

# Summary of Comments

## May 24, 2017 MSH Community Workshop

Agriculture	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No to Agriculture (So of Hospital Rd)</li> <li>• Agriculture/ Arboretum – upkeep maintenance?</li> <li>• Yes: Arboretum + Agriculture</li> <li>• Maintain agricultural space in conjunction with farm to table restaurant (in combination here)</li> <li>• Agricultural features vs. Open space. ? use East &amp; West as agricultural use; 50-50 open space (Sc 1) vs agricultural use (Sc 2)</li> <li>• Like ag concept; good for town beauty</li> <li>• Like Agriculture in Scenario 2 for north.</li> <li>• PHASED – South of Hospital Road. Revenue from Agriculture first. Have town master plan deal with it. Why address it immediately. Do agriculture first &amp; plan for Town.</li> <li>• Loses open space to Agriculture lease (Sc 2)</li> <li>• Open space/ agriculture at the north vs. future development</li> <li>• Ag not necessary</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please keep South Side in Agricultural Use</li> <li>• Prefer Rec Center v. Agricultural</li> <li>• Strongly prefer the south side of Hospital Rd be kept open with agricultural use. Do not want Park &amp; Rec Building – extra traffic -- Place on North Campus, Dale. Do not give up the land.</li> <li>• Please add in the agricultural piece to scenario</li> <li>• I prefer greenhouse and am very opposed to recreation facility</li> <li>• I support Parks n Rec building but hope they will reconsider scale &amp; location. The land is ideal for agriculture + that has revenue potential two (CSA, farmers mkt, supplying for restaurants, food pantry, &amp; comm. gardens).</li> <li>• Area should be farmed and sell local produce to restaurants and Farmers' Market.</li> <li>• Agricultural – south side; Commercial, local produce, agriculture</li> </ul>

Arts	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town needs a larger meeting/event space. Not necessarily fancy wedding space. Love the idea of integrating that with the arts space.</li> <li>• Art Facility Yes</li> <li>• Outdoor concerts; festivals</li> <li>• Artist Live/Work is good.</li> <li>• Concerns raised by several members of group about presence of arts competing w/ Zullo and other members of downtown community interests.</li> <li>• Would this compete with downtown interests? Would it be used all year round? Who would it serve, what duplication of services??? Could complement Medfield's offerings rather than compete; could be a destination from other towns for classes, festivals, performance art, etc.</li> <li>• We are supportive of an arts space</li> <li>• Revenue neutral art centers?</li> <li>• Question on parking, supporting arts, etc.</li> <li>• Develop more "community" arts, restaurants, wine bar, shops, inn</li> <li>• Artist live space among seniors</li> <li>• Better access to arts &amp; culture or com'l (Sc 1)</li> <li>• We value Arts Center + Living area</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please Please Please <u>Park &amp; Recreation</u>. It generates \$\$\$ not art center → Competes with what new Park &amp; Rec can do...</li> <li>• "Arts" is key. Even a small # of live-work spaces has a disproportionately large effect on culture.</li> <li>• * Arts center will make it a vibrant site whether #1 or #2</li> <li>• The arts center and the Pfaff Center/Parks &amp; Rec could be combined in that they could share some parts of Arts bldg.</li> <li>• Drop Art Center;</li> <li>• New Park and Rec provides what arts center would – but Arts Center possibly 6 months \$\$\$ Park &amp; Rec 12 months \$\$\$</li> <li>• Lowell Mason Tribute in arts space?</li> <li>•</li> <li>• We have great music in Medfield. Showcase local talent in an outdoor concert space.</li> <li>• We need a new music concert space. Bring back Fall Fest. Encourage teens with music.</li> </ul>

Arts	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Want amphitheater + arts</li> <li><u>Arts space</u></li> </ul>
Commercial	
Small Group Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create café instead of day care center</li> <li>On west side of quad, the group wrote “Commercial” and “Less Housing”; “Lot 3 has overflow housing to meet our needs.”</li> <li>Any scenario needs commercial space – retail like restaurant</li> <li>Views of the Charles must be <u>shared</u> w/ restaurants &amp; other.</li> <li>Limited Commercial (Sc 1)</li> <li>Too much commercial (Sc 2)</li> <li>Add retail shops; wine/ cheese/ flowers</li> <li>Yes: more commercial; Local control of vendors?</li> <li>Would be nice to have an inn somewhere? Would it be used?</li> <li>We think mixed commercial development is important and needs to be close to the housing or interspersed within the housing/buildings.</li> <li>Like café concept in Scenario 2</li> <li>Like the concept of an inn, gathering spot.</li> <li>Skeptical commercial what type</li> <li>Value. Add a little more commercial devel. (Sc 1)</li> <li>Add convenience store (center of quad)</li> <li>Develop more “community” arts, restaurants, wine bar, shops, inn</li> <li>We love INN idea for guest, visiting family!!! Kids – but is it financial feasible/ realistic.</li> <li>We need restaurants, cafes, etc. The group prefers Scenario 1 with adjustments – more commercial and tax revenue. Add a Forekicks-type facility that pays us taxes</li> <li>Commercial space is too large for interest</li> <li>More cafes &amp; restaurants. Winery ☺</li> <li>Need market study to evaluate commercial uses</li> <li>Scenario 2 is way better (commercial space)</li> <li>Commercial help create village – more self-sustaining</li> <li>Commercial is a plus</li> <li>We value: Inn/Idea/Recreational commercial</li> </ul>

Commercial	
Individual Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More commercial in center of property to serve residents &amp; bring others into the campus;</li> <li>There is still a need for hospitals of all constellations. I would like to see the campus et al to be used in that way.</li> <li>Business Park; No new R.E, taxes <u>Enough is Enough!!</u></li> <li>Need more restaurants. Always busy</li> <li>Keep open space + ↑ revenue with restaurants</li> <li>From our table: Consensus was that size of commercial space was too big. They won't go up there.</li> <li>Idea of adding some mixed use bldgs. (retail shops, bakery, wine shop, etc.) &amp; have this on 1<sup>st</sup> floor + condos/ apt on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor....so no all bldgs. Just housing on perimeter of campus! (yellow/gold) area</li> <li>Café w/ wine &amp; noshes.</li> <li>Both scenarios need commercial areas for residents – café, -- shop (small groc, etc.), wine bar ☺</li> <li>I like the idea of a European style village with housing, shops, coffee. Show little eating spots. Keep senior living on outside – not so central,</li> <li>Restaurants &amp; cafes for Revenue</li> <li>Medfield has a lot of day cares already. Need more new, updated restaurants. Revenue increases w Avenue, Nosh &amp; Grog, Cafes.</li> <li>Prefer to have decreased living space overall, increase units in area close to Senior Center (Hinkley &amp; other); add more town activity &amp; studio/workshop type space in main quad area.</li> </ul>

Day Care	
Small Group Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create café instead of day care center.</li> <li>Day care location preferred (referencing Scenario 1)</li> <li>Like day care; slightly better location (Scenario 1)</li> </ul>
Individual Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No need for day care. Have lots</li> <li>Why do we need day care centers if housing units more in balance. Nix day care centers.</li> <li>Maybe build a new one up on Hospital Hill, and use the current senior center as a day care.??</li> <li>Medfield has a lot of day cares already. Need more new, updated restaurants. Revenue increases w Avenue, Nosh &amp; Grog, Cafes.</li> </ul>

<b>Dog Park</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Want to have open space for dog walking for non-occupants of property</li> <li>Walking dog friendly open space.</li> <li>Make sure there is dog friendly walking space</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dog Park Keep it,</li> <li>There is an obvious need for a free space to walk dogs. Make the dog aspect a requirement. <b>KEEP THE DOG PARK.</b></li> <li><u>Preserve dog trails.</u></li> </ul>

<b>Financials</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a crystal ball. Open space has an impact on town services.</li> <li>Do revenue generation.</li> <li>The group prefers Scenario 1 with adjustments – more commercial and tax revenue. Add a Forekicks-type facility that pays us taxes</li> <li>Scenario 1 perhaps easier to finance. Scenario 2 is better economic in the long run.</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How much is this going to cost? Will we find out before Town Meeting?</li> <li>Will this project allow people to downsize (affordable) and stay in Medfield?</li> <li>Difficult to answer this since no information is available to say how taxpayers will be affected. (re: Objective on achievable acceptable long-term economic, environmental and financial impacts on Medfield residents and taxpayers)</li> <li>Great presentation! More financial information.</li> </ul>

<b>Group Home</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We support group home(s) to meet 40B goals.</li> <li>• Group home is wonderful way to honor history and include these individuals – Not isolate them in a corner of development</li> <li>• Why group home here (sc #1)? We like sc # 2 location.</li> <li>• Good that group home is incorporated with the rest (Sc 2)</li> <li>• Keep cottages (or Townhouses 50+ age) in both scenarios, plus group home.</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	

<b>HINKLEY</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We like the Senior Housing @ Hinkley and Lot 3</li> <li>• Parks &amp; Rec good. Is there a way to have agriculture too; Possibly move Parks &amp; Rec to Lot 3 or Hinkley</li> <li>• Senior housing closer to Council on Aging good</li> <li>• Lot 3/Hinkley DO IT! Ready to go Either plan works. Do it well</li> <li>• Like bulk of senior housing near senior center on Ice House Road/Hinkley</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	

<b>Historic Preservation</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognize history</li> <li>• Maintain as much of historic resources as possible</li> <li>• Preservation of as many bldgs. as possible.</li> <li>• Less demolition makes Sc # 2 slightly more favorable on this objective (conserve when feasible site's architectural &amp; cultural history).</li> <li>• Love to preserve as many of the buildings as possible.</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping as many existing buildings is <u>Great</u>...walkways, etc.</li> <li>• Don't like to demo buildings</li> </ul>

<b>Housing</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like Apt/Condo Mix in Scenario 1</li> <li>• Have housing view the river or inn &amp; restaurant.</li> <li>• Provide housing for seniors to transition from cottages to assisted living to nursing (to cemetery)</li> <li>• On west side of quad, the group wrote “Commercial” and “Less Housing”; “Lot 3 has overflow housing to meet our needs.”</li> <li>• A mix, please, of <u>both</u> multi-level senior housing (42 units) plus Cottages (15 units or more) roughly 1500 sf, two bedroom, etc. Limit # of bedrooms; Underground parking?</li> <li>• Prefer senior housing plan on west side (scenario 1)</li> <li>• We really applaud 40 B housing for diversity and senior housing.</li> <li>• We like the Senior Housing @ Hinkley and Lot 3</li> <li>• Scenario 2 better serves Medfield (affordable; seniors; general housing needs)</li> <li>• Artist Live/Work is good.</li> <li>• We support group home(s) to meet 40B goals.</li> <li>• We support the senior housing placement in Scenario 2.</li> <li>• We support the housing mix in Scenario 2 because less pressure and more opportunity for more seniors to stay in town.</li> <li>• We support preserving the cottages NOT an arboretum.</li> <li>• We liked the housing in Scenario 2. Why can't diversify be in # 1, e.g., live/work be in #1</li> <li>• Housing Production Plan – Follow it! More housing diversity – consider impact on schools.</li> <li>• Good, but is it permanent affordable or not?</li> <li>• Who will be “owning” the apts (1<sup>st</sup> 5 years)?</li> <li>• ? cottages are ? sq ft --- We feel “cottages”</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Least amount of housing – mostly open space!</li> <li>• The 40B units should be sprinkled in, not clumped in an undesirable location.</li> <li>• How are we going to accommodate more children in our schools? Can we limit housing to senior or retirement living + fewer houses</li> <li>• ? apts ? 40 B Driving forces 40B – utility upgrades ? breakeven Who builds with same philosophy? – what if can't attract uses consistent w/ this plan? Where are “units” of sr housing? Apts? Or downsizing? No sewer water needs. Partner w/ developer</li> <li>• If families that have &gt;2 kids don't have housing will they come?</li> </ul>

<b>Housing</b>	
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this project allow people to downsize (affordable) and stay in Medfield?</li> <li>• Mix affordable housing into other housing areas! Why segregate?</li> <li>• I would like town to own 40B housing to eliminate need to acquire safe harbor annually</li> <li>• Higher 30% 40B</li> <li>• Prefer to have decreased living space town activity overall, increase units in area close to Senior Center (Hinkley &amp; other); add more &amp; studio/workshop type space in main quad area.</li> </ul>

<b>INTERIOR OF QUAD</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leave quad open</li> <li>• West sides – seniors – depends on type of clientele planned. Use in this senior housing, Memory car vs. over 55. May be neat to leave seniors in the center of the quad if population can use facilities.</li> <li>• Parking lot should not be so big. Not centralized.</li> <li>• Common, as community gathering</li> <li>• Good for seniors to be close in the middle of things. Sc 1 isolates seniors?</li> <li>• Better spacing. Preserve Keep (Scenario 1)</li> <li>• We liked the housing in Scenario 2. Why can't diversify be in #1, e.g., live/work be in #1</li> <li>• Add convenience store (center of quad)</li> <li>• **☺</li> <li>• Height limit to buildings</li> <li>• Scenario 1 – Open Quad preserves natural resources + ru. But do you want concerts in your front yard?</li> <li>• Scenario 1 = green space in middle is key</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• </li> </ul>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bike &amp; walking path to hospital – integration</li> <li>• Question on parking, supporting arts, etc.</li> <li>• ? Parking is not shown. Is it part of the space blocked off?</li> <li>• Need clarity on parking</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From our table: Please address the surrounding infrastructure (sidewalks, wider roadways)</li> <li>• Please keep the road that leads directly to the put in.</li> <li>• Option 1. No parking and surrounded by apts.</li> <li>• Let's incorporate a bike path back in the fields</li> <li>• PLEASE Minimize pavement (Maximize open space). Open Land is a one-time thing!</li> <li>• Stop signs; <u>sidewalks</u></li> <li>• Info-structure</li> </ul>

<b>Lot 3</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On west side of quad, the group wrote “Commercial” and “Less Housing”; “Lot 3 has overflow housing to meet our needs.”</li> <li>• We like the Senior Housing @ Hinkley and Lot 3</li> <li>• Parks &amp; Rec good. Is there a way to have agriculture too; Possibly move Parks &amp; Rec to Lot 3 or Hinkley</li> <li>• Lot 3/Hinkley DO IT! Ready to go Either plan works. Do it well.</li> <li>• Like bulk of senior housing near senior center on Ice House Road/Hinkley</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• </li> </ul>

<b>Mixed Use</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible mixed use in some buildings. Add retail shops; wine/ cheese/ flowers</li> <li>• Condos/apt on top; retail on first floor</li> <li>• We think mixed commercial development is important and needs to be close to the housing or interspersed within the housing/buildings.</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate more mixed-use in Scenario 1.</li> <li>• Scenario 2 → Like mixed use;</li> </ul>

<b>Open Space</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a pavilion for group gatherings (Scenario 1)</li> <li>• Prefer open space for interior</li> <li>• Preserve Open Space (Sc 1)</li> <li>• Remove new building; More Green Space (Sc 1)</li> <li>• Fresh air; open space</li> <li>• Diversity</li> <li>• Preserve sledding hill</li> <li>• Need a crystal ball. Open space has an impact on town service.</li> <li>• Yes. Keep land reserved. Need More.</li> <li>• Yes. Open space and Arboretum (Sc 2)</li> <li>• Agricultural features vs. Open space. ? use East &amp; West as agricultural use; 50-50 open space (Sc 1) vs agricultural use (Sc 2)</li> <li>• More open space. Like It ** Save Trees. Walking dog friendly open space.</li> <li>• Loses open space to Agriculture lease</li> <li>• How does Medfield community access “the Square”? or is it only for MSH residents</li> <li>• Keep open green space near the DCR site</li> <li>• Amphitheater near DCR site</li> <li>• Prefer greater open space in Scenario 1</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

## Open Space

<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We felt the open space scenario was too much. We wouldn't really be used by anyone else...</li> <li>• Least amount of housing – mostly open space!</li> <li>• Keep open space + ↑ revenue with restaurants</li> <li>• The large common would be *huge* for the town -- &amp; establish a real New England feel.</li> <li>• Love green areas &amp; <u>Keeping trees</u> w/ character, quality + age... Arboretum sounds great.</li> <li>• <u>SAVE THE TREES</u> in any and all scenarios!</li> <li>• It would be great to develop the Charles River to be able to rent kayaks and canoes!</li> <li>• Liked 2 – Feel open space in the middle will be used more by the residents than the public in scenario 1</li> <li>• Central Park area would be like Olmstead's Central Park in NYNY. Bring in thoughtfully designed spaces</li> <li>• Option 1. Consider Open Space too large. Will only be used by Residents, not Town</li> <li>• Let's incorporate a bike path back in the fields</li> <li>• We have great music in Medfield. Showcase local talent in an outdoor concert space.</li> <li>• # 1 open space preserves character fo town &amp; reflects <u>Medfield values</u>. <u>Preserve dog trails</u>.</li> <li>• PLEASE Minimize pavement (Maximize open space). Open Land is a one-time thing!</li> <li>• Save the Vistas</li> <li>• Maintain some open space, not huge Asst'd living facility</li> <li>• Outdoor amphitheater</li> <li>• Open Space is better in Scenario 2</li> </ul>
----------------------------	---

<b>Ownership; Control</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who will be “owning” the apts (1<sup>st</sup> 5 years)</li> <li>• Sell it little by little vs. one big sale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ If we sell – split w/ state 50/50</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SAY – keep land in Town Ownership. We would like to keep control so we get the Development we (Town) wants!</li> <li>• Need clarity on Ownership by Town: <u>Keep Control</u></li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like town to own 40B housing to eliminate need to acquire safe harbor annually</li> <li>• Private and assisted living seems to have more access to space than Medfield public. Who's land is it?</li> <li>• </li> </ul>

<b>Parks and Recreation Center</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefer parks &amp; rec center opportunities with parking (indoor track); Preserve Sledding Hill</li> <li>• Yes Parks &amp; Rec</li> <li>• Boat rental site; salt water pool w P&amp;R building</li> <li>• Yes, to Parks &amp; Rec</li> <li>• Parks &amp; Rec good. Is there a way to have agriculture too; Possibly move Parks &amp; Rec to Lot 3 or Hinkley</li> <li>• We would like to see the Parks &amp; Rec facility south of Hospital Road in Scenario 1.</li> <li>• Parks &amp; Rec needs a building for kids</li> <li>• Need more facilities for young children</li> <li>• Add a Forekicks-type facility that pays us taxes</li> <li>• Include Parks &amp; Rec (both scenarios)</li> <li>• Add Parks &amp; Rec to Scenario 2</li> <li>• Parks &amp; Rec in Scenario 1 better; not ag</li> <li>• We need new parks and rec building. Love that it is included in Scenario 1.</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefer Rec Center v. Agricultural</li> <li>• Park &amp; Rec in either scenario</li> </ul>

## Parks and Recreation Center

<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any way to carve out a space for a community pool? It would be a great gathering spot for families and seniors.</li> <li>• Indoor track!</li> <li>• Yes to: <u>Rec Facility</u> (w/ teen area) b/c nothing for teens in town</li> <li>• Build Rec Facility w/ revenue, like ForeKicks</li> <li>• Do not like having Park'Rec building on South Campus</li> <li>• This Town needs a pool!</li> <li>• The Parks &amp; Rec should have an ice rink. Give youth something to do, like free skate</li> <li>• Consider building Park &amp; Rec @ Dale. Building new "Dale" school next to Wheelock. Park &amp; Rec should be in the center of town and accessible to all.</li> <li>• Strongly prefer the south side of Hospital Rd be kept open with agricultural use. Do not want Park &amp; Rec Building – extra traffic -- Place on North Campus, Dale. Do not give up the land.</li> <li>• Recreation facility and turf field too costly &amp; extravagant</li> <li>• Please Please Please <u>Park &amp; Recreation</u>. It generates \$\$\$ not art center → Competes with what new Park &amp; Rec can do...</li> <li>• Parks &amp; Rec is key to the equation. An arboretum in the plan would be excellent for the many scout groups in town.</li> <li>• 60,000 SF Rec Center?? You're crazy → We have <u>12,000 people</u>.</li> <li>• The arts center and the Pfaff Center/Parks &amp; Rec could be combined in that they could share some parts of Arts bldg.</li> <li>• No Park'Rec Bldg!</li> <li>• Need new Rec Center! Medfield is a town for families and we can't have the Pfaff Center fall apart!!</li> <li>• It would be great to develop the Charles River to be able to rent kayaks and canoes!</li> <li>• A recreation center is a <u>MUST</u> for a town w/ this many children!!! Why does a building have to be designated to just one category? Couldn't you line the bottom of apartments/ condos w/ commercial storefronts (so that 1 building can be mixed use (coffee shop downstairs, condo upstairs) etc..... enlarge the vision of mixed use</li> <li>• New Park and Rec provides what arts center would – but Arts Center possibly 6 months \$\$\$ Park &amp; Rec 12 months \$\$\$</li> <li>• I prefer greenhouse and am very opposed to recreation facility</li> <li>• Build sports center for <u>Revenue!</u> Fore Kicks, for example</li> </ul>
----------------------------	--

<b>Parks and Recreation Center</b>	
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I support Parks n Rec building but hope they will reconsider scale &amp; location. The land is ideal for agriculture + that has revenue potential two (CSA, farmers mkt, supplying for restaurants, food pantry, &amp; comm. gardens).</li> <li>• Rec Center should have ice skating so teens can do free skate. Healthy activity.</li> <li>• Rec Center should be an option in <u>both</u> scenarios</li> <li>• Rec Ctr! Yes!</li> <li>• Rec Ctr with Revenue! Like ForeKicks or NEFC/GPS Sports Facility</li> <li>• Concern size of Parks &amp; Rec</li> <li>• Parks'n'Rec – smaller scale</li> </ul>

<b>Phasing</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PHASED – South of Hospital Road. Revenue from Agriculture first. Have town master plan deal with it. Why address it immediately. Do agriculture first &amp; plan for Town.</li> <li>• Majority favored # 1 with limits, phases outlined in sectors.</li> <li>• Sell it little by little vs. one big sale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ If we sell – slit w/ state 50/50</li> <li>◦ SAY – keep land in Town Ownership. We would like to keep control so we get the Development we (Town) wants!</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I really need to know about Hinkley &amp; Lot 3 – town owned \$ generated first – then top hill</li> </ul>

<b>Public Access</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does Medfield community access “the Square”? or is it only for MSH residents</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private and assisted living seems to have more access to space than Medfield public. Who's land is it?</li> <li>• Keep the feel of <u>public access</u> to the most beautiful spaces as opposed to surrounding them with private buildings.</li> </ul>

<b>Public Access</b>	
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems like that's all that is here housing. Not town activity sites other than open space around the site.</li> <li>• </li> </ul>

<b>QUAD BUILDINGS</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better use of open space; Better Spacing; Preserve historical (Scenario 1)</li> <li>• Concerned about demolition – not loving it</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• </li> </ul>

<b>QUAD PERIMETER: Western &amp; Northern</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On west side of quad, the group wrote “Commercial” and “Less Housing”; “Lot 3 has overflow housing to meet our needs.”</li> <li>• Prefer Senior Housing plan on west side</li> <li>• Group feels that keeping some portion open for future development is wisest.</li> <li>• Agricultural features vs. Open space. ? use East &amp; West as agricultural use; 50-50 open space (Sc 1) vs agricultural use (Sc 2)</li> <li>• West sides – seniors – depends on type of clientele planned. Use in this senior housing, Memory car vs. over 55. May be neat to leave seniors in the center of the quad if population can use facilities.</li> <li>• Like senior center facing river</li> <li>• Have housing view the river or inn &amp; restaurant.</li> <li>• Back building is in best shape (but demolished...?)</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• </li> </ul>

Scenario 1	
Small Group Comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like Apt/Condo Mix in Scenario 1</li> <li>• Group consensus → Like feel of scenario 1 the most, but trade some housing for dynamic commercial/ retail space. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like future development site</li> <li>• Future Dev – block views a concern</li> <li>• Yes – Sc 1 reflects values</li> <li>• Better placement of services in Sc 1.</li> <li>• Yes Parks + Rec space creates value to overall site and serves community</li> <li>• Yes. Keep land reserved. Need More.</li> <li>• Like the option of future development in north.</li> <li>• Offers some balance; Housing with green; More accessible; Pressure off quad for housing re: SE Quad/ Front Lawn/Approach</li> <li>• We liked the housing in Scenario 2. Why can't diversify be in # 1, e.g., live/work be in #1</li> <li>• Senior living – what does it look – objective; Is it affordable</li> <li>• Majority favored # 1 with limits, phases outlined in sectors</li> <li>• Like senior center facing river. Like bulk of senior housing near senior center on Ice House Road/Hinkley</li> <li>• **</li> <li>• Scenario 1 – Open Quad preserves natural resources + ru. But do you want concerts in your front yard?</li> <li>• Assisted living better location in Scenario 1. General housing needs met in Scenario 1.</li> <li>• We need restaurants, cafes, etc. The group prefers Scenario 1 with adjustments – more commercial and tax revenue. Add a Forekicks-type facility that pays us taxes.</li> <li>• Open space/ agriculture at the north vs. future development</li> <li>• Integrates seniors better. T more housing!</li> <li>• Prefer Scenario 1, appreciate the open quad near the arts center – it's a welcoming space; Prefer the greater open space in Scenario 1. We need a new Parks &amp; Rec bldg. Love that it's included in Scenario 1.</li> <li>• Scenario 1 = green space in middle is key</li> <li>• Generally Like Scenario 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Open Quad</li> <li>◦ Cottages in front</li> <li>◦ Leaving open land in back area</li> <li>◦ But want to swap in some scenario 2 elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Take Inn from #2</li> <li>▪ Expand the Arts area of 1 to be more like # 2</li> <li>▪ Keep senior housing on perimeter space</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Scenario 1										
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lots of gardens for use by all residents</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="409 382 1334 903"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="409 382 616 424"></th><th data-bbox="616 382 1334 424"><b>OPTION #1</b></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="409 424 616 692"><b>LIKE</b></td><td data-bbox="616 424 1334 692"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open Space in square &amp; in general (layout)</li> <li>• Bldg Preserved</li> <li>• 40B Option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Cottages</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Location senior living</li> <li>• Reserved land for later use</li> </ul> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="409 692 616 741"><b>DISLIKE</b></td><td data-bbox="616 692 1334 741"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Agriculture</li> </ul> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="409 741 616 903"><b>MIX</b></td><td data-bbox="616 741 1334 903"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of Parks'n'Rec <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Need for Parks &amp; Rec but scale + Location</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If land primed for agriculture, that's ideal</li> </ul> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>		<b>OPTION #1</b>	<b>LIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open Space in square &amp; in general (layout)</li> <li>• Bldg Preserved</li> <li>• 40B Option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Cottages</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Location senior living</li> <li>• Reserved land for later use</li> </ul>	<b>DISLIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Agriculture</li> </ul>	<b>MIX</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of Parks'n'Rec <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Need for Parks &amp; Rec but scale + Location</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If land primed for agriculture, that's ideal</li> </ul>	
	<b>OPTION #1</b>									
<b>LIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open Space in square &amp; in general (layout)</li> <li>• Bldg Preserved</li> <li>• 40B Option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Cottages</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Location senior living</li> <li>• Reserved land for later use</li> </ul>									
<b>DISLIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Agriculture</li> </ul>									
<b>MIX</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of Parks'n'Rec <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Need for Parks &amp; Rec but scale + Location</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If land primed for agriculture, that's ideal</li> </ul>									
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate more mixed-use in Scenario 1.</li> <li>• Combo 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>• Favor Scenario 1. Pros: Cottages take advantage of valuable space. Senior living not in center of community. Space for future development on north side provides flexibility. Potential to move senior living north to next lot indicate for parking. Prime views there. Great open space in The Square. Recreation facility and turf field too costly &amp; extravagant.</li> <li>• Not in favor of Scenario 1. Commercial space not viable/waste. Senior Living in the epicenter devalues use of the central square. Arboretum wastes valuable space for residential offsetting costs. Agriculture should be on south side, wastes valuable space in this scenario. Group home situated better in Scenario #1. Too much arts space is allocated, heavy expense/ low use.</li> <li>• Please consider: <u>Scenario 1</u> with the following caveats: 1) Consider group home be moved south of Hospital Road. 2) Consider renovation and new additions to existing building instead of all new bldg. Incorporate lobbies, elevators, fire stairwells. 3)</li> </ul>									

Scenario 1	
Individual Comments	<p>Adopt barn/agricultural plan for south of Hospital Road. 4) Shrink arts space allocation a bit. 5) Recreation opportunities will be important to future residents. Highlight trail network. Consider space for tennis courts. Consider a dog park. 6) Have you done a parking study? Can any garage space (outside of quad) be consider for residences? 7) Quad space for outdoor activities per Scenario 1 is valuable. 8) Café might work in any case; other commercial not so sure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• → Scenario One is best for Quad &amp; north of Hospital Hill. → Scenario Two for South Hospital Rd.</li> <li>• .Option 1. Consider Open Space too large. Will only be used by Residents, not Town. No parking and surrounded by apts.</li> <li>• Seniors living near existing Senior Center is a benefit of scenario 1.</li> <li>• Merge option 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>• Senior Separate layout # 1</li> </ul>

Scenario 2	
Small Group Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario 2 better serves Medfield (affordable; seniors; general housing needs)</li> <li>• Scenario 2 preferred</li> <li>• Prefer Scenario 2</li> <li>• More senior housing is a positive. Less appeal is important b/c of strain on school</li> <li>• We support the senior housing placement in Scenario 2.</li> <li>• We support the housing mix in Scenario 2 because less pressure and more opportunity for more seniors to stay in town.</li> <li>• Like café concept in Scenario 2</li> <li>• Like the concept of an inn, gathering spot.</li> <li>• We liked the mixed housing in Scenario 2. Why can't diversify be in # 1, e.g., live/work be in #1</li> <li>• Like Agriculture in Scenario 2 for north. Skeptical commercial what type?</li> <li>• Loses open space to Agriculture lease</li> <li>• Like tax offset (Sc 2)</li> <li>• Scenario 2 spreads seniors out better</li> <li>• Like day care. Better amount of amenities in Scenario 2.</li> <li>• More affordable spread of senior housing.</li> <li>• Gives us more access to open space.</li> </ul>

## Scenario 2

<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favor option 2, but add parks &amp; rec + the density. Make space for historic commission.</li> <li>• Less demolition makes Sc # 2 slightly more favorable on this objective (conserve when feasible site's architectural &amp; cultural history).</li> <li>• Better vicinity for seniors.</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="408 528 1338 1098"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="408 528 1338 580">OPTION # 2</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="408 580 571 770"><b>LIKE</b></td><td data-bbox="571 580 1338 770"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agriculture</li> <li>• 40B Option</li> <li>• Art Space / living</li> <li>• Bldg Preserved</li> <li>• Arboretum</li> </ul> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="408 770 571 865"><b>DISLIKE</b></td><td data-bbox="571 770 1338 865"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of senior living (not in middle)</li> <li>• Feels / looks more dense (layout)</li> </ul> </td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="408 865 571 1098"><b>MIX</b></td><td data-bbox="571 865 1338 1098"> <u>Other ideas:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combine arboretum with cottages</li> <li>• Can Parks &amp; Rec be elsewhere so agr can go in prime space?</li> <li>• If agr goes south side no need for it up at the Quad</li> </ul> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	OPTION # 2		<b>LIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agriculture</li> <li>• 40B Option</li> <li>• Art Space / living</li> <li>• Bldg Preserved</li> <li>• Arboretum</li> </ul>	<b>DISLIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of senior living (not in middle)</li> <li>• Feels / looks more dense (layout)</li> </ul>	<b>MIX</b>	<u>Other ideas:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combine arboretum with cottages</li> <li>• Can Parks &amp; Rec be elsewhere so agr can go in prime space?</li> <li>• If agr goes south side no need for it up at the Quad</li> </ul>
OPTION # 2									
<b>LIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agriculture</li> <li>• 40B Option</li> <li>• Art Space / living</li> <li>• Bldg Preserved</li> <li>• Arboretum</li> </ul>								
<b>DISLIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of senior living (not in middle)</li> <li>• Feels / looks more dense (layout)</li> </ul>								
<b>MIX</b>	<u>Other ideas:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combine arboretum with cottages</li> <li>• Can Parks &amp; Rec be elsewhere so agr can go in prime space?</li> <li>• If agr goes south side no need for it up at the Quad</li> </ul>								
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario 2 → Like mixed use;</li> <li>• Combo 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>• I love scenario #2; Need Senior living; Arts; Rec Center/multi-purpose sports; group living; green space; Why day care? Don't we have enough already?!</li> <li>• Scenario 2 – prefer. Put cottages instead of arboretum – portion of cottages for seniors. *Salt water pool – an asset for all ages. Park &amp; Rec Bldg on south side at snow hill. Laurel Scotli, 10 Green St. Unit 14</li> <li>• → Scenario One is best for Quad &amp; north of Hospital Hill. → Scenario Two for South Hospital Rd.</li> <li>• Liked 2 – Feel open space in the middle will be used more by the residents than the public in scenario 1</li> <li>• Scenario 2 seals off the back of the property for the town?</li> <li>• Merge option 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>• Open Space is better in Scenario 2</li> </ul>								

<b>Senior Housing</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• prefer senior housing plan on west side (scenario 1)</li> <li>• Provide housing for seniors to transition from cottages to assisted living to nursing (to cemetery)</li> <li>• Use in this senior housing, Memory car vs. over 55. May be neat to leave seniors in the center of the quad if population can use facilities.</li> <li>• We support the senior housing placement in Scenario 2.</li> <li>• We support the housing mix in Scenario 2 because less pressure and more opportunity for more seniors to stay in town.</li> <li>• Senior living – what does it look – objective; Is it affordable</li> <li>• Like senior center facing river. Like bulk of senior housing near senior center on Ice House Road/Hinkley</li> <li>• Scenario 2 spreads seniors out better</li> <li>• Artist live space among seniors</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Love integrating the SR housing into the center;</li> <li>• I worry that the existing Senior Center will be a ghost town. Maybe build a new one up on Hospital Hill, and use the current senior center as a day care.??</li> <li>• Cottage housing near Sr. Ctr. should be for seniors.</li> <li>• I like sr. living in the center of the property</li> <li>• Would like the senior living <u>not</u> in the center but off to the side</li> <li>• .Keep senior living on outside – not so central,</li> <li>• Seniors living near existing Senior Center is a benefit of scenario 1.</li> <li>• </li> </ul>

<b>Southeast Quadrant – Arboretum; Cottages....</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefer cottages; Allows for senior housing independently</li> <li>• No arboretum; More cottages</li> <li>• Some cottages instead of arboretum if cost is associated w/ upkeep of grass</li> <li>• Yes: Arboretum + Agriculture</li> <li>• Yes. Open space and Arboretum (Sc 2)</li> <li>• Keep cottage housing &amp; trees</li> </ul>

<b>Southeast Quadrant – Arboretum; Cottages....</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arboretum vs. Cottages, 50—50 on each scenario; Can we keep the cottages and still expand/keep the trees</li> <li>• We support preserving the cottages NOT an arboretum.</li> <li>• Like Arboretum</li> <li>• Cottage development – also preserve small “arboretum” wildflower meadow</li> <li>• Like the cottages</li> <li>• Why not keep cottages (in Sc 2)?</li> <li>• Keep cottages (or Townhouses 50+ age) in both scenarios, plus group home.</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An arboretum in the plan would be excellent for the many scout groups in town.</li> <li>• Arboretum sounds great.</li> <li>• <u>SAVE THE TREES</u> in any and all scenarios!</li> <li>• The cottage/Arboretum area could be denser townhouses (connected) with 2 bedrooms for singles, seniors &amp; small families – this would increase revenue but keep more open space.</li> <li>• Would like to add “Cottages” – maybe with more density to Scenario 2.</li> <li>• Overlap Arboretum &amp; cottages</li> <li>• Both arboretum and cottages.</li> <li>• Arboretum + cottages</li> </ul>

<b>SOUTH OF HOSPITAL ROAD</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sledding Hill keep</li> <li>• Keep some open space for community gardens</li> <li>• No large buildings. No large parking</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenario 1 is better than Option 2 w/ Rec facility</li> </ul>

Taxes	
Small Group Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Individual Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No new taxes</li> <li>• I've been paying taxes for 40 years. Enough is enough. Thanks to the "Town" and the "younger generation" -- I can no longer can survive</li> <li>• Why can't the town give seniors a tax break – instead of spending all the time – You all will be there someday.</li> <li>• Business Park; No new R.E. taxes <u>Enough is Enough!!</u></li> <li>• No Taxes</li> <li>• No new or added R.E. taxes!!!!</li> <li>• Please work <u>VERY HARD</u> to keep taxes low!</li> </ul>

Misc.	
Small Group Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historical Society would like a space on the Hospital.</li> <li>• Maintenance standards; caring; recog history</li> <li>• Net zero energy for all construction</li> <li>• Medfield's values ... let's really consider this and do great things w/ this property</li> <li>• Sounds like change from beginning though. Sounds like more existing buildings can be re-used.</li> <li>• Not totally independent of each (areas). Feel that focusing only on north of Hospital Road hinders decisions. South side has an effect on the rest.</li> </ul>
Individual Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'd like to see a long term plan to build all new schools, campus situation. Is new school every 10 years. Thanks. Randy Dissinger</li> <li>• More <b>Bostoegs</b> # 1</li> <li>• There is still a need for hospitals of all constellations. I would like to see the campus et al to be used in that way.</li> <li>• Need more community spaces. The gazebo by the library isn't enough!</li> <li>• Seems like the "destination" is in someone's neighborhood.</li> </ul>

<b>Overall</b>	
<b>Small Group Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bad Job. FIRE</li> <li>• Marvelous presentation to Community!</li> <li>• Very thorough presentation ☺</li> <li>• Thank you for doing such great job allowing the town to be part of the process</li> <li>• Great presentation! More financial information.</li> </ul>