



TOWN OF SHREWSBURY
Richard D. Carney Municipal Office Building
100 Maple Avenue
Shrewsbury, Massachusetts 01545-5398

February 29, 2016

LOCATION: The Presentation Room, Shrewsbury High School

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ron Rosen, Chair
Paul George, Clerk
Fred Confalone
Melvin Gordon
Dale Schaetzke
Lisa Cossette, Associate Member

STAFF PRESENT: Matthew Sarcione, Assistant Town Planner

CONSULTANTS PRESENT: Atty. Paul Haverty, Blatman, Bobrowski, Mead & Talerma, LLC (40B)
Jeff Walsh, Graves Engineering (Site Peer Review)
Annabelle Dally, Conley Associates (Traffic Peer Review)
Justine Carroll, Tata & Howard (Water Peer Review)

Mr. Rosen opened the meeting at 6:30PM and reviewed the procedures.

Minutes:

The January 25, 2016 minutes were presented for approval.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. George moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Schaetzke seconded. Motion carried.

Minutes: The minutes of the January 25, 2016 meeting were unanimously approved.

Sign Bills:

Mr. Rosen announced the following bills:

- \$305.77 to *Telegram & Gazette* for January 25, 2016 legal notices.
- \$6,200.00 to Conley Associates for Traffic Peer Review for Comprehensive Permit, 440 & 526 Hartford Tpke.
- \$6,622.20 to Graves Engineering - Site Plan Peer Review for Comprehensive Permit, 440 & 526 Hartford Tpke
- **Total = \$13,127.97**

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Schaetzke moved to approve the bills. Mr. George seconded. Motion carried.

Bills: The bills were unanimously approved and signed.

Mr. Sarcione noted that the peer review bills were not paid for by the Town, but were paid out of an escrow account set up by the Town using the Comprehensive Permit applicant's funds.

Hearing 1: Continued from 1/25/16

173 South Street – J.E.K.N., Inc.

Variances – Common driveway (grade, location, & drainage)

Mr. Rosen read the legal notice into the record. Other acting Board members included Mr. Confalone, Mr. George, Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Schaezke.

Presentation

- Peter Normandin, manager and contractor of J.E.K.N, Inc. was present, as was Atty. Richard Ricker and engineer John Grenier to represent them. Site plans were displayed.
- Atty. Ricker reminded the Board that they had been before them at the last meeting to request a common driveway, which would require three (3) Variances – 1) for the curb cut to be fifty-five (55) feet from the centerline of Lamplighter Dr, rather than the required one hundred (100) feet, 2) for a twelve percent grade (12%), rather than the required grade of eight percent (8%) or less, and 3) which would require post-development drainage in the event of a one hundred (100) year storm. They could put three (3) driveways in by right. However, the three (3) Variances are needed because of their request for a common driveway.
- He explained that their engineering information had been peer reviewed at their expense. He reiterated the topography as the hardship with this site.
- He also reiterated that although one (1) lot is in question due to whether it has enough frontage, their request for the common driveway is still applicable to the other two (2) lots.

Board Questions

- Mr. Gordon commented that the hardship is self-created by the applicant by choosing this property.
 - Atty. Ricker argued that it is the slope of the hill and the drainage issues caused by it that are the hardships.
- Mr. Rosen asked what the hundred (100) year storm ramifications would be if it were not granted.
 - Mr. Grenier said he had calculated the drainage system to hold for a majority of storms, including a twenty-five (25) year storm. Basically, the detention basins need to be down grade to be most effective, and there are limited spots to capture run-off/place them. There are three (3) planned. Predicting the effects of a one hundred (100) year storm can be difficult. With three (3) driveways, or with double the pavement, there are no requirements for holding the drainage back. Without the drainage requirements in place, he predicts about three and a half (3 ½) cubic feet of water per second (CFS).
 - Mr. Rosen asked him clarification. Their drainage plan would reduce the overall volume for all storm events including the higher peak event of a one hundred (100) year storm, by just under three (3) CFS.
 - Mr. Rosen remained unconvinced regarding the one hundred (100) year storm event issue.
 - Atty. Ricker admitted there were safety issues involved, but that the common driveway was the best alternative engineering-wise.
 - Mr. George asked if they had a plan to prevent run-off toward the neighbors down grade if the Variances were not granted. They had no current plans regarding that.

Abutters

- Dan Morgado, Town Manager, 11 Concord Rd, who had submitted a letter to the Board prior to the meeting, requested that Mr. Rosen read it into the record. Mr. Morgado then summarized that the Board was basically being asked to approve something poor because otherwise the developer would do something worse.

- Atty. Ricker responded that “the horse is out of the barn”. This property will be developed either way. The Town can ignore it or it can recognize it and can help the process.
 - Jaime King, 6 Ryan Rd, said there was no excuse for the appellant’s team not having fully thought out the answers to the questions raised on the possible effects. He said he would rather know if the third lot was to be developed or not; knowing that still pertained to the discussion.
 - Atty. Ricker reminded him that the third lot decision was outside of their purview at this time.
- As there were no additional comments from the public, the hearing was closed.

Board Discussion

- Mr. George commented he was not in favor of this appeal.
- Mr. Schaetzke added that the hardship was self-created.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Schaetzke moved to deny the Variances for 173 South St. Mr. George seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 1: The Variances for 173 South St were unanimously denied.

Hearing 2:**224-228 South Quinsigamond Avenue – Joseph Kvaracein
Variance – Construct a barn (accessory use in front yard)**

Mr. Rosen read the legal notice into the record. Other acting Board members included Mr. Confalone, Mr. George, Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Schaetzke.

Presentation

- Mr. Kvaracein was present, as was his son, Jeff Kvaracein. Jeff explained that his father would like to put a fancy barn or garage on the property, which would fit the neighborhood. There had been one there about eighty years ago. It would be well within the setbacks as that is an undeveloped area of the lot. However, the hardship is that when one lives on the lake, the front yard/back yard is reversed. One cannot have an accessory structure in one’s front yard (street side), but when one is on the lake that is generally considered one’s back yard.

Board Questions

- Mr. George asked what it would be used for. Storage for vehicles/boats, lawn mower, etc.
- Mr. Rosen asked if they had a set of plans to show them what it would look like. Yes. (Submitted as H2:E1-3.)
- Mr. Gordon asked if the plans had been submitted to the Building Inspector yet. No, she has seen them, but they have not been filed there yet.
- In looking at the plan, Mr. George asked what the second floor would be used for. Storage. Mr. George clarified there would be no living space. Not now, but there could be in future.
- Mr. Gordon asked if they had spoken to their neighbors. Yes, some of them are here and they seem OK with it.
- Mr. George asked how they would have access to it. From the lake side, not the street side.

Abutters

- Ken Polito, 8 Tatassit Cir, spoke in support.
- Stephan Rodolakis, 11 Coachman Ridge and 2 Tatassit Cir, also spoke in support. He thought the lot was unique, and that the soil conditions and topography would not allow the barn elsewhere on the lot. He had also seen the plans and thought it would be an improvement.
- As there were no additional comments from the public, the hearing was closed.

Board Discussion

- The hardship was seen as the typical front yard vs. rear yard one due to lake proximity.

- No one thought it would detract from the neighborhood.
- It should not be used as living space.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Schaetzke moved to approve the Variance for 224-228 South Quinsigamond Ave, with one (1) condition. Mr. George seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 2: The Variance for 224-228 South Quinsigamond Ave was unanimously approved, with the following condition:

- 1) The barn may not include any living space.

Hearing 3:

33 Venus Drive– Rev. Dr. Susan L. DeHoff

Special Permit Renewal – Home occupation (tutoring & pastoral counseling)

Mr. Rosen read the legal notice into the record. Other acting Board members included Mr. Confalone, Mr. George, Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Schaetzke.

Presentation

- The Rev. Dr. DeHoff was present to request renewal of her Special Permit to operate a home tutoring and pastoral counseling occupation.

Board Questions

- Mr. Rosen asked if she was requesting any changes at all, i.e., in hours, etc. No.
- Mr. Gordon asked Mr. Sarcione if the Town had received any complaints to do with the business. Mr. Sarcione said, No, not to his knowledge.
- Mr. Schaetzke acknowledged that she was making her request early, i.e., before it expired.

Abutters

- As there were no comments from the public, the hearing was closed.

Board Discussion

- Mr. George echoed Mr. Schaetzke’s comment by remarking that she was how responsible by returning to the Board to make her renewal request before the Special Permit expired.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Schaetzke moved to approve the Special Permit renewal for 33 Venus Dr with one (1) altered condition. Mr. George seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 3: The Special Permit renewal for 33 Venus Dr was unanimously approved, with the following condition:

- 1) All previous conditions will remain.
- 2) It will now sunset with her ownership.

Hearing 4:

476 Boston Turnpike – BW-Shrewsbury Operations, LLC

Special Permit– Outdoor food service

Mr. Rosen read the legal notice into the record. Other acting Board members included Mr. Confalone, Mr. George, Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Schaetzke.

Presentation

- Scott Neri, Regional Manager of Buffalo Wild Wings, was present to represent the applicant. Mr. Neri informed the Board that they had been before the Board of Selectmen last Tuesday and were approved for their request. They would like to now provide outdoor seating. This would not be additional seating, but alternative seating to allow customers to enjoy the view. They are proposing no

entertainment and no parking changes. He submitted four (4) pages (H4:1-4) showing the site designed with the proposed outdoor seating area and building façade/elevations.

Board Questions

- There was some confusion on how adding outdoor seating would not increase the total number of seats they have/are allowed. Several board members asked clarifying questions, including Mr. Rosen and Mr. Gordon. Mr. Neri explained that an employee at the front of house is tasked with the job of counting those who enter with a clicker. They are currently used to doing this and do it at their other locations as well. This way, their total capacity will not be exceeded. If near capacity, the next potential customer must wait for a customer to leave before they can enter.
- Mr. George asked if there would be wait service provided to these tables. Yes, it would not be a self-service arrangement.
- Mr. Rosen asked if the outdoor area would have direct access to the parking lot. No, only in an emergency. The usual flow will be via the front door only.
- Mr. Gordon said his concern was for parking and overflow onto the street. Mr. Neri responded that he has not seen parking issues in the street for a long time, nearer to the time they first opened.
 - He added that Shrewsbury's outdoor area will have a shorter season than their other locations, which have outdoor heaters.
- Mr. Gordon asked how high the fence surrounding the seating area will be. Mr. Neri was unsure of the exact height, but figured it would be four (4) feet.
 - Mr. Sarcione assured them that the Building Inspector would ensure it was up to the code requirement.
- Mr. Gordon asked if there would be enough bathrooms. Mr. Neri said, Yes, because the overall occupancy/capacity will not be changing. Fifty-six (56) seats will be outside during the season.
- Mr. Gordon asked when they tended to be at their busiest. Mr. Neri answered, usually in December, January, and March or at the height of football season and March Madness.
- Mr. Gordon asked about the proposed hours. They would be the same as they are now for the interior seating, which is Monday-Saturday until 1:30am, with the last seating/service occurring no later than 12:30am, and on Sunday with an hour earlier shift, i.e., closing at 12:30am, with the last seating/service occurring no later than 11:30pm.

Abutters

- Purvi Patel, 6 Hawkrigde Rd, asked on which side of the building the outdoor seating would be. Mr. Neri replied, On the Route 9 side, right underneath where the sign is. She commented that people still park on the street and it is hazardous. She also commented that it was noisy at night.
 - Mr. Gordon asked if she had contacted the police regarding the street parking situation. No. He encouraged her to do so in future if she was still concerned.
 - Mr. Neri admitted that it had been "insane" upon opening. They had the largest first day in Shrewsbury out of all of their locations, with eleven hundred (1,100) customers visiting. But he said it has not been that busy for some time now.
- Mr. Gordon asked what their main demographic was. The first category is males eighteen to forty-five (18-45) years of age; the second is families.
- As there were no additional comments from the public, the hearing was closed.

Board Discussion

- There was some discussion as to a possible condition on hours. It was decided no conditions were necessary as long as their total occupancy count was met, as Mr. Neri assured them it would be.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Schaetzke moved to approve the Special Permit for 476 Boston Tpke. Mr. George seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 4: The Special Permit for 476 Boston Tpke was unanimously approved.

Hearing 5:**1 Hawkridge Road – Sujatha Kannan
Special Permit Renewal – Home occupation (spa)**

Mr. Rosen read the legal notice into the record. Other acting Board members included Mr. Confalone, Mr. George, Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Schaetzke.

Presentation

- Ms. Kannan was present to request renewal of her Special Permit to operate a home spa.

Board Questions

- Mr. Rosen asked if she was requesting any changes at all, i.e., in hours, etc. No.
- Mr. Gordon asked Mr. Sarcione if the Town had received any complaints to do with the business. Mr. Sarcione said, No, not to his knowledge.
- Mr. Sarcione asked for more specificity on her hours of operation. She replied that she actually works less than she used to – more like three to four (3-4) hours – because she has two children now.

Abutters

- As there were no comments from the public, the hearing was closed.

Board Discussion

- As there had been no complaints, the suggestion was to extend the time limit now.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Schaetzke moved to approve the Special Permit renewal for 1 Hawkridge Rd with one (1) altered condition. Mr. George seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 5: The Special Permit renewal for 1 Hawkridge Rd was unanimously approved, with the following condition:

- 1) All previous conditions will remain.
- 2) It will now sunset with her ownership.

Hearing 6:**14 Shannon Drive – Padmini Nagarajan
Special Permit – Home occupation (retail floral business)**

Mr. Rosen read the legal notice into the record. Other acting Board members included Mr. Confalone, Mr. George, Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Schaetzke.

Presentation

- Ms. Nagarajan was present. She explained that she would like to become a selling agent for a floral supplier in New York. There would be weekly orders based on her customers' requests, which would result in one (1) UPS delivery weekly. Her customers would come to pick up their orders Friday night and Saturday morning.

Board Questions

- Mr. George asked if she had spoken to her neighbors. Yes, about four to five (4-5) of them, and they were OK with it.
- Mr. Gordon asked if there would be storage. No, none. She will only have what is based on orders. If something is not picked up, she will donate it to the nearby temples.
- Mr. Rosen asked if she would have any employees. No, she will order items herself online.
- Mr. Gordon asked how the customers will choose their orders, via an online catalog? Yes.
- Mr. Rosen asked what she predicted for volume. She was unsure. She said to start it is simply based on her interest, and it would be a trial run. Although she knows that it is happening in other states.

These are for tropical flowers which are generally not available here and are usually used for religious purposes.

- Mr. Schaetzke clarified that it would be one (1) delivery per week and followed with how many vehicles she might anticipate picking up orders. Five to ten (5-10) cars per week.
- Mr. George asked if she really needed the Friday night pickup timeframe to be until 9:30PM, as stated on her application. She was hoping for a maximum window of opportunity for the customers.
- Mr. Gordon suggested a short sunset period, such as two (2) years.
- Mr. Confalone expressed a concern for her having a number of vehicles there at once. She did not anticipate that.
- Mr. Rosen, who was not in favor of it himself, agreed with the idea of a two (2) year time limit to be able to check in on how the business was affecting the neighborhood. He also had a concern for the 9:30PM pickup window and suggested 8PM instead.

Abutters

- Derek Grillo, 16 Shannon Dr, asked if there would be any signs advertising the business. No. He also suggested re-considering a shorter time limit - e.g. one (1) year or even six (6) months - based on concerns about the pickup timeframes, more traffic being added to the street when children are playing, and having to wait two (2) years if there are problems associated with it.
- Mr. Sarcione reported he had received a phone call from an abutter in opposition because of concerns for the pick-up hours and additional traffic.
- As there were no additional comments from the public, the hearing was closed.

Board Discussion

- Mr. George suggested conditioning the customer pick-up hours.
- Mr. Schaetzke suggested no condition on volume to allow her the freedom to grow the business.
- Mr. Gordon suggested it be conditioned that she be the only employee.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. George moved to approve the Special Permit for 14 Shannon Dr with three (3) conditions. Mr. Confalone seconded. Mr. Rosen opposed. Motion carried.

Hearing 6: The Special Permit for 14 Shannon Dr was approved 4-1, with the following conditions:

1. Customers may only come to the house for pick-up during the hours of Friday 6:00pm-8:00pm and Saturday 11:00am-1:00pm.
2. She will be the only employee.
3. There will be a one (1) year time limit. To operate past the first year, she must return to the Board to request a renewal.

Hearing 7:

**440 & 526 Hartford Tpke – Smart Growth Design, LLC – *Cont'd from 12/14/15, 12/28/15, & 1/25/16*
Comprehensive Permit – Construct a 280-unit, multi-family apartment community**

Mr. Rosen read the legal notice into the record. Other acting Board members included Mr. Confalone, Ms. Cossette (serving for Mr. George, who recused himself), Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Schaetzke.

Announcement

- Mr. Rosen announced that an extra meeting for this hearing only has been added to the Zoning Board schedule. It will be on March 21, 2016 at 7PM in the Selectmen's Room at Town Hall.

Introductions

- Developer Fran Zarette, Smart Growth Design, LLC, engineer Wayne Belec. Waterman Design, architect Doug Carr, Cube 3 Studio, and traffic engineer Courtney Jones (for Nancy Doherty), Tetra Tech, were present. Owner Atty. Rod St. Pierre and 40B consultant Bob Engler were in the audience.

Presentation

- Mr. Zarette explained that since the water testing and the water and sewer peer review were not yet complete, they intended to focus on site plan and traffic wrap-ups from the previous meetings. Based on the feedback given, site changes have been made to both.

Site Plan

- Mr. Belec reviewed the site design changes. By either eliminating or shifting the location of the buildings, there is no longer a need for any of the previously discussed dimensional waivers for either phase of the project. Only the one (1) use waiver for multi-family zoning will be needed at this point. The site plan was displayed and the waivers no longer required were reviewed, then the modifications were itemized.
 - **Phase 1**
 - A reduction in density has been accomplished by reducing the number of buildings from five (5) to four (4) and the number of units from one hundred eighty (180) to one hundred fifty-six (156), or by eliminating twenty-four (24) units.
 - More green space has been achieved.
 - Parking has been increased to two hundred fifty-eight (258) spaces, or using the formula of 1.5 spaces x 156 units (=234) + 24 in the parking garages.
 - **Phase 2**
 - A reduction in density has been accomplished by creating two (2) buildings instead of three (3) and in eliminating the fourth floor originally planned for what is Building 2. What was one hundred (100) units, has now become ninety-two (92) by eliminating eight (8).
 - According to Graves peer review, the grade of the access drive has been leveled out. This has accomplished twenty percent (20%) more spaces for visitor parking.
- Mr. Carr offered more detail on the site changes.
 - **Phase 1**
 - In reducing the five (5) buildings to four (4), twelve (12) of the eliminated units were evenly distributed to the remaining buildings by adding three (3) per building.
 - More green space helps create a more pedestrian-friendly atmosphere.
 - **Phase 2**
 - In dropping the roofline from four (4) stories to three (3), eleven (11) feet in height were eliminated.
 - Eight (8) units were eliminated from the fourth floor. Where there had been five buildings with thirty-six (36) units each - to equal one hundred (100) units - there are now four buildings with thirty-nine (39) units each - to equal one hundred fifty-six (156) units.
 - He also commented that he had never been involved with a 40B project that had been waiver-free.

Board Questions

- Mr. Rosen asked about the mix of bedrooms.
 - Ten percent (10%) are 3-bedrooms.
- Ms. Cossette asked for more about the parking formula as it relates to the mix of bedrooms.
 - According to the industry standard for apartment building with a large number of units, they would need to provide 1.23 spaces per unit. The one (1) and three (3) bedroom units offset each other. They are providing ten percent (10%) more visitor spaces overall, or twenty percent (20%) more over the 1.5 x unit formula.

- Mr. Belec added that what the waivers did was provide more space between the buildings. In Phase 2, what were Buildings 1 and 2, have become Building 1, which is now L-shaped. What was Building 3, has now become Building 2.
- Mr. Rosen asked if the site plan peer reviewer had seen these latest changes. No, not yet.
- Mr. Haverly advised the Board that they should not be looking for the plan to have the least amount of waivers, but to have the best site design.

Traffic Response

- Courtney Jones reminded the Board that Tetra Tech's original presentation had taken place on 12/14/15. It had then been peer reviewed by Conley Associates at the 1/25/16 meeting. Since then traffic modifications have been made. They proposed two (2) options, both of which are viable and would require more review by the State and the Town.
 - Option 1 - at Stoney Hill Rd west and Phase 1 - is to taper to facilitate a right turn. This would enhance the sight lines, but not bring about a traffic signal. They met with MassDOT, but the idea of the traffic signal was rejected again due to not enough volume out of Stoney Hill Rd, the steep roadway grade, and the presence of the auxiliary truck lane.
 - Option 2 – at Stoney Hill east and Phase 2 - is to have a traffic signal. There would be two (2) through lanes for two hundred fifty (250) feet, a left turn lane and a crosswalk at Route 20. MassDOT said they would consider the traffic signal if the intersection were restricted to a right in/right out on west, and a deceleration lane would no longer be provided.
 - During the AM peak hours, approximately eighty (80) vehicle trips – or about one (1) trip per minute - would be pushed from the west end to the east end. During the PM peak hours, approximately seventy-eighty (70-80) vehicle trips would also occur.
 - A memo was submitted providing an overview of both options.

Board Questions

- Ms. Cossette asked about Option 1 and the originally planned long deceleration lane. Mr. Belec answered that a quarter of its five hundred feet would become the taper zone.
- Mr. Rosen asked if Conley Associates had a response. They will review the memo submitted.
- Mr. Gordon asked who would be building the development. Mr. Zarette answered that he did not know yet.
- Mr. Schaetzke thought that the work-around of Option 2 would just make the situation worse and did not understand why the State did not recognize that.

Abutters

- Dale Martin, 6 Pheasant Hill Dr,
 - We would have to drive to the east end of Stoney Hill to make left turn? Yes.
 - Would there be a left turn lane from Stoney Hill to Route 20. No.
 - Had concern for longer wait time, if there is already wait time. Asked what the queuing projections would be.
 - Ms. Jones said they have submitted a memo to Town and for peer review. It would then be fine-tuned through the process and with MassDOT.
 - He recommended that the peak AM hours be shifted to earlier, e.g., 6:15 AM range, and the school buses come around 6:40AM.
- Scott Payne, 70 Stoney Hill Rd,
 - Although there are plans to widen Route 20, it doesn't make a lot of sense since some of the businesses sit very close to it already.
 - It was still questioned as to why the project would have to increase the impact on Stoney Hill and the surrounding neighborhood and not absorb it itself.
 - Playing with the traffic count numbers is misleading. It does not seem to get at the second order effects or impact.
 - Why are we not hearing from the commercial businesses in the area?

- Mr. Rosen confirmed that they had been notified of the hearing.
- Steve Danielson, 75 Stoney Hill Rd
 - Would still prefer a west end light.
 - Said he did not like either option. Also, that Option 2 does make a lot of sense for the natural traffic flow. He predicted that drivers would speed through the neighborhood. Given that, he would prefer not to have an east end light and to still have the access and/or reduce the density.
 - Questioned why the traffic signal was not recommended for the west end because of the slope, yet the Route 9 traffic signal at South St has a steep slope. He encouraged them to gather more information on it and to compare the grades involved.
 - Ms. Jones said she was not familiar with that traffic signal, but she knows that MassDOT sees the slope factor as undesirable.
- Peter Reilly, 19 Pheasant Hill Dr,
 - Was not sure promoting walking on Route 20 was wise.
 - Mr. Rosen informed him it was a Mass Highway requirement.
 - Said he does not have an issue with the project being a 40B, but with the size of the development planned for the plot of land.
- Ken Manning, 26 Stoney Hill Rd,
 - Asked the distance from the Stoney Hill east entrance to Phase 2. Sixty (60) feet to edge of pavement.
 - Was there a discussion about lowering speed? No, that is set by MassDOT.
 - Will Phase 1 and 2 be constructed at the same time? Mr. Zarette said it will be market-driven.
- Paul George, Zoning Board (not serving for this hearing), 2 Rice St,
 - In regard to the traffic light, would it increase the speed? No, but the Centech traffic signal will be coordinated.
- Maurice Depalo, Selectman, 18 Willard St,
 - Asked if the eighty additional trips were all generated from the development.
 - Ms. Jones said about half are and the other half would be from Phase 1
 - He also asked if Phase 2 would be needed in order to trigger the traffic signal.
 - Ms. Jones said the data was always considering that both phases would be completed.
 - Mr. Zarette said there would most likely be a tipping point. However, he assumed that if only Phase 1 was built, it would not be enough to trigger the traffic signal.
- Suzanne Remington, 73 Stoney Hill Rd,
 - Said both Option 1 and 2 are bad for different reasons. The project seems crammed in. The morning peak traffic time is also when the children are waiting for the bus, so re-routing the cars is a big concern for child safety.
 - Mr. Gordon and Ms. Cossette reminded her this was not a typical subdivision project and that neither traffic option seemed very attractive. However, even if considerable modifications made, there will still be an impact on the neighborhood.
- Jose Reyes, 5 Pheasant Hill Dr,
 - Had concerns for density, snow storage, and parking, especially for the potential for cars parking on Stoney Hill.
 - Mr. Belec said that for the larger storms the snow would be hauled off-site.
 - Asked for clarification on the re-routed traffic count – whether the extra 80 vehicles included Phase 2 traffic. Ms. Jones, No.
 - Asked if the decision could be conditioned on future conditions? No.
 - Asked whose decision it would be between Options 1 and 2 to decide on the traffic signal – the developers? the Board?
 - Mr. Haverty said it is ultimately MassDOT's decision.

- Joe Taylor, 132 Stoney Hill Rd,
 - Said the latest information seemed to contradict the MassDOT warrant requirements to support a traffic signal. Traffic is already bumper to bumper, one cannot take a left turn easily at all.
 - Ms. Jones responded that when they first spoke to MassDOT, there was not enough volume on Stoney Hill to support a light. But they tried to think of what they could do. Reassigning the traffic is a trade-off. Peak hours of 7-9AM and 4-6PM are very typical traffic study hours.
- Ken Mangan, 74 Summer St,
 - Do the traffic numbers given reflect the reduction in units? No, they still reflect the two hundred eighty (280) units.
- Guo Wenxuan, 93 Stoney Hill Rd,
 - Previously lived in a complex in Northborough where snow removal had to be coordinated with the residents – there would be a knock on the door and they would have to move their car to a neighboring street. So he was concerned for the potential for cars parking on Stoney Hill.
 - He was also concerned about waiting to enter Route 20 by going from the east end to the west end.
 - The interval of the light would greatly affect the queuing.
 - Ms. Jones said that the cycle lengths or “splits” would be fine-tuned and coordinated with the Centech signal. That will really be the determining factor for cycle length.
 - Are flashing lights/stop signs possible at the Stoney Hill crosswalks?
 - Ms. Jones said “flashing warning beacons” are subject to industry standards and MassDOT as well.
 - He asked about what might happen should someone take an illegal left turn at the right only intersection.
 - Ms. Jones said it would be an enforcement issue.
 - Mr. Belec added that the mountable island for fire apparatus there would also help restrict access to do that.
- Dave Mercuri, 108 Stoney Hill Rd,
 - How will the Board finalize its decision?
 - Mr. Rosen and Mr. Gordon replied that the peer reviewers will contribute their reports and that it will need to be decided within one hundred eighty (180) days per State regulation, unless the applicant is willing to agree to more time.
 - He encouraged more discussion about the traffic issue with MassDOT.
 - Mr. Rosen and Ms. Jones assured him it was an ongoing process.
- Greg Sinotti, 95 Stoney Hill Rd,
 - Asked when the one hundred eighty (180) days had started.
 - Mr. Sarcione answered it started on the date they opened the hearing, 12/14/15.
 - Had a concern for the spacing distance between traffic signals on Route 20.
- Brian Hansen, 4 Pheasant Hill Dr,
 - Were there ever stop signs on either end of Stoney Hill? No one knew.
- Mr. Zarette responded that since the traffic signal had been brought up numerous times by the neighborhood, they had tried to find a way to work with the State to get them to agree to one although the crash data does not support the intersection being unsafe. This will cost over one (1) million dollars to accomplish, and will involve a lot of coordinating. It may not be ideal, but these are two (2) new options that were not available before. With a traffic signal, there is more of a chance to get out onto Route 20 than there is currently. Also, all neighborhoods have some traffic flow from drivers who don't live there. They had met with Joe Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools, who also had asked for a reduction in the number of units. So although MassHousing had originally approved the site for three hundred (300) units; they have now reduced that count by fifty-two (52) units to two hundred

forty-eight (248) units. Due to the reduction in units, their water and sewer report must be revised and re-submitted for peer review. He added that concessions are not usually made in an unfriendly 40B.

- As there were no additional comments from the public, the hearing was closed.

New Business:

None.

Old Business:

Master Plan Update

The Master Plan Steering Committee will be before the Planning Board on March 3, 2016, to ask them to adopt the Master Plan as drafted. Once adopted, implementation will follow.

Correspondence:

None.

The meeting adjourned at 9:42PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

Michele M. Bowers, Administrative Assistant

Reviewed by,

Matthew Sarcione, Assistant Town Planner

Approved by vote of the Board,

Paul M. George, Clerk