

In The Matter Of:

*Mandell, et al. v.
Town of Reading*

*Sidney R. Bowen, III
September 28, 2000*

*vol. 1
pp. 1-129*

*Jones, Fritz & Sheehan
A LegaLink Company
210 South Street
11th Floor
Boston, MA 02111
(617) 542-0039*

*Original File 0928BOWE.V1, 129 Pages
Min-U-Script® File ID: 0330579814*

Word Index included with this Min-U-Script®

[1] addresses the fact that the process of review by
 [2] conservation is going to take place, basically.
 [3] It has not been a requirement that you
 [4] complete the notice of intent process and order
 [5] of conditions process but that you simply make a
 [6] presentation to a conservation commission and
 [7] begin the process with them.
 [8] SBA's recognized that these processes
 [9] take time and are not always consistent with
 [10] their schedule, but what they require us to do
 [11] in case of historical and conservation is to at
 [12] least have acknowledgment by the commission that
 [13] they are being included in the process, so we
 [14] were asking for that.
 [15] Q: And that's how you see your request to
 [16] the conservation commission, as asking them to
 [17] notify the SBA as part of the town's submission
 [18] that they are being included in the process?
 [19] A: Yes.
 [20] Q: You do not view the letter that comes
 [21] from the conservation commission as a result of
 [22] your letter as an indication that the project
 [23] will be approved by the conservation
 [24] commission?

[1] A: No. If you may, it's not a question
 [2] of approval or disapproval. It's a matter of a
 [3] notice of intent and an order of conditions.
 [4] It's a process rather than a specific approval.
 [5] In the relationship of a construction
 [6] project with conservation is continuous until
 [7] the project is complete and the order of
 [8] conditions is met by the completed project.
 [9] So it's not so simple as yes, we
 [10] approve; no, we don't approve. It's more what
 [11] do we expect and require of the project during
 [12] its construction.
 [13] Q: I might have asked you this before.
 [14] Has a full traffic analysis been conducted?
 [15] A: A full traffic analysis is underway,
 [16] and it will be completed in early October. The
 [17] work was done this past summer, but because of
 [18] changes in the parking and access schemes on the
 [19] site based on requirements of the town, we've
 [20] asked them to revise some of his information and
 [21] review it again.
 [22] Q: How has the parking scheme changed?
 [23] A: Earlier in the design phase we were
 [24] basically — well, we had half of our parking

[1] spaces on the north side of the site and half on
 [2] the south. They are now roughly three fourths
 [3] south, one fourth north.
 [4] Q: Why was that change necessary?
 [5] A: In order to — well, one of the issues
 [6] with respect to conservation is that this
 [7] project is in an aquifer protection district.
 [8] That means that no more than 20 percent of the
 [9] site can be subject to impervious materials,
 [10] building or parking lot.
 [11] And the first schematic work we had
 [12] done when calculated by civil engineering was in
 [13] excess of 20 percent. So they basically
 [14] required that we review the plan and revise it
 [15] so that we reduce the amount of asphalt. We are
 [16] now at 19.4 percent, and that resulted in a
 [17] change in the way the parking lots were
 [18] developed. So they are different shapes, and as
 [19] a result, different orientation.
 [20] Q: Did it result in a change in the
 [21] amount of parking?
 [22] A: Well, parking's changed about 16
 [23] times. It's been up and down, but it's revolved
 [24] around 50 to 55 spaces for all of discussions,

[1] because that's what the school department
 [2] required.
 [3] Q: Is the new school expandable?
 [4] A: It's possible.
 [5] Q: How would it be possible?
 [6] A: By putting an addition of classrooms
 [7] on it.
 [8] One of the objectives of the school
 [9] administration in Reading when we began this
 [10] project was not to be in a position they found
 [11] themselves in in the other schools we looked at
 [12] of if they wanted to add classrooms, having to
 [13] add core space because that's very expensive.
 [14] So the core spaces in this building
 [15] are designed in such a way that they could
 [16] accommodate basically four more classrooms,
 [17] almost another 80 kids without pushing up
 [18] against the limits of SBA for core space.
 [19] So if in 10 years the town said we
 [20] want four more classrooms in Reading, where will
 [21] we put them, this bidding, at least by current
 [22] standards, is the place you might go because the
 [23] library would be satisfactory, the cafeteria and
 [24] the gym would be satisfactory. Not true in the