15)

Appendices

I. Review of Committee Purpose

- The Committee was created by Spring 2014 Town Meeting by vote under Article 40 and extended by vote of Fall 2014 Town Meeting under Article 13
- The charge of the committee is " to evaluate any and all matters connected to i) Article 40, ii) appropriate rezoning of 22 Pleasant St. in South Natick, iii) appropriate land use for the property, and iv) such related topics within the Towns Zoning By Law as they deem appropriate"
- The Committee has "access to town counsel and to staff from within the administration for resource support including the staff of the community development office and the department of public works"

- The committee requested that Fall 2014 Town Meeting extend the term of the committee through Spring 2015 Town Meeting to continue work on a potential Assisted Living Overlay Option Plan (ALoop) and to further research open issues
- Open issues included considerations around a) power line easements and the ability to screen the site from nearby residences, b) residual use, c) details of the 1911 deed, d) traffic generation, e) emergency vehicle access, f) size of the land portion of the site, g) size of the land area in each zone comprising the site, h) interest of the current owner of record in having the property rezoned, i) appropriate number of units or density and j) specifics of a potential ALoop among other items
- Town Meeting required the committee to report to Spring 2015 Town Meeting

II. Committee Tasks and Activities Since Fall 2014 Town Meeting

- The Committee has completed research on open issues including
 - power line easements and the ability to screen the site from nearby residences,
 - residual use,
 - details of the 1911 deed,
 - size of the land portion of the site,
 - size of the land area in each zone comprising the site,
 - traffic generation,
 - emergency vehicle access
 - appropriate number of units or density
 - appropriate height and setbacks and
 - detail specifics of a potential ALoop among other items
- The Committee sponsored Article 33 for Town Meeting's consideration regarding an ALoop
- The Committee also considered matters under Article 34 for acquisition of an easement through 22 Pleasant St and Article 35 for the acquisition of 22 Pleasant St. by the Town
- In completing these tasks, the Committee's other tasks included:
 - Reviewing the provisions of the Assisted Living sections of the Zoning ByLaw including parking requirements
 - Reviewing site plans provided by a developer for 22 Pleasant St.
 - Requesting elevations /renderings from the developer to show height, setback, size in perspective and context of the site and neighborhood
 - Obtaining building size comparables from Town assessing records to evaluate building size when developer did not provide elevations/renderings
 - Researching and obtaining building height comparables and data points from blue prints for Town owned buildings from the Town's facilities management department to evaluate height
 - Researching the height of certain private buildings in downtown Natick from special permit decisions
 - Obtaining the state's list of all licensed assisted living facilities showing location and number of units

- Identifying and obtaining square footage, land area and assessment information for existing assisted living facilities in Natick, Framingham, Wellesley, Needham, Ashland, Wayland, Hopkinton, Newton and Weston
- Evaluating the building size, height , unit count, land area and other data to guide the development of ALOOP parameters
- Obtaining measurements from a professional surveyor with existing knowledge of the site about the size of the land and water area and the size of the RG, I 1 and RSB portions of the site
- Presented preliminary findings to the Planning Board which strongly advised that RSB land not be used for an assisted living facility or parking consistent with previous votes of Town Meeting
- Completed a draft detailed ALOOP change to the Zoning By Law for Town Meeting's consideration based on the above despite being informed that the deal between the property owner and developer was terminated on April 2nd
- Evaluated professional surveys and developer site plans to identify issues for a potential easement
- Engaged a surveyor with knowledge of the site for a cost of \$750 to calculate the water area, private way area, I 1 area, RG area and RSB area of the site
- Heard from the citizen sponsor of Article 35 for acquisition of 22 Pleasant St by the Town for park , recreation and open space purposes
- Evaluated the bonding schedules prepared by the Town Administration for funding such acquisition by borrowing over 20 and 30 years respectively
- Met with the Deputy Town Administrator and Finance Director regarding the interest rates used in those calculations
- Adopted a process for considering Articles 33, 34 and 35 to recognize the interrelationships and to address the competing nature of Article 33 and 35
- Specifically, the Committee decided to approach all matters with the goal of providing advice instead of recommendations to Town Meeting on these articles on a standalone basis before considering any recommendations
- The Committee's advice consists of informed suggestions and input to Town Meeting in the event Town Meeting chooses to decide on favorable or unfavorable action for any of these articles
- Such advice differs from recommendation(s) on that action the Committee believes that Town Meeting should take Articles 33, 34 and 35
- To minimize and prevent cross talk between the articles, the committee deliberately refrained from any and all recommendations until the process for developing such advice was completed

III. Report on Open Issues

- The Committee's findings to Town Meeting on the open issues are presented below
 - power line easements and the ability to screen the site from nearby residences,
 - residual use considerations,
 - details of the 1911 deed regarding the private way,
 - traffic generation ,
 - emergency vehicle access,
 - size of the land portion of the site,
 - size of the land area in each zone comprising the site,
 - appropriate number of units or density
 - appropriate height and setbacks

Power Line Easements

- A power line easement exists which includes a small portion of the south western area of 22 Pleasant St and significant portions of abutting residential property to the south of 22 Pleasant St.
- Details of power line easement indicate the electric utility has the right to clear cut (to the ground) a 100 foot wide width of the electric power line easement
- The power line easement makes abutters to the south effectively unable to plant bushes or trees on their property to screen 22 Pleasant St.
- A requirement for screening on 22 Pleasant St. , similar to the provisions of the 1967 court decision, has been included in the draft rezoning

Residual Use:

Easement Considerations

- Residual use addresses what an assisted living residence can become when that use is no longer viable
- Zoning Bylaw requires that the feasibility of conversion to a residual use allowed in a zone be demonstrated before a special permit can be issued
- Zoning Bylaw also requires that a property have sufficient land for parking minimums for the residual use before an Assisted Living special permit can be granted
- Assisted living is allowed only by special permit
- Uses permitted in the underlying industrial zone at 22 Pleasant St. include " Business or professional office or agency, bank or other financial institution" (Use 27)
- Parking requirement for office is 1 space for every 400 sq. ft. of gross building area for offices and 1 space for every 250 sq.ft. of gross building area for financial institutions

- Assuming an assisted living facility of 75 units at an all in average of 850 sq.ft. per unit would indicate 63,750 sq. ft.
- The 850 sq ft per unit is the total facility size including individual units, common areas, administrative offices and dining rooms divided by the number of units
- Parking requirements for a 75 unit , 63,750 sq.ft. assisted living facility would be 38 spaces
- Parking requirements for residual office use would be 159 spaces and parking requirements for a residual financial institution use would be 255 spaces or between 4.25 times to 6.8 times the assisted living parking
- 22 Pleasant St might have difficulty satisfying the parking requirement for residual use
- This could significantly increase the cost of acquiring an access easement after a rezoning
- If the access easement uses land that is needed for residual use parking, an assisted living facility might become unable to satisfy the residual use parking requirement and become unfeasible
- If the property were rezoned before an easement was 1) granted or taken by eminent domain and 2) recorded at the registry of deeds , claims might be made that the cost would equal the entire value of the land & property including foregone profits from building and operating an assisted living facility
- If an easement were granted or taken after rezoning and the requirement for residual use parking could still be met, the easement could be more costly if the residual use parking had an inferior location as a result of the easement
- This could also occur if the assisted living parking had an inferior location as a result of the easement
- If an easement were obtained subsequent to a rezoning the cost of the easement could increase if 22 Pleasant St became more valuable as a result of the rezoning
- For these reasons, the committee unanimously recommends that Town Meeting NOT rezone the property unless and until an adequate, permanent access easement to the Hunnewell Fields has either 1) been finalized , paid for if necessary, and recorded at the registry of deeds or finalized, including price and location, closed in escrow where the only escrow contingency and remaining issue is an appropriation vote of Town Meeting for the easement.
- Town Meeting members should know that the date of determining value of an easement taken by eminent domain is not the date of Town Meeting's vote but rather the date the easement is subsequently recorded at the registry of deeds.
- Therefore, the committee recommends that no vote to rezone the property occur unless either one of the conditions above has been fully vetted by the Finance Committee and fully demonstrated to Town Meeting

Dover Amendment Protected Uses

- Town Meeting members should also know of another potential issue concerning residual use
- Religious and educational uses are protected by the Dover Amendment and cannot be regulated or prohibited by zoning bylaws
- Educational uses covered under the Dover Amendment include halfway houses
- Although the Dover Amendment pertains to all properties, under current law there is no way for the town to prevent an assisted living facility with bedrooms, bathrooms and dining facilities from being converted to a halfway house use
- Town Meeting should be aware that a future request might be made to rezone the property to multi family apartments as an alternative to a conversion to a halfway house once assisted living is no longer viable or the property becomes out of date
- The committee does not have an opinion on whether or if such changes in use might occur but considers a halfway house use to be incompatible next to youth ball fields

Details of the 1911 Deed

- The 1911 deed which subdivided 22 Pleasant St from a larger parcel created a 15 foot wide private way along the southern edge of 22 Pleasant St.
- The details of the 1911 deed indicate that the three residential abutters to the south have the right to use the entire width and length of this private way.
- This private way is a private matter between the three abutters and the owner of 22 Pleasant St.
- The private way effectively makes 22 Pleasant St. 15 feet narrower from a development standpoint
- Massachusetts statutes and case law provide that abutters on either side of a private way own to the centerline of the private way (as indicated by legal counsel for 22 Pleasant St last September and subsequently confirmed by Town Counsel)
- These statutory and case law provisions could make 22 Pleasant St. a legally smaller lot
- The size of the private way is 10,096 sq. ft. with 5,048 sq. ft. being ½ of the private way area

Size of the Land , Water and Various Zones at 22 Pleasant St.

- Town Meeting members will recall that 22 Pleasant St. is a 4.13 acre or 179,870 sq.ft. parcel comprised of a portion of the Charles River and a land area which consists of three zones: I1, RG and RSB
- The surveyor calculated the water area as 18,991 sq.ft. and the land area as 160,879 sq.ft.
- The private way is contained in the RSB portion of the site
- Town Meeting members will recall that question exists as to whether the zone line (running east to west on the property) which separates the RSB portion on the southern part of 22

Pleasant St. from the RG and I1 portions runs: 1) through the center of the canal, 2) along the northern edge of the canal or 3) along the southern edge of the canal

- The citizen petition for rezoning from Spring 2014 Town Meeting suggested the northern line of the canal
- Previous surveys indicate the southern line of the canal but disclaim any zone boundaries
- Inspection of the 1960 zoning map and text indicate the centerline of the canal
- The surveyor calculated the land area under all three scenarios
- Using the centerline of the canal as the zone boundary, the RG portion is 41,231 sq.ft., the I 1 portion is 82,878 sq.ft. and the RSB portion is 36,770 sq.ft.
- The zoning by law does not allow assisted living buildings or supporting parking in the RSB zone
- If the citizen petition from Spring 2014 Town Meeting to rezone the I 1 portion to RG had passed, the total RG area would have been 124,109 sq.ft. or 2.849 acres
- If the citizen petition had passed, an assisted living facility would have been based on the size of only the RG land area at a size density of 30 units per acre
- Contrary to statements made by the Community Development office last spring, the size of an assisted living facility would have been 85 units not 124 units
- This density information was an important starting point for the committee in drafting a rezoning for Town Meeting's consideration

Traffic Generation and Emergency Vehicle Access

- Conversations with the Fire Chief and the Police Chief indicated that they believe their departments would be able to access 22 Pleasant St. for emergency services
- Traffic data from ITE manuals are inconclusive regarding traffic generation for an assisted living facility vs. an industrial facility operating under the restrictions for the 1967 court decision

Appropriate Density, Height and Setbacks

- Data obtained from the State Department of Elder Affairs listing the name, location and size of very Assisted Living facility in Massachusetts indicates that there are 223 assisted living facilities in the state
- These range in size from 15 to 150 units
- The average size of an assisted living facility is 65 units
- 147 facilities are larger than 50 units; Only 25 facilities are 100 units or larger
- Only 5 facilities are 124 units or larger
- The Community Development recommendation in Spring 2014 Town Meeting for 124 units would have resulted in the 5th largest assisted living facility in the state
- 119 facilities are 64 units or larger and 97 facilities are 74 units or larger
- A limited number of facilities are mixed use with either nursing home components or 55 and over rental or condominium units which do not provide assisted living services
- The committee obtained assessment record data for 18 existing assisted living facility comparables located in Natick, Wellesley, Needham, Sudbury, Wayland, Ashland, Hopkinton,

Newton, Framingham and Weston to evaluate number of units, land area, density, building size, number of stories, value and other parameters

- The committee adjusted mixed use facilities to 100% assisted living equivalents for comparison purposes to approximate the number of assisted living units that might result if the entire comparable facility were assisted living
- As adjusted these facilities range from 21 to 134 units
- The larger facilities are located either on major roads such as Rt. 9 or next to the Mass Pike in Newton or on very large land tracts of 20 -30 acres
- Comparable facilities on other roads and/or on parcels of 3-4 acres tended to range from 60 - 70 units
- Through a series of votes the committee unanimously decided on a maximum density for 22 Pleasant St. of 68 units (without waivers) increasable to 75 units (with waivers) by the Special Permit Granting Authority and a limit of 90 bedrooms
- Town Meeting members should note that the current zoning bylaw provides no limit on how many assisted living units can be more than 1 bedroom which might be a consideration for a future Town Meeting
- The limitation incorporated into the draft ALOOP would apply only to the ALOOP if passed and would not apply anywhere else in town
- The committee also notes that the general zoning bylaw provision of 30 units per acre might be a subject for a future Town Meeting because it creates a blanket town wide density regardless of where a facility is located
- For example, 45 East Central St which is a 1.87 acre parcel in a central location on a main road could allow a relatively small 56 unit assisted living facility
- To develop parameters on building height and to assist in the aforementioned density discussions, the committee also obtained size and height comparables of well known public buildings in the Town
- These findings were used to reject the developers initial proposal of a 100 unit three story , 375 foot long building located 20 feet from the ball field property line
- Such a building would have been as tall as Natick High School and the condominiums directly behind the Police and Fire Station parking lots and would have been 1.6 times as long as Clark's block
- Using this comparable size and height data, the committee unanimously decided through a series of votes to conclude on a limit of a two story building with height of 30 feet increasable by the Special Permit Granting Authority to a maximum of 33 feet
- Unlike the waiver and modification provisions in the general assisted living section of the zoning bylaw which give the Special Permit Granting Authority the ability to grant unlimited modifications and waivers, the draft ALOOP limits the extent of any waivers and modifications to 10%
- Overall density in the draft ALOOP would be established using a calculation involving Net Usable Land Area which is defined as all land excluding bodies of water and land lying within the 100 year flood plain

- The area in the 100 year flood plain is approximately 17,684 sq.ft. and the Net Usable Land Area is 144,120 sq.ft.
- The calculated maximum density in the ALOOP for 22 Pleasant St. would be 68 units without waivers from the Special Permit Granting Authority
- Setbacks were considered and ultimately established to keep a new building in the area of the current building and no further west toward Pleasant St., to provide setbacks to abutting properties and the Charles River and to keep development and parking out of the RSB portion of the site
- The committee is concerned about the ability to separate ball field parking from assisted living parking given that much if not most of the ball field parking would be as close or closer to the front of an assisted living facility as the assisted living facility's parking on 22 Pleasant St.
- Preventing use of the ball field parking, which is already seriously overcrowded on game days from being used by residents, visitors or staff at an assisted living facility would create very problematic enforcement and policing issues unless a fence was installed 1) along the property line to separate the Hunnewell Ballfields from 22 Pleasant St and 2) to go either along the southern edge of an easement line on 22 Pleasant St. and/or into the Hunnewell Ballfield parking area in order to make walking distances from the ball field parking area greater than walking distances from assisted living parking
- The committee is concerned that such a fence would disrupt or impair the use of the ball field parking lot and present a cost to the Town

Detail Specifics on Potential ALOOP

- The ALOOP details are presented in an appendix
- These details are consistent with the findings above
- These details have also been reviewed by Town Counsel
- At the request of the Planning Board, the detail specifics would provide for an ALOOP section of the zoning by law that might possibly apply to other properties in addition to 22 Pleasant St.
- However, the committee has made no study of any other properties for potential rezoning
- Further, the committee makes no representation that an ALOOP would ,could or should apply to other properties
- The ALOOP details provide a two step process should Town Meeting decide to rezone
- The first step would be to create an ALOOP and the second step would apply the ALOOP designation to 22 Pleasant St
- The following Section IV contains the committee's advice to Town Meeting and findings of pros and cons for
 - Article 33
 - Article 34
 - Article 35
- Later Section V contains the committee's recommendations to Town Meeting and conclusions on highest and best land use

IV. Pros and Cons of Articles 33, 34 and 35

Easement – Article 34:

Pros/Benefits

- Necessary if not overdue for access to Town ball field and recreation land

Cons/Risks

- Cost to acquire
- Cost to improve and maintain including driveways, fences and natural screening
- Might require eminent domain action

Advice – if Town Meeting wants an access easement

- Get an appraisal to avoid over paying but pay a fair price unless easement is gifted
- Consider safety of entering and exiting in negotiation of easement location
- Although 22 Pleasant St. has 117 feet of frontage on Pleasant St., only 40-45 feet is usable for access given the location of the existing bridge abutment and the existence of a private way to the south of the bridge
- Consider screening for neighbors to the north side of access in negotiation of easement location
- Make sure access is adequate for ball field and other traffic
- Make sure access is permanent vs temporary right whether that right is fixed or relocateable in its physical location
- Easement needs to be within a narrow area on the parcel to avoid or to minimize potential parking sprawl onto the ball field recreation land
- Parking sprawl onto the ball field land could reduce the value and use of the ball fields
- Easement should include right to erect a fence on 22 Pleasant St if possible to prevent parking sprawl onto the ball fields
- The narrow area is further away from the existing building and a potential assisted living facility therefore minimizing effects on the existing and potential rezoned use of 22 Pleasant St.
- Consider deferring action on any rezoning unless an adequate and appropriate permanent easement is either 1) fully completed, closed and recorded at Registry of Deeds Or 2) closed in escrow for defined area and at defined amount with only escrow condition being Town Meeting's approval of funds and authorization to Board of Selectmen under Article 34
- Rezoning first might otherwise increase cost of easement; potentially significantly
- Effective date of value in an eminent domain taking is the date of recording at Registry of Deeds not the date of Town Meeting vote

ALoop Rezoning – Article 33

Pros/Benefits

- Might result in an Assisted Living Facility (see below)
- Could provide for a use called for in Natick 360
- Keeps Property currently paying \$18,000 per year on tax rolls vs. removing from the tax rolls through acquisition
- Provides potential for some new growth revenue possibly ranging from \$ 80,000 to \$ 140,000 on a very preliminary basis unless property is acquired at some point by a tax exempt
- Potentially results in a cleaned up site. (Reports differ on whether soil will be removed or encapsulated.)
- Creates more construction jobs than Park and Recreation land
- Creates jobs in operation of an Assisted Living Facility
- Avoids cost of acquisition by the Town
- Protections have been added to ALoop draft for the neighborhood and the ball fields

Cons/Risks

- Loss of Opportunity for Additional Park and Recreation Land which is a use called for in Natick 360
- Loss of Strategic Assemblage with Other Public Park and Recreation Land
- Inability to Prevent Possible Future Conversion to a Dover Amendment Protected such as a Halfway House or a future Rezoning under pressure to Apartments
- No Guarantee of any Assisted Living Development (Developer has indicated that Seller's Land Price Requires at Least 100 units with minimum 25 % as 2 Bedroom Units)
- As of Friday April 3, 2015, agreement between land owner and a potential assisted living developer for sale of the property was terminated by the parties
- Key Zoning Features Such as Height, Density and Setback Developed without Any Perspectives, Elevations or Renderings (Only Site Plans Were Provided)
- Committee has made educated guesses that height limitation is not too high or too low
- Ball field parking is physically much closer to a potential assisted living facility entrance. Fencing will be required to prevent parking sprawl of assisted living use onto the otherwise physically more convenient ball field parking.
- There is no requirement for affordable units

Advice – if Town Meeting wants to rezone the property

- Obtain an easement first
- Adopt ALoop after Planning Board and Finance Committee hearings

Acquisition By Town – Article 35

Pros/Benefits

- Strategic Assemblage with Other Adjacent and Nearby Recreation Land (See map in appendix)
- Possible Creation/Reactivation of Canoeing and Kayaking
- Provide Parking for Adjacent and Nearby Recreation Land
- Increase in Utilization of and Access to Other Recreation and Park Land
- Eliminates Need for an Access Easement
- Provides for Potential Relocation of Memorial Fields if Memorial School is Expanded
- Acquisition if Clean or Remediated to Acceptable Levels
- Consistent with Natick 360 Stated Goals for More Park and Recreation Space
- Prevents possible future conversion to Dover Amendment protected use such as a halfway house or Rezoning to Apartments
- Once in a 100 Year Opportunity
- Results in a Cleaned Up or Mitigated Site
- Town Meeting members should note that the Town previously acquired contaminated property for strategic assemblage purposes and for recreational parking purposes in 2007 on Mechanic St. for a possible rail trail
- Mechanic St. property is not cleaned up, is permanently deed restricted for use as parking only and is mitigated by maintaining asphalt paving
- Article 35 does not require a potential acquisition of 22 Pleasant St to be on a clean basis but rather to see if Town Meeting wants to impose that condition
- If Approved by Town Meeting, Town (unlike a private developer) would require No Financing Contingencies which could improve the ability to negotiate

Cons/Risks

- Cost to Acquire
- Cost to Improve
- Loss of Current Property Taxes of \$18,332
- Foregone New Growth revenue possibly ranging from \$ 80,000 to \$ 140,000 on a very preliminary basis unless Property is Acquired by a Tax Exempt
- Cost can be mitigated or achieved through 20 or 30 year borrowing
- Loss of Development of a possible site for Assisted Living which is a use also Called for in Natick 360
- Possible Complexity in Negotiating Acquisition on Sufficiently Clean Basis
- Site reportedly has one potential area of environmentally affected soil reportedly 60 feet in diameter (approximately 2,800 sq.ft.) under the slab of the back part of the building
- Requires Due Diligence
- No Guarantee Owner Will Negotiate (Could Be Offset by Future Eminent Domain Action)

Advice – if Town Meeting wants to Acquire

- Authorize funds for and Perform Due Diligence
- Get an Appraisal to Avoid Over Paying but Pay a Fair Price
- Acquire for active recreation purposes
- Authorize \$3.1 million reported asking price bonding authorization subject to not paying more than appraised fair market value and subject further to reduction by any amounts contributed from Conservation Open Space fund
- The committee notes that the 4.0% and 4.5% interest rates used in a bonding analysis by the Deputy Town Administrator for Finance for 20 year and 30 year borrowing are high
- Rates for AAA rated communities such as Natick are 2.75% and 2.85 % respectively as of May 6, 2015 but have risen 15 to 20 basis points (0.15% points to 0.20% points) in the last two months
- The Deputy Town Administrator informed the committee that the higher rates to provide an upper limit on potential borrowing costs in the event interest rates rise by the time a potential acquisition might close
- The committee advises Town Meeting that any acquisition be funded through borrowing at the longer 30 year term to reduce annual cash expenditures by the Town
- Authorization by Town Meeting for the Town to acquire would allow the Board of Selectmen or other designated committee to perform due diligence on all matters, including any environmental issues and negotiate accordingly
- Authorization by Town Meeting would not compel the Board of Selectmen or other designated committee to execute an acquisition if due diligence results were problematic

V. Highest & Best Use and Recommendations

- The committee voted in the fall that an assisted living use would be an appropriate land use for 22 Pleasant St.
- The committee also voted in the fall that an open space, park and/or recreation use would be an appropriate land use for 22 Pleasant St
- On April 6, 2015 by a vote of 5 -1-0 the committee voted that open space, park and/or recreation use would be the highest and best use
- On April 6, 2015 by a vote of 6-0-0 the committee voted to recommend that Town Meeting not rezone the property unless and until an adequate permanent access easement to the Hunnewell Ballfields has been either 1) granted to the Town, paid for , if necessary, and recorded at the registry of deeds or 2) fully negotiated and defined, closed in escrow with the only escrow release contingency being approval and appropriation of Town Meeting

VII. Acknowledgements and Appreciation

- The committee would like to thank Mr. Ron Rutkowski of the Town's Facilities Management Department for making blueprints of various Town buildings available to indicate various building height benchmarks
- The committee would also like to thank Ms. Jan DeAngelo, Town Assessor, for explaining the basic methodology used for new growth
- The committee notes however that the Assessor advises it is too soon to estimate any potential new growth

Sincerely;

Committee Members

Paul Griesmer, Chair

Julian Munnich, Vice Chair

Greg Vitarelli, Secretary

Seth Levine

Jason Makofsky

Nancy Quinlan

Jerry Pierce

Appendices:

1911 Plan

Utility Easement Power Line Survey

2007 Survey

Letter From Surveyor

Assisted Living Facility Comparables

Building Size and Height Comparables

Draft ALOOP Rezoning Text

Map of Town Owned Land in and around 22 Pleasant St.

Bonding Schedules

Mechanic St. Deed