Board Members
Andy Rodenhiser, Chair
Sarah Raposa, A.I.C.P., Vice-Chair
Timothy Harris, Clerk
John Parlee, Member
Janine Clifford, Member

Medway Town Hall
155 Village Street
Medway, MA 02053
Telephone (508) 533-3291
Email: planningboard@medwayma.gov
www.medwayma.gov

TOWN OF MEDWAY
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Minutes
Tuesday, July 14, 2026 @ 7:00 p.m.

Medway Middle School – Presentation Room
45 Holliston Street, Medway, MA

Andy Rodenhiser Chairperson	Sarah Raposa Vice Chairperson	Timothy Harris Clerk	John Parlee	Janine Clifford
X	X	X	X	X

Also present: Jeremy Thompson, Town Planner
Barbara J. Saint Andre, Director, Community and Economic Development (via Zoom)

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairperson Andy Rodenhiser called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and announced that the meeting is being recorded by Medway Cable Access and broadcast on Facebook live.

CITIZEN COMMENTS. None.
PUBLIC HEARINGS

Design Review Guidelines – For the adoption of new municipal Design Review Guidelines pursuant to Section 3.11 of the Town of Medway General Bylaws.

The Board briefly discussed the review and examination of the new municipal Design Review Guidelines. Mr. Thompson explained that although the Design Review Guidelines were previously approved by the Board as part of the Heritage on Main public hearing process, staff felt it prudent to notice a standalone public hearing in accordance with the Medway General Bylaws.

Motion to adopt the 2026 Design Review Guidelines prepared by Dodson & Flinker by Sarah Raposa, seconded by Tim Harris. All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried.

107-119 Main Street, 1 & 3 Elm Street, 0 & 26 Kelley Street – (Continued from June 9, 2026)
This is an application from Rte. 85 Realty Corp., for Major Site Plan review and special permits for

properties located at 107-119 Main Street, 1 & 3 Elm Street, 0 & 26 Kelley Street, Assessor Parcel Nos. 40-076, 40-075, 40-074, 40-073, 40-072, 40-071, 48-046, 48-047-0001, 48-047, 48-047-002, 48-047-003, 49-032-001, 49-032 within the Central Business District (CB),Villages Multifamily Housing Overlay District (VMHOD), and Agricultural Residential II (ARII) zoning districts. The proposal includes a four-story apartment building with 267 residential units and outdoor amenities; commercial buildings for a bank, restaurant/retail with drive-through lane, redeveloped gas station and convenience store; related parking and other features. Access will be from curb cuts on Main Street. No development is proposed for 0 and 26 Kelley Street. The following special permits are requested: mixed-use development, redevelopment of an existing fuel station with a convenience store, off-street parking placement, installation of a drive-through facility, reduction in affordable housing unit percentage; outdoor amenity space approvals.

Mr. Rodenhiser stated the applicant has requested a continuance to allow their project team more time to respond to peer and public comments and to ensure the availability of subject matter experts that can address technical questions in a factual manner.

Applicant's attorney, Jonathon Silverstein, reiterated their request for a continuance to the August session. After receiving feedback, the applicant is working on a revision that will hopefully resolve a lot of design concerns.

Motion to continue the public hearing to August 11, 2026, at 7:05 p.m. at the Middle School presentation room by Sarah Raposa, seconded by Mr. Harris. All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried.

0R & 12 Waterview Drive - This is an application for Site Plan Review for Exempt Uses pursuant to G.L. 40A § 3 for property located at 0R & 12 Waterview Drive, Assessor Parcel Nos. 67-061, 67-046, in the Agricultural Residential II (AR II) zoning district.

Mr. Rodenhiser read the public hearing notice and set forth ground rules for public comment.

Attorney Edward Cannon and Dan Merrikin, Legacy Engineering, were present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Merrikin displayed the site plan on the projector and provided an overview of the characteristics of the property. The property is undeveloped and is actively being used for agricultural purposes. The site has frontage on Waterview Drive. Mr. Merrikin noted the significant presence of wetland resources on-site and indicated the applicant would be filing a notice of intent with the Conservation Committee tomorrow.

Mr. Merrikin stated that the proposed plan is to build a farm. He noted that access to the site would be provided by a gravel driveway leading to the interior of the site where most structures and materials would be located. The site would include vegetable and flower gardens, animal pens hosting a variety of livestock, a fence enclosure, and a twenty-space parking area. A single-family residence is proposed near the front lot line to allow caretakers to live on the property. Mr. Merrikin described the floodplain area and stated that they will address this in detail with the Conservation Commission. Water and sewer tie-ins are needed for the single-family home; the applicant wishes to run a water line across the site for the purpose of installing hydrants in the rear of the site. A stormwater report has been provided, which includes two stormwater infiltration basins for mitigation of the stormwater.

Attorney Cannon outlined plans for agricultural expansion. The field will be used for wildflowers and vegetables, as well as keeping of various animals such as chickens and horses, and additional

educational programming such as horsemanship classes and day camp programs. The property will not be open on a daily basis, and visitors will be required to sign up in advance. Manure will be held in an enclosure and will be hauled off weekly. Mr. Merrikin stated there are no plans to bring in any large trucks or tractor-trailers onsite. The applicants have another farm and will use their truck and trailers. Mr. Rodenhiser requested the applicant submit a photometric plan per the Site Plan Rules and Regulations. Mr. Rodenhiser informed those in attendance that the exemption the property owners have requested is not in the Planning Board's jurisdiction; the Building Commissioner is the acts as the Chief Zoning Officer and has yet to make a determination.

A discussion ensued regarding zoning determination procedures. Mr. Rodenhiser stated the applicant is the one at risk regarding monies spent, as they are asking for the exemption under the Dover Amendment.

Mr. Rodenhiser provided a brief explanation of the Dover Amendment, which provides for certain exempt uses that the Board has very limited ability to regulate. The Board has limited scope in its site plan review process; The Commonwealth has a list of statutorily established uses, and the Board is required to follow the law. The Board can make requests for information and certain recommendations, but the applicant is not required to satisfy those requests should they fall outside the scope of review required by law. Ms. Raposa wanted to set expectations for those in attendance, so they know what the Planning Board has the ability to approve or deny. Mr. Rodenhiser stated that because the applicant submitted an exempt use application, the Board must review the application as such. The applicant is confident in their determination, but if the Building Commissioner feels differently, the applicant's expenditures to date are their risk.

Mr. Rodenhiser stated that the Board will receive a report from the Conservation Commission once completed, and opened the meeting up to public questions.

The first resident asked about the exemption and the Dover Amendment. Mr. Rodenhiser reiterated the previous discussion and added that if a resident feels aggrieved by the Building Commissioner's decision, they can appeal that decision to the Zoning Board of Appeals. If a resident is an abutter, they will receive notice. Ms. Saint Andre discussed the memo that she forwarded to the Board today. The determination as to whether the proposed use constitutes commercial agriculture, which is the standard under Section 3, is up to the Building Commissioner, who has not yet made the decision. The Board is being asked to review a site plan without a ruling from the Building Commissioner, without knowing the scope or what standard to apply. The applicant should work with the Building Commissioner before the Board's review so the Board knows which standard to apply. Ms. Saint Andre stated the Building Commissioner has not received a formal request for a determination.

Mr. Rodenhiser inquired about the deadline for action before the application would be constructively approved. Ms. Saint Andre responded that the deadline is 60 days, which falls on August 15th. Mr. Rodenhiser asked if the Building Commissioner is available to make a determination within this timeframe. The onus is on the applicant to put together a clearly defined package for the Building Commissioner. Ms. Clifford asked if the Board is limited in its ability to impose conditions in the Decision. The review is limited because exempt use is deemed to be a use allowed by right. The Board can propose reasonable regulations to the extent allowed by law.

A range of inquiries were raised by members of the public. Questions regarding site planning and operations addressed proposed business hours, camp programs, seasonality, livestock keeping and animal welfare, traffic management, sight lines, bathroom facilities, ADA compliance, and

organizational classification. Residents expressed primary concerns about traffic volume and safety, stating that the corner where the farm will be is very dangerous, and loss of privacy. Additional questions concerned whether abutters would be notified of the Building Commissioner's zoning determination and whether the Board would distribute materials from other boards and committees to the abutters. One member of the public asked the applicant to clarify whether active discussions have taken place between the applicant and Medway Community Farm concerning programming arrangements. Attorney Cannon clarified that no such discussions have taken place and acknowledged that the project narrative was misleading.

A handful of comments supported the project and vouched for the applicant and their stewardship of the land.

The applicant, Nancy Dubin, said this is a farm that will operate every day of the year. Visitors will be limited to spring, summer, and fall. There will be no buses on site; parents will drop children off. Mr. Rodenhiser asked if the applicant has a traffic count. She said they will provide a more detailed traffic plan. She explained that this property is not like their property in Holliston. They currently own an active equestrian facility in Holliston, but this will be more like a farm; an agricultural, small operation.

Ms. Raposa stated that information was not included in the application and there is not a lot of detail in the application. Ms. Clifford said residents have concerns; once the exemption is in place, there is not a lot of control. If the applicant sells the property, the use is still in place. She stated it is very difficult for residents to know what to expect when there is little information in the application. There are concerns about parking and queues forming to enter the farm. Mr. Rodenhiser asked for a plan on how it will impact the residential neighborhood.

A resident asked how the public will know if the applicant receives the exemption; Ms. Raposa said it is up to residents to check in with the Building Commissioner. They will have 30 days from the date of decision to appeal.

Ms. Saint Andre asked if the applicant responded to the July 7th email requesting the applicant to specify the water source and whether bathrooms onsite would be ADA compliant. Ms. Saint Andre also stated that the cover page needs space for the Town Clerk's signature for the 20-day appeal. Ms. Saint Andre asked if there will be any EV stations, and the applicant stated there are no current plans for EV. Lastly, where will trash and manure be stored until disposal? How will they remove that trash and manure, plan for access for emergency vehicles? Mr. Rodenhiser stated the fire department will review and provide comments.

Ms. Saint Andre stated with regard to the extension, September 15th is a Tuesday. There will be meetings on August 11th, 25th, and September 8th. Mr. Rodenhiser asked if September 8th would work for the applicant. The applicant agreed to submit a signed request to extend the deadline for final action to September 15, 2026.

A resident at 11 Waterview Drive inquired if the applicant felled any trees in restricted areas, and what mitigation efforts would be required if so. Mr. Rodenhiser asked when the next Conservation Committee meeting was scheduled for and clarified that this particular matter falls within the purview of the Conservation Committee. Mr. Rodenhiser encouraged all to sign up for email notification of meetings and agendas.

A participant submitted testimony that the Dubins are great neighbors in Holliston. They are well

known in Holliston and have a remarkable reputation. The participant conveyed to the board that the Dubins have contributed to Holliston and are great stewards of their land.

Motion to approve the plan review budget estimate for 0R & 12 Waterview Drive prepared Tetra Tech in the amount of $4,675 by Ms. Raposa, seconded by Mr. Harris. All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried.

Motion to approve an extension for the Board to take Final Action to September 15, 2026, per the handwritten letter submitted to the Board at the meeting, to be submitted on official letterhead tomorrow, and filed with the Town Clerk, by Ms. Raposa, seconded by Mr. Harris. All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried.

Motion by Sarah Raposa to continue to the public hearing to August 25, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. here in the Middle School presentation room.

The Board discussed the correct date and time. The Board should continue to August 11th at 7:00 p.m., open the meeting, and continue to August 25th without taking testimony because the request submitted at the meeting tonight is not filed with the Town Clerk yet.

Ms. Raposa retracted her original motion and subsequently made a new motion to continue the public hearing to August 11, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. in the Middle School presentation room, seconded by Mr. Harris. All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

Vote to approve Committee Appointment for Open Space Committee – Andrea Burke

Motion to approve the reappointment of Andrea Burke to the Open Space Committee by Ms. Raposa, seconded by Mr. Harris. No discussion. All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried.

Plan Endorsement – 39 West Street
Motion to endorse the plan for 39 West Street by Ms. Raposa, seconded by Mr. Harris. No discussion. **All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried**

Based on a clerical error in the annotated agenda, Mr. Rodenhiser requested the previous vote be rescinded to discuss the item in more detail.

On behalf of the chair, Ms. Raposa made a motion to recall the previous vote. Seconded by Ms. Clifford. All members of the Board voted in favor, motion carried.

Mr. Thompson clarified that 39 West Street is a Multifamily Overlay District (MOD) project approved by the Board in 2025. He stated further that the only substantive peer review comment from Tetra Tech was to call out the decommissioned wellhead on-site in the plan, which has been satisfied.

Motion to endorse the plan for 39 West Street by Ms. Raposa, seconded by Mr. Harris. No further discussion. All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried

Construction Reports - Mr. Rodenhiser asked to check with Tetra Tech to look at the Eversource site. It seems like it has expanded from the transformer area.

ZBA application: 18 Broad Acres Road - Mr. Rodenhiser asked if there was any comment or discussion. Mr. Thompson will gather more information.

Review and approval of minutes from June 9, 2026 and June 23, 2026

Motion to approve the meeting minutes from June 9, 2026, and June 23, 2026, as prepared, by Ms. Raposa, seconded by Mr. Harris. No discussion. All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried.

Any other business that may properly come before the Board

None.

Adjourn

Motion by Ms. Raposa to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Harris. All members of the Board voted in favor; motion carried

Meeting adjourned at 8:39 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Douglass
Recording Secretary

Edited by:
Jeremy Thompson
Town Planner

Barbara J. Saint Andre
Director, Community and Economic Development

List of Documents Reviewed:
0R &12 Waterview Drive Site Plan