

Attendance Roster

Committee Members		
--------------------------	--	--

Stephen Nolan	Patrick Casey	Ralph Costello
Teresa James	Randal Karg	Brandie Erb
Gil Rodgers		

Resource Members		
-------------------------	--	--

Alec Stevens – absent	Ros Smythe	Frank Perry - absent
Lucille Fisher	Jean Mineo	Bill Massaro
John Thompson	John Harney	

Others		
---------------	--	--

Sarah Raposa	Kathy McCabe	Jen Mecca
Jerry Potts	Gus Murby	Mel Seibolt
Dave Jacobson	Christine Potts	Bob Tormey
Carri Hulet	Betsy Jacobson	William F. Pope

Agenda

- 6:30 PM Welcome, intros, review previous sessions
 - Confirm completion of action items from 05 Jul 17
 - Discuss and vote on meeting minutes

- 6:35 Hinkley and Lot #3 Proposal - Review Board of Selectmen’s meeting

- 6:40 Review 43D meeting – Key Takeaways

- 6:45 First draft preferred scenario
 - Decide on elements included in the draft preferred scenario on the north side of Hospital road, making decision zone by zone

- 9:50 Public Comment

- 10:00 Conclude

And, any additional business that came in after the deadline that must be discussed prior to the next meeting

Agreements

Motion was unanimously approved that K. McCabe will provide by August 14, 2017 detailed financial backup assumptions and calculations for major costs and revenues in spreadsheet format based on the draft scenario proposal. K. McCabe agreed to this timing and the action items here capture the adjusted timeframe.

Motion by G. Rodgers, Seconded by R. Costello; unanimously approved

This table provides an overall understanding of the agreements for the draft scenario along with the site map included on the final page of notes. A more thorough understanding of the agreements is possible within the context of the commentary made in the meeting summary section of the minutes.

Zone	Agreement
A	Designate as residential and revisit potential for ground floor retail in Bldgs. 3,4,5, with artist live-work and affordable housing. Review density with concern for revenue generation in a high-value zone (viewscape is valuable). Also consider commercial uses in southern half. Anticipate demolishing Building 9 and consider demolition of Building 3, though it has some unique architectural features (trusses). Evaluate 45-74 units as a range.
B	Designate Zone B a cultural/creative hub with performance and office space in Bldgs. 22, 22A, 23, 24 and 25, but to be decided if this should be an off-balance sheet project with economic and financial viability on a stand-alone basis. Use Bldgs. 22 and 23 as artist live/work space.
C	Demolish Bldg. 27B and expand public uses from Zone B into this area. Retain the center of Bldg. 27A and expand north for commercial purposes and rehab or replace the “wings” for commercial or residential use.
D	Demolish Bldgs. 28 and 21. Use buildings 16-20 for senior living (independent living, assisted living, CCRC) with higher density. Buildings may be in-filled as deemed necessary for functional requirements so long as campus symmetry is retained. Develop Bldg. 29 with apartments of moderate size with potential to expand building to north. Consider 70-150 units to start, but consultants to explore.
E	Use Bldg. 2 for Inn with high-end housing as back-up; possible rec center (work-out facility in it). Use Bldg. 7 for mixed use commercial (distillery, office, function space/ restaurant, gallery). Bldg. 10 and former laundry area: art gallery/historical museum/recreational/ retail with housing above. Extend zone to the northern property boundary after laundry area is remediated and turned over to Town
F	Demolish paint building and Bldg.13. Extend zone to eastern and western edges of property. Leave open for the same agricultural use it’s been used for: haying (other ag. uses a concern because of equipment and structures). Reserve for future use. Considerations: Even though building 13 has been upgraded more recently, consensus is that its doesn’t fit with the rest of the campus and has a problematic history due to use for incarceration.
G	Residential use with the potential to expand the buildings themselves to the north; look at range of 42-80 units.
H	Demo most of the existing structures and construct residential cottages without compromising the tree population. The best tree collectin is closest to Bldg. 30. Plot plan will arrange buildings to screen them from entrance view. 3 buildings

	are priority contributors to the historical context and may be considered for preservation. Evaluate 20-40 units in zone.
--	---

New Action Items

#	Item	Responsible	Due
1.	Contact Suzanne Siino to clarify/confirm requirements for a group home	S. Nolan	28 July 17

Holdover Action Items

#	Item	Responsible	Due
2.	Schedule Tangerini farms to meet with the Committee regarding potential agricultural uses	G. Rodgers	Open
3.	Provide financial estimate basis, assumptions and details used to develop the summary financial analysis of the draft scenario plan, most likely in spreadsheet format.	K. McCabe	14 Aug 17
4.	Distribute summary of stakeholder engagement to date to committee members	C. Hulet	DONE

Summary Notes

Meeting began: 18:39

Meeting concluded: 23:29

Meeting minutes for 05 Jul 17 unanimously approved
 Motion: B. Erb Second: R. Costello

Board of Selectmen Feedback from 11 July meeting -

Key takeaways:

Selectmen generally agree with our desire to retain planning responsibility for Hinkley property and Lot #3 Ice House road with some concerns.

- Loss of commercially zoned land at Lot #3
- Quantity of senior appropriate housing stock and the concerns of the Senior Housing Committee
- Their ability to understand and fully support our plan. They requested more contact to keep them informed of progress and plan details

A recommendation was made to conduct a tour of buildings that have been renovated/upgraded for movie production once filming activity is complete to demonstrate the potential for building re-hab.

43D Briefing Takeaways (from meeting on Wednesday, July 12) –

- Dependent upon Planning Board actions

- Requires Town Meeting approval – could be January or Annual Town Meeting in April
- Marketing of properties supported via listing on Massachusetts agency websites
- S. Raposa is investigating timeline to determine whether when the committee would have to commit to pursuing 43D in order to fit with our planning process.

First draft preferred scenario discussion –

C. Hulet reviewed the meeting rules and reinforced the need for disciplined, timed conversation in order to achieve the meeting objective - creating a first draft preferred scenario. The committee agreed to use consensus rules for agreement. The context for conversation was set by the drawings and summary data provided to each committee member by K. McCabe. This includes a map of the central campus that has been divided into arbitrary zones for discussion purposes as well as a table of preliminary information about each zone. The zone designations do not reflect any agreement or suggestions for land disposition, parcelization, or project phasing purposes. The map is included on the last page of these minutes for reference. The draft scenario will be used as the basis for financial analysis, zoning, and design guidelines and will be subject to further adjustment as the committee moves toward a final scenario for public review and approval.

J. Harney was invited to participate as an honorary Resource Committee Member.¹

The record of the discussion for each zone includes a list of comments that were made and is followed by the agreement achieved by consensus. Each zone was reviewed individually.

Zone A – West side of campus quad**Comments noted:**

- Consider commercial for Bldgs. 3,4,5 and housing for 6,8,9
- Consider low-income housing in this residential zone
- Consider Bldg. 3 as arts space; building 9 demo
- Evaluate residential with possible consideration
- Consider residential with potential for artist live-work or ground floor retail possibly incorporated
- Keep options open
- Residential with some cafés / convenience stores
- Demolish Bldg. 9
- Plan for fewer units – luxurious (45 units total) – premium views and value

Agreement:

Designate as residential and revisit potential for ground floor retail in Bldgs. 3,4,5, with artist live-work and affordable housing. Review density with concern for revenue generation in a high-value zone (viewscape is valuable). Also consider commercial uses in southern half. Anticipate demolishing Building 9 and consider demolition of Building 3, though it has some unique architectural features (trusses).
Evaluate 45-74 units as a range.

¹ It was later confirmed via communication with Assistant Town Manager Kristine Trierweiler that Mr. Harney was officially appointed to the Resource Committee and that he should be recognized as such going forward.

Zone B – Southern half of central quad

Comments noted:

- Move forward with this as a creative place making area
- Use Lee Chapel for arts; also like to see space for historic function/museum
- Café and live-work buildings
- 16 units of live-work space is less than the projected needs
- Continue of arts & culture development process
- Concerned about the south side – this is what you see when you arrive – it sets the tone for the entire project
- Zone B is the “nucleus of values” (arts, volunteerism, health, worship, fresh air, etc.)
- Prefer the more expansive version of the arts, include regional history center, worth discussing live-work space (integrate or isolate?)
- Consider “B” a cultural hub. (Put daycare in 3, 4 or 5)
- This is the strategic center for the development; need a good back-up plan as this financing is aspirational
- Need to get this space right as it will determine the value of all around it
- In favor of a cultural hub, but want it off the balance sheet and must be financially viable on its own

Agreement:

Designate Zone B a cultural/creative hub with performance and office space in Bldgs. 22, 22A, 23, 24 and 25, but to be decided if this should be an off-balance sheet project with economic and financial viability on a stand-alone basis. Use Bldgs. 22 and 23 as artist live/work space.

Zone C – Northern half of central quad

Comments noted:

- Good spot to consider for recreation
- “Wings” on Bldg. 27A should be removed (in poor condition) and center kept (in good condition)
- Consider culinary institute/ incubator in 27A - Know a restaurateur that would take this on
- Senior housing building proposal is too monolithic - can't fill open space that people have become used to
- Keep open but reserve as option for future development
- Dog park locale
- Line streets w some new buildings?
- Town square - Develop Bldg. 27a “wings” as new construction (prime units on new construction)
- Not a good space for the town square - Too big as an open space - Senior living bldg. activates the space – this is prime real estate
- Expand core of 27A - reduce some of the green space – think of it as a courtyard with horticultural paths -This is such a campus; should be preserved
- C as a compliment to B, as something that gives this place vitality - Can it be programmed with a skate park, winter skating rink

- Bldg. 27A can be a core public space that expands out into the common as a patio/ gathering area - Needs to be enough commercial stuff going on to make it feel public, but can have housing surrounding it

Agreement:

Demolish Bldg. 27B and expand public uses from Zone B into this area. Retain the center of Bldg. 27A and expand north for commercial purposes. Rehab or replace the “wings” with new construction for commercial or residential use.

Zone D – East side of campus

Comments noted:

- Remove Bldg. 21 and expand Bldg. 29 as assisted living - no group home
- Bldg. 29 problematic as senior given the activity in the public green
- Prefer this for the continuing care community (preserve value of views for higher revenue)
- Bldg. 29 residential - remaining area in D for senior housing
- Demo Bldgs. 16, 17 & 21, extend Bldg. 29 (highest topo spot on site) - no group home
- Reduce the density from 108, do not make it monolithically senior housing.
- Move senior living further to the north - Take out Bldgs. 16 & 17 - Make Bldgs. 15 & 17 senior living
- Rebuilding Bldgs. 16 & 17 will require a variance due to the water tower proximity
- Expand Bldg. 29 by taking down Bldg. 21 – use 29 for millennial housing
- Not in favor of reducing density here because we will need units to attract a CCRC - Would sell with the option to connect buildings and build amenity/service needs.
- Aligned with keeping this area flexible as it may help drive the revenue - Support group home but not sure it should be isolated
- In favor of higher density here to support some of the open space desire - Treat 29 as a premium property

Agreement:

Demolish Bldg. 28. Use buildings 16-21 for senior living (Independent living, Assisted living, CCRC) with higher density. Buildings may be in-filled as deemed necessary for functional requirements so long as campus symmetry is retained. Demolish Bldg. 21 and develop Bldg. 29 with apartments of moderate size with potential to expand building to north. Consider 70-150 units to start, but consultants to explore.

Zone E – West side of campus

Comments noted:

- Make building 2 the inn - Extend Zone E down to road and develop duplexes or such at the road
- Use as commercial zone with new construction - Save Bldg.10 for a gallery - Hold Bldg. 2 for Parks and Rec back-up
- Make this public space – galleries, hotel, reception hall in building 7 - Take advantages of the view
- Put the inn in building 2
- Concerned about the commercial viability of an inn - Optimize the views

- Demolish Bldg.10 and reserve for future development along with laundry area - Expand southern area as more cottage housing. (Charles River views here.) - Bldgs. 2 & 7 as residential
- Make building 7 commercial or a small inn - Make Bldg. 2 a high-end condo or apartment complex - Keep 10 for distillery or gallery
- Bldg. 2 is a good spot for an inn or high-end condo - Do not extend Zone E to hospital road – keep as open space. Bldg. 7 maybe mixed residential - Retain Bldg.10: distillery or restaurant
- Bldg. 2 an inn, front as parking for both inn and green event area - garden or greenhouses between Bldgs. 2 and 7 - use this area for receptions, put distillery in Bldg. 7 adjacent to open space - Demolish 10 because this is prime real estate.
- Tear down or replace Bldg. 7 for commercial or residential - concerned about economic viability of inn, but let market dictate
- Extend zone to hospital road - Why tear down Bldg. 10 if people are interested in it - Use Bldg. 7 as residential. 2 condos - let market dictate inn viability
- 'Commercial public use' – can Bldg. 7 be subdivided into complimentary uses – incubator space - Put parking where letter “E” is - See Bldg. 2 as educational facility- easy to add to back of building: recreation component/ community space
- Commercial recreation opportunities related to the river - Do not extend zone: this is part of the entry/ attractiveness - Bldg. 7 mixed commercial with office/ incubator potential - Bldg. 2 as high end residential

Consistent opinions expressed:

- Take advantage of views across open fields down to Charles River
- Use for public access and active uses

Agreement:

Use Bldg. 2 for Inn with high-end housing as back-up; possible rec center (work-out facility in it)

Use Bldg. 7 for mixed use commercial (distillery, office, function space/ restaurant, gallery)

Bldg. 10 and former laundry area: recreational/ retail with housing above

Explore extending zone to the north after laundry area is remediated and turned over to Town

Zone F – Northern most parcel

Comments noted:

- Building 13 has been remediated so possibly retain for housing; remove paint shop.
- Remove Bldg.13 – bad juju - Keep as open space
- Concern about any development in the open space/ forest. This is the area people enjoy going to - Not opposed to development, but we need to be judicious and this is not the place for it.
- Like the agricultural use, but it's problematic from buildings needed (although hay field here is ok) - Vistas and open space is important to protect
- Building 13 and paint building need to come down - Nice place for community gardens in the interim.
- Consider keeping Bldg.13 if it's in good shape - Ok with open space
- The view north is one of the finest - don't want to do anything in Zone F that compromises value in Zone G - Keep Bldg.13 if its in good condition
- Liked idea of opening up north view alee by tearing down Bldg.13, but if it has value or is viable would consider keeping it

- Tear Bldg. 13 down unless there is a real compelling reason - Keep vista; maybe use for hay but no more than that - Can see another layer of high end condos
- Paint shop and Bldg. 13 should go – Zone F is a huge parcel (22 acres) and the most valuable parcel of entire site - Do not use for agriculture
- No agriculture here - expand Zone F to west but don't do anything with it - Get rid of Bldg.no 13 – it doesn't fit with other buildings and has a gruesome reputation

Agreement:

Demolish paint building and Bldg.13. Extend zone to eastern and western edges of property. Leave open for the same agricultural use it's been used for: haying (other ag. uses a concern because of equipment and structures). Reserve for future use. Considerations: Even though building 13 has been upgraded more recently, consensus is that its doesn't fit with the rest of the campus and has a problematic history due to use for incarceration.

Zone G – Northern perimeter of campus quad

Comments noted:

- Strong support for residential
- Bldg. 12 good shape, 14 bad shape. 11 “spiritual entrance to campus” – don't do anything bad with it
- More senior housing can go into Bldgs. 14 & 15
- 38-42 residential units is fine
- Think about whether buildings can expand northward to create more units, but preserve view sheds

Agreement -

Residential use with the potential to expand the buildings themselves to the north; look at range of 42-80 units.

Zone H – Southeast Parcel

Comments noted:

- Use as arboretum for public resource to maintain the notion of the great lawn - Use Bldgs. 34 & 36 as arboretum resources/ education - No housing development here - Group home somewhere on campus does not have to be here
- Use for housing if plantings/ trees can be kept, housing in this zone may not be necessary if housing is expanded in Zone G - building 36 ok for group home
- Trees are valuable and need to be preserved
- Good sense to have an attractive entrance - favor group home on campus, but no opinion as to where
- Rare trees centered around building 30 - Would not make this a group home - Keep slope north of building 30 - Not sure housing needed if we expand on campus.
- Group home could be building 36 – good access, open space – What is done here is hidden from campus - build between the trees to preserve them
- Demolish houses, preserve trees, and develop housing in this area - In favor of group home: good for diversity, not sure where it should go - This is a good starting point for development.

- Preserve trees, but favor creating a housing development around the trees - good starting point for development - Single story 1800-2000sf. - Include building 29 as part of this area.
- Save the trees - No development on south portion of Zone H, this is the entry to the campus - support development closer to building 29 – favor a group home on campus, but not sure where to locate on campus
- Develop this with respect for trees - Put development where the letter H is so it is further buffered from view. Support group home idea but they like new construction - it could be built here where it might blend in.
- This is the entrance to the campus - should not have housing right at front - Might be ok with housing by letter H along property edge or further north. Prefer upper campus development first. Group home: prefer integration, not segregation as independent living, maybe in building 9
- Development will not take away from trees, especially if it is to the east, north – Support group home, but not sure where.

Agreement:

Demo most of the existing structures and construct residential cottages without compromising the tree population. The best tree collection is closest to Bldg. 30. Plot plan will arrange buildings to screen them from entrance view. 3 buildings are priority contributors to the historical context and may be considered for preservation. Evaluate 20-40 units in zone.

Parked items and Issues -

Zone A

- What is structural condition of buildings 3 and 9?

Zone B

- Should the arts/cultural center be included in project economics or considered as a separate off-balance sheet project that is treated on its own financial merits? There is a difference between economic viability and financial viability.
- Need to have a back-up plan for the core area if arts/cultural concept fails or is infeasible.
- What is the event / arts center parking approach needed?

Zone F

- Park idea of maintaining 13

Total Unit Count in Draft Preferred Scenario

Zone	Units
A	45-74
B	16
C	?
D	70-150
E	24
F	0
G	42-80
H	20-40
Hinkley/Lot 3 Ice House Rd.	57
Total	274 - 441



Medfield State Hospital Strategic Reuse Master Plan

Medfield State Hospital Master Plan Committee, Town of Medfield, MA

McCabe Enterprises Team | McCabe Enterprises | CRJA - IBI Group | PARE Corporation | Paul Lukez Architecture | Project Management & Cost