

Warrant Article Questionnaire Citizen Petitions Articles

Section III – Questions with Response Boxes – To Be Completed By Petition Sponsor

Article # 32	Date Form Completed:
Article Title: Re-zoning of portions of East Central, Wilson, Grant & Union Streets	
Sponsor Name: George Richards	Email: grichards@southnaticklaw.com

Question	Question
1	Provide the article motion exactly as it is intended to be voted on by the Finance Committee.
Response	See attached proposed Motion.
2	At a summary level and very clearly, what is proposed purpose and objective of this Warrant Article and the required Motion?
Response	To continue and complete a corridor of the Downtown Mixed Use (DM) along East Central Street all the way from Route 27 (Main Street) to Union Street to encourage more mixed use development with retail/business below and housing above.
3	What does the sponsor gain from a positive action by Town Meeting on the motion?
Response	The sponsor's client will be benefit by purchasing 67 East Central Street (currently the Neighborhood Wrench) and hopefully purchasing additional parcels in the area with the intention of redeveloping a portion of East Central Street into a mixed-use project.
4	Describe with some specificity how the sponsor envisions how: the benefits will be realized; the problem will be solved; the community at large will gain value in the outcome through the accompanied motion?
Response	For some unknown reason, all of the properties on the north side of East Central Steet (other than 44-46 East Central and being the St. Patrick's rectory are zoned DM all the way from Main Street (Rte. 27) to Dewey Street while the south side of East Central is only zoned DM from Main Street to Wilson Street. By extending the DM district all the way to Union Street, the zoning will be consistent on both sides of the street and will create a "downtown mixed-use corridor" all the way from Union Street to Main Street and will encourage redevelopment of several under-utilized sites in the this area.
5	How does the proposed motion (and implementation) fit with the relevant Town Bylaws, financial and capital plan, comprehensive plan, and community values as well as relevant state laws and regulations

Warrant Article Questionnaire Citizen Petitions Articles

Response	This implementation of this Motion would be consistent with the proposed redevelopment of the Saint Patrick's site on the south side of East Central and would continue to bring more retail/business uses and desperately needed market rate, affordable housing and retail/service businesses to the downtown area.
6	<p>Have you considered and assessed, qualified and quantified the various impacts to the community such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town infrastructure (traffic, parking, etc.) • Neighbors (noise, traffic, etc.); • Environment and green issues (energy conservation, pollution, trash, encouraging walking and biking, etc.);
Response	The general idea is "smart growth" development with less parking needs due to proximity of train station but assuming each project will have sufficient parking with access/egress on East Central Street to minimize traffic on the residential neighbors nearby. Potential "pocket parks" along East Central will also be considered for environmental benefits, green space and pedestrian/public access with bike racks.
7	<p>Who are the critical participants in executing the effort envisioned by the article motion?</p> <p>To this point what efforts have been made to involve those participants who may be accountable, responsible, consulted or just advised/informed on the impacts of executing the motion?</p>
Response	After meeting with town planners, there was considerable support of the concept and then the sponsor's client later appeared informally before the Planning Board to get the Board's input but the Board will not be having a public hearing on the article until October 13 th .
8	<p>What steps and communication has the sponsor attempted to assure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested parties were notified in a timely way and had a chance to participate in the process, that • Appropriate town Boards & Committees were consulted • Required public hearings were held
Response	The sponsor's client has notified every property owner whose parcel is proposed to be re-zoned and he has received nothing but support from those owners. See answer # 7 re: Boards and committees and/or public hearings.

Warrant Article Questionnaire Citizen Petitions Articles

9	Why is it required for the Town of Natick AND for the sponsor(s)?
Response	Although this article is in NO way required for the town or the sponsor, it simply makes a lot of sense from a planning, financial and community perspective.
10	Since submitting the article petition have you identified issues that weren't initially considered in the development of the proposal?
Response	No but I am sure we will in the future as more stakeholders weigh in.
11	What are other towns and communities in the Metro West area, or the Commonwealth of MA doing similar to what your motion seeks to accomplish
Response	Most nearby towns have found ways to create "downtown corridors" for long stretches where retail, restaurants and businesses can thrive. It only makes sense to allow for residential uses above those uses to help maintain demand for the services as well as to provide those needed services to the residents – creating a win-win situation. When you add in the additional tax revenue from the redevelopment of this area, it is now a win-win-win proposal. Natick is fortunate to already have greater building heights downtown than many surrounding towns which allows for the town to allow greater building heights for residential projects downtown to help make sure the downtown are thrives for years to come.
12	If this Warrant Article is not approved by Town Meeting what are the consequences to the Town and to the sponsor(s)? Please be specific on both financial and other consequences.
Response	The consequences to the town are: 1) status quo will encourage 2 family/duplexes on East Central Street instead of creating a commercial/residential corridor; 2) tax revenue will be significantly less than if rezoned; and 3) an opportunity to obtain many affordable residential units will be lost.

2021 Fall Town Meeting Warrant

ARTICLE 32

Re-Zoning of Portions of East Central Street, Wilson Street, Grant Street and Union Street

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to re-zone the following properties from Residential General (RG) to Downtown Mixed Use (DM) and to amend/update the Town's Zoning Map to reflect the zoning changes:

- 2 Union Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 240);
- 5 Union Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 239);
- 4 Grant Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 219);
- 5 Grant Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 216);
- 6 Grant Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 220A);
- 6 Grant Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 220B);
- 6 Off Grant Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 220C);
- 4 Wilson Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 197);
- 6 Wilson Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 198);
- 44 East Central Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 354G);
- 46 East Central Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 354H);
- 47 East Central Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 196);
- 51 East Central Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 217);
- 57 East Central Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 244);
- 59 East Central Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 243);
- 63 East Central Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 242);
- 67 East Central Street (Assessor's Map 44, Lot 241);