



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

January 25, 2016

LOCATION: Selectmen's Meeting Room, Municipal Office Building

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)
Jennifer Conley, Conley Associates (Traffic Peer Review)
Jeff Walsh, Graves Engineering (Site Peer Review)

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

Minutes:

The December 14, 2015 and December 28, 2015 minutes were presented for approval.

VOTE TAKEN:

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

Minutes: The minutes of the December 14, 2015 and December 28, 2015 meetings were unanimously approved.

Sign Bills:

Mr. Rosen announced the following bills:

- \$204.00 to the Telegram & Gazette for the December 14, 2015 legal notices.
- \$759.00 to Graves Engineering for the Preliminary Site Plan Peer Review.
- **Total = \$963.00**

VOTE TAKEN:

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

Bills: The bills were unanimously approved and signed.

Hearing 1:

4 Hemlock Cir – R.J. Foley

Special Permit & Variance – In-law apartment above attached garage

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

Presentation

- R.J. Foley’s wife, Lisa, and their daughter were present. Mrs. Foley explained that they would like to have an in-law apartment in their detached carriage house. They were told they needed both a Special Permit and a Variance for this purpose, for the in-law status and for the detached structure, respectively.

Board Questions

- Mr. Rosen asked who would be living in the in-law. Mrs. Foley answered, Mr. Foley’s sister. He also checked that the restrictions to do with an in-law were understood: the resident of it must be a blood relative to the owners, it cannot be rented out, and the Special Permit “sunsets” or dissolves with a change in ownership. She agreed those conditions were understood.

Abutters

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

Board Discussion

- None.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Schaetzke moved to approve the Special Permit and Variance for 4 Hemlock Cir. Mr. Gordon seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 1: The Special Permit and Variance for 4 Hemlock Cir were unanimously approved, with the following conditions:

- 1) Only blood relatives of the owners can reside in the in-law apartment.
- 2) The in-law status will sunset with the Foley’s ownership of the home.

Hearing 2:

187 North Quinsigamond Ave – Tony F. El-Nemr

Variance – Construct a single family home (front & side setbacks)

Variance – Construct a cabana (side setback)

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. El-Nemr was present, as was Atty. Richard Ricker to represent him. Engineer Wayne Belec was also present in the audience. Atty. Ricker explained that this is a redevelopment of a house lot. Admittedly, the new house is a good-sized house, but it will be a single family.
- There has been much discussion with the Sewer Commission regarding relocating the sewer easement from inside to outside the lot. It would be barely visible from the street. This property slopes down toward the lake, more than those lots around it. Over the lot length, which is about three hundred fifty (350) feet, it slopes by about thirty (30) feet down to the retaining wall.
- It would be of benefit to the Town to rebuild. There would be a newer, non-asbestos pipe installed, and the tax revenue would be increased. Mr. El-Nemr is contributing to the cost of these improvements. There would be no nuisance value to the neighborhood.

Board Questions

- Mr. Rosen asked about the related memorandum that had been submitted with the filing. Atty. Ricker said the sewer correction was still in process and must happen anyway.
- Mr. Schaetzke asked about the hardship(s). Atty. Ricker replied the impacts were from the slope, the proximity to the lake, and the sewer easement, to which the Town needs access. But Mr. Schaetzke wondered if the hardships were self-created due to the size of the proposed house. Atty. Ricker responded that the required setbacks affect the proposed house's shape.
- Mr. George asked if this would have to go before the Conservation Commission. Yes, and then back before the Sewer Commission.

Abutters

- Ron Malone, 185 N Quinsigamond Ave, said that the previous owner had wanted to build a garage on the property, but the Town stopped him. The foundation was then left there for years. This applicant bought the property, introduced himself to the neighbors, and seems willing to do whatever it takes to improve it. For example, the week after he purchased the property, a work crew was sent in by Mr. El-Nemr to do some clean-up, e.g., trimming trees, etc.

Board Discussion

- Mr. George said that at first he had reservations to do with the sewer connection, but he now understands there are enforcement procedures taking place.
- Mr. Confalone saw it as an improvement.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Gordon moved to approve the Variances for 187 N Quinsigamond Ave. Mr. George seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 2: The Variances for 187 N Quinsigamond Ave were unanimously approved.

Hearing 3:**5 Edgemere Blvd – Christopher Henchey****Variance – Construct a single family home (side setback)**

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. Henchey was present, as was Atty. Richard Ricker to represent him. Atty. Ricker explained that the previous house on this lot was destroyed by a fire in 2011. The new, proposed house would have a better placement on the lot. This lot is impacted by a zone line at the north end of the lot by Hartford Tpke, which requires a fifty (50) foot setback plus a fifteen (15) foot buffer from a public way. However, the lot itself is only seventy (70) feet. Thus, if these setbacks were abided by, nothing would be able to be built there.
- If a house had been built on the lot within two (2) years of the fire, it could have been done by right. But that time limit has expired now.
- There should be no nuisance to the neighborhood; it would be built in keeping with the neighborhood.

Board Questions

- Mr. Rosen and Mr. George asked if the appellant owned the property now. Atty. Ricker said, No, it is bank owned, but under a purchase and sale agreement.
- Mr. George asked if the appellant had spoken to the abutters. No, just to a tenant in a rental nearby.
- Mr. Confalone asked about the footprint of the new house. It will be a little larger.
- Mr. Rosen asked if they would also be before the Conservation Commission. Yes.

Abutters

- None.

Board Discussion

- None.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Gordon moved to approve the Variance for 5 Edgemere Blvd. Mr. Schaetzke seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 3: The Variance for 5 Edgemere Blvd was unanimously approved.

Hearing 4:

206 S Quinsigamond Ave – Shrewsbury Youth & Family Services, Inc.

Use Variance – Convert a portion of building from a place of assembly to office use

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

Presentation

- Thomas Kennedy, Chairman of the Board of Directors and Terry Cassidy, Executive Director, both of Shrewsbury Youth and Family Services (SYFS) were present. Atty. Richard Ricker was also present to represent them. Officers of the Knights of Columbus were also present in the audience.
- This petition represents a use change. The Knights of Columbus is already a non-conforming assembly use. The K of C would like to rent out their upper level for the sole office use of SYFS. SYFS, which is supported by the Town as well, offers quiet, confidential counseling services. Erring on the side of caution, and acting on the recommendation of the Building Inspector, they are requesting a Use Variance rather than a Special Permit.
- For their previous use alone, the Bylaw required seventy (70) parking spaces. For this new proposed use, eight to ten (8-10) spaces would be required, which could easily be accommodated. SYFS is a day use, and K of C is a night use.
- The K of C sent out their own letter informing neighbors of their intentions to rent to SYFS. A copy of the letter was submitted for the Zoning Board as well.

Board Questions

- Mr. George asked how many days a week SYFS would operate. Five and a half days (5 ½) per week, Monday through Friday and occasionally half days on Saturday.
- Mr. Sarcione asked if they would be asking for a parking Variance as well. Atty. Ricker said that they wanted to come ask for the Use Variance first. Mr. Rosen agreed that they would need a parking Variance.
- Mr. George asked if SYFS would be utilizing the entire upper level. Yes.

Abutters

- John Litchfield, with the K of C, submitted a letter in support of SYFS. The K of C will continue to maintain the building.

Board Discussion

- The parking issue was recognized, but as an issue for the Building Inspector to enforce. That is, if parking is not found to be adequate for this use, the Building Inspector will not issue the building permit for the renovations necessary.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Gordon moved to approve the Use Variance for 206 S Quinsigamond Ave. Mr. Schaetzke seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 4: The Use Variance for 206 S Quinsigamond Ave was unanimously approved, with the following condition:

- 1) The Use Variance is restricted to this tenant.
- 2) It will sunset with a change in ownership.

Hearing 5:

196 Main St – Jean Kileen & David Tiberii

Use Variance – Convert a single family home with a former home business to mixed use

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. Kileen and Mr. Tiberii were present, as was Atty. Richard Ricker to represent them.
- Atty. Ricker explained that two home occupations or Special Permits have been on this property before – previously, a pediatric doctor, and lately, a chiropractor (first as Hokanson Chiropractic, then as Health and Wellness Group). This particular home has a divided interior for the family and the business. A home occupation by Special Permit must have no more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the living space devoted to the business. In this case, a Use Variance is requested, since the business space would use approximately thirty-six percent (36%) of the living space.
- They propose to operate a specialty, “Mom and Pop”-type wine and cheese shop. It would be similar to one in another Massachusetts community, which is called “Pairings”. If approved, they would apply to the Board of Selectmen for their beer and wine license. They would like to operate six (6) days a week from 10AM-7PM, or perhaps until 8PM or 9PM.
- They would need some renovations to the building, and they have spoken to the Building Department about it.
- They would live on the side of the house set up for residential use.
- There is already a large parking area. Atty. Ricker suggested that this would be a less intense use as chiropractic appointments can be for fifteen (15) minutes or less.
- This neighborhood is changing. There are already several other businesses nearby.

Board Questions

- Mr. Rosen asked what percentage of the space had been used for Hokanson’s business. About fifty percent (50%).
- Mr. Schaetzke asked if that percentage of prior use was authorized. Atty. Ricker answered that he did not know, but he hoped so.
- Mr. Schaetzke asked if there would be structural changes incorporated with the renovations. In other words, if the living space needed fire proofing from the business due to the building code.
- Mr. Schaetzke followed with what would be the required parking spaces required for this type of use. Atty. Ricker replied, they would need five (5) spaces, two (2) of which would be for the owners. Mr. Schaetzke added that his understanding was that the parking spaces were not properly dimensioned on the parking plan submitted with the application. Atty. Ricker said the parking plan had been revised and submitted the new copy (H5:E1).
- Mr. Schaetzke also asked which day of the week was not included in the desired hours. Sunday.
- Mr. George commented that in another recent Main Street hearing they had conditioned it so that exiting cars could not cross traffic. There was some discussion of this and it was thought that, in this case, it might cause more problems to condition it.
- Mr. Rosen checked that they were only asking for the Use Variance at this time, and that they were planning to come to an agreement with the Building Inspector on the parking lot’s landscaping and screening later. Yes.

- Mr. Rosen suggested this use should sunset with their ownership.

Board Discussion

- There was some discussion as to whether this business could be considered a more or less intense use than the previous business.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Gordon moved to approve the Use Variance for 196 Main St. Mr. Confalone seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 5: The Use Variance for 196 Main St was unanimously approved, with the following conditions:

1. Business hours will operate six (6) days a week (not Sunday) from 10AM-7PM.
2. This business use will sunset with ownership of the home.

Hearing 6:

173 South St – J.E.K.N., Inc.

Variations – 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. Schaetzke.

Presentation

- Peter Normandin, manager of J.E.K.N, Inc. and contractor was present, as was Atty. Richard Ricker and engineer John Grenier to represent him. Site plans were displayed. Atty. Ricker explained they would like to build a common driveway to serve two-three (2-3) houses rather than two-three (2-3) separate driveways. They would ideally like three (3) houses, but this number remains to be worked out with the Town. The common driveway would be three hundred (300) feet long and eighteen (18) feet wide. Three (3) driveways could be built by right; there would be a lot of impervious area and there would be no drainage requirements to adhere to. Three (3) Variations are needed.
- Since the Town requires that a common driveway be one hundred (100) feet from an intersecting roadway, and this driveway would be fifty-five (55) feet from Lamplighter Dr, a Variance is required.
- A second Variance is needed because the grade would be twelve percent (12%), exceeding the maximum of eight percent (8%).
- Third, a Variance for the drainage plan would be needed. Detention basins would be put in place to catch the drainage coming down off South St.
- Mr. Grenier confirmed that three (3) twelve (12) foot wide single family driveways could be put in by right. This would be thirty-six (36) feet wide total for a three (300) hundred foot length. If the common driveway were put in place, the width would be cut in half.
- Mr. Grenier said their engineering planned for just slightly over the one hundred (100) year plan/goal. Thus, the catch basins would catch the majority of runoff for most storm events. He added that Mr. Normandin has already been out doing some site work, and that the site is currently close to what it would be in the end.
- If granted, they would be going back before the Planning Board for a common driveway Special Permit and the drainage would be reviewed.

Board Questions

- Mr. Rosen asked Ms. Sarcione about the peer review proposal for this. Town Counsel determined that this request should be peer reviewed for the drainage issue. Graves Engineering has been chosen.
 - Atty. Ricker commented that apart from what may be found regarding the drainage issue, they would still need to make this request of this Board because of the grade and the proximity to Lamplighter Dr.

- Mr. Gordon commented that a twelve percent (12%) grade seemed too steep. In bad weather, it may be unsafe; one may not be able to stop on a hill or one may roll back. He added he would like to see the drainage calculations presented at the Planning Board.
- Mr. Schaetzke asked why they could not meet a lesser grade. Atty. Ricker said because of the slope of the land. The lower stretch is flatter, however, at about six percent (6 %).
- Mr. Gordon said he thought the grade should be two percent (2%) or less when meeting another road.
 - Mr. Grenier said that is for a regular driveway; a common driveway has different regulations. He also said that to his knowledge a ten percent (10%) grade is allowed in a new subdivision, for example.
- Mr. George followed by asking what the grades were for the existing homes there. Mr. Grenier answered, up to 15%.
- Mr. Confalone asked how many catch basins were planned. Mr. Gordon followed by asking about swales, and Mr. George about preventing runoff going towards Floral St.
 - Mr. Grenier said there will be an asphalt berm and some swales, which will direct runoff toward the basins. The majority of the runoff will head towards South St and will be directed away from Floral St.

Abutters

- Anthony Mastromatteo, 1 Lamplighter Dr, argued that from the beginning this property has been developed irresponsibly. He believes the common driveway will be unsuccessful. The retaining walls have had to be rebuilt several times. Even the snow plows have a hard time; they have hit the fire hydrant there many times. It is already a dangerous intersection, and children get picked up there by the school bus. Attempts to grow grass have failed. He believes it will never stop eroding. He was also concerned that the detention ponds will be a temptation for the children to play in and also become a breeding place for mosquitoes.
 - Mr. Rosen made sure he understood that they could do three (3) driveways without approval.
 - Mr. Mastromatteo encouraged the Board to compare the calculations for the common driveway vs. the three (3) driveways before approving.
- Robert Delauder, 3 Ryan Rd, asked if a previous Variance had already been granted for the back side of Floral.
 - Mr. Rosen clarified, Not before this board.
 - Atty. Ricker said it may have had to do with abandoned Town property near the Floral Street School. Mr. Grenier added that if the common driveway is approved, it will negate the need for a driveway on Floral St.
- Bob Heske, 9 Floral St, asked which of the three (3) lots was in question and if the swales could be explained further. He also asked how large the basin would be.
 - The lot in question is the nearest one to his property, Mr. Grenier replied, explaining the pitches using the site map. The majority of water heads towards South St. Swales would be created towards the back area so that it does not flow towards Ryan Rd. The largest basin would be located down towards South St. It would be four-five (4-5) feet wide.
- Jaime King, 6 Ryan Rd, said these issues had been going on for eight (8) years and had a lot has to do with the grade. Clear-cutting fourteen (14) acres there was not a good idea. Although we have not had a one hundred (100) year storm, there have been issues already. He echoed the safety issues mentioned – that even an SUV could slide into traffic on ice, if the road was not sanded properly. There is a blind corner there and school buses use that route as well. He said these were already documented issues with the Town's Highway Department. New buyers will not know what they are getting in to. There were originally seven (7) lots planned. The project seems not to have an end in sight, especially if Variances keep getting granted against common sense and safety.
 - Mr. Normandin responded that no retaining wall that he has put up has fallen down, although he admitted that there had been some issues with runoff and that we have had the effects of two (2) hurricanes over these past few years.

Board Discussion

- The Town is hiring Graves to do a peer review for the drainage. Town Counsel will be consulted on the building lot question. It was mentioned that the applicant could pay for both of these fees. But Atty. Ricker disagreed with his client paying for Town Counsel's advice.
- Mr. Rosen recommended continuing the hearing.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion 1: Mr. Schaetzke moved to engage the Peer Review process on drainage calculations as outlined in the memo dated 1/18/16. Mr. George seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 6: The Peer Review process on drainage calculations for 173 South St was unanimously approved to proceed.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion 2: Mr. Schaetzke moved to continue the hearing for 173 South St to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. George seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 6: The hearing was continued to February 29, 2016 at 6:30pm at the High School.

Hearing 7:

**440 & 526 Hartford Tpke – Smart Growth Design, LLC – *Continued from 12/14/15 & 12/28/15*
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.

Introductions

- Developer Fran Zarette, Smart Growth Design, LLC, engineer Wayne Belec. Waterman Design, and architect Peter Bartash, Cube 3 Studio were present. Owner Atty. Rod St. Pierre and drainage design engineer Mike Scott was in the audience.

Peer Review Report - Traffic

- Traffic engineer, Jennifer Conley, Conley Associates, provided a summary of the Peer Review on Tetra Tech's traffic report. Her review found that Tetra Tech's data had been collected and adjusted properly, according to industry standards. She reviewed their memo in detail for thoroughness. She also went out four (4) different times to the two (2) intersections. Her findings on queuing and timing were similar to theirs.
 - She found that only one (1) vehicle waited a number of minutes. The distribution pattern changed slightly – when some are not able to take a left turn, they take a right.
 - She also observed a number of the issues relayed by the abutters anecdotally.
 - There is a below average crash rate in this area.
 - Drivers in this area of Massachusetts are known to accept gaps to pull into that are less than the national average.
 - As for minimum sight distance, there is one (1) spot that is slightly deficient. However, this is common in Massachusetts with hilly topography. It would be desirable to locate all driveway access points in visible sightlines. Although some crash history was reviewed by Tetra Tech at the last meeting for the two (2) intersections, she found them to have acceptable sightlines in person.
 - Some considerations:
 - Deceleration at the west driveway tightens, but at minimum standards.
 - The desire for a traffic signal at the west intersection was heard at the previous meeting. If the traffic meets the peak hour warrant, this could be used as access management. There are a number of things that could tip that decision. She did leave a

message for a contact at MassDOT. He was on vacation, but did respond that he would be willing to meet with her about it.

- It would be very helpful if the Town and Town Counsel worked on transportation monitoring for the subsequent data.
 - The stop lines and stop signs are not illustrated on the plans yet, but she was confident that Tetra Tech will work on that.
- Atty. Dan Hill, representing several abutters, asked to comment. He questioned several aspects of the original study and the peer review encouraged another look at these areas of concern, including intersection sight distance (ISD) analysis, the days originally chosen for the trip data counts/analysis and argued they were not adjusted for seasonal variations, how much lower rated the east and west intersections would become in the end if they were already rated lower on the level of service scale. He also repeated what he had said previously – that the decision could be conditioned to have a traffic signal, citing resident safety.
 - Ms. Conley said it is typical to allow the appellant's traffic engineer to respond, but she clarified that trip counts referred to existing conditions and trip generation referred to future conditions.

Presentation – Focus on Site Design, Stormwater, and Interior Circulation

- Wayne Belec explained the project had evolved since it was first filed with MassHousing. Phase 1 was reduced from its original 192 unit to its current 180 units, and Phase 1 was reduced from its original 128 units to its current 100 units. The zoning districts surrounding this property are the commercial, industrial, and residential districts.
- Phase 1:
 - There will be five (5) buildings, of three (3) stories each, containing thirty-six (36) units. There will also be four (4) garages with six (6) bays each, or twenty-four (24) bays total.
 - The parking space requirements are 180 units by one and half spaces each (180 x 1 ½) or 270 spaces total, with dimensions of nine (9) feet by nineteen (19) feet. ADA requirements will also be met, with those spaces placed at the most level grading areas.
 - There will be a two hundred (200) foot driveway in as well as a nineteen hundred (1,900) foot driveway that loops around.
 - This westerly side has eight hundred (800) feet along Route 20 and five hundred thirty (530) feet along Stoney Hill Rd.
 - The zoning district line is located just off the property.
 - The topography goes from a gentle to moderate to steep grade, or from 414 feet to 494 feet.
 - The soils are consistent with the ANR CS data.
 - There is an intermittent stream, which flows east to west. This bifurcates the site. The wetlands are in the lower west corner. Conservation agrees with the delineation.
 - The vegetation is deciduous and evergreen.
 - A property taking is involved on Route 20 for a deceleration lane.
 - There is also an easement plan – secured from an abutter for drainage, utilities, and a sidewalk –which has been recorded at the Worcester Registry of Deeds.
 - There will be a dedicated right in/right out access point.
 - There will be an indigenous trail system.
 - A dumpster on site, near the Route 20 side, will provide trash disposal. A private hauler will be contracted.
 - Grading and drainage will meet the State storm water requirements.
 - A clubhouse will be the central, focal point on a landscaped common, which will be fairly flat with some gentle slopes for ease of maintenance.
 - There will be pedestrian access to this common as well as to the perimeters of the buildings.

- There will be some retaining walls, approximately six to ten (6-10) feet tall depending on the location.
- For drainage, the rooftop and pavement runoff will be collected in catch basins, treated, and put into the ground with a closed pipe drainage system.
- For utilities, involving water, gas, and sewer, there are plans in place. For the water/sewer plan, it will involve a loop system, efficient for flushing the lines.
- For the landscaping around the parking areas, they will meet the minimum five percent (5%) requirement. There will be small islands with landscaping and trees. Everything will be completed by Asian Longhorned Beetle (ALB) certified landscaper and all will be ALB resistant. Examples of the trees to be used are lindens, evergreens, and zelkova, which is a triangular-shaped tree which grows to be 60-70 feet high and which will frame the entryway.
- For lighting, a photometrics analysis has been performed to avoid light pollution. The greater concentration will be on the parking and pedestrian areas, without it spilling over onto the abutting properties. Basically, the lighting fixtures will have a more practical appearance in the parking lot areas, but a more decorative one in the central, common areas.
- Phase 2
 - There will be a six hundred fifty (650) foot length driveway. The grade of this driveway does not exceed five percent (5%) in most areas except when it meets Stoney Hill Rd at which is it eight percent (8%).
 - There will also be a common here with a walkway and plaza/patio area. It will not only be the centerpiece, it will also be a storm water drainage area.
 - There will be a trail around the back of the property.
 - The parking calculation here is one hundred units by one and a half per unit (100 x 1 ½) to equal one hundred fifty-one (151) spaces.
 - The dumpster location was also pointed out on the site plan.
 - The emergency vehicle route was traced on the site plan.
 - For drainage, the wetlands are naturally the low point. There will be catch basins there, along with a two (2) foot high wall along the outside of the northeast area.
 - For landscaping, ALB resistant materials will also be used. They will enhance the detention basins and outer edge areas with landscaping, mainly evergreen.
 - For lighting, a similar photometric plan will be used. The decorative lighting fixtures for the interior common area have a kind of acorn shape.

Waivers

Two (2) waivers are requested for Phase 1, other than the multi-family use:

- A nine (9) foot waiver from the Town's required fifteen (15) foot buffer along a public way. i.e., from a corner of the parking lot to Route 20. This is related to the Route 20 area taking. This helps prevent pushing the project back towards the residences on the abutting street(s). It also helps keep the common area further away from Route 20.
- A nine (9) foot waiver from the Town's required thirty (30) foot buffer from wetlands.

Two (2) waivers are requested for Phase 2, again other than the multi-family use:

- A nine foot (9) foot waiver from the Town's required fifty (50) front setback in the Limited Industrial zone. This is to help keep the buildings away from the wetlands.
- A four (4) foot waiver from the Town's required fifty (50) foot height of building requirement. This would enable them to relocate the mechanical equipment from off the ground to just under the upper roof and still enable them to have a pitched roof, which is more in keeping with New England and less industrial-looking than a flat roof.

Board Questions

- Mr. Rosen asked Mr. Zarette if he could address to the comments/concerns in the MassHousing letter dated 6/17/15 to do with size, scale and density.

- Mr. Zarette said he requested a list of multi-family developments in Town from the Assessor with their data on units, acreage, etc. These included Yorkshire Terrace, Sheridan Apartments, Crescent Street Apartments, Southgate, Madison Place, and the planned Lakeway Commons, which is to be two hundred fifty (250) units on eight (8) acres. These projects' various percentages of units/acreage were listed. For this project, Phase 1's units/acreage equals 17.3% and Phase 2's equals 11.24%, or well within what's required for a multi-family.
- Ms. Las, the Assistant Town Manager and Economic Development Coordinator, added that these densities were in zoning districts where these developments were permitted by right.
- Jeff Walsh, Graves Engineering, who is tasked with the Site Plan Peer Review, briefly highlighted a few of the thirty-two (32) comments itemized in his letter to the Board dated 1/22/16.
 - Mr. Rosen asked Mr. Belec if he had had a chance to review the comments in the letter yet and was prepared to respond to them. However, he had only had a chance to review them briefly and was not prepared to respond.
 - Mr. Walsh asked if he had the authorization to talk with the appellant's design team. Technically, yes, but there should be no findings outside of the Board.
- Ms. Cossette requested more detail on the parking for residents, visitors, and staff, and whether the visitors to the clubhouse could be quantified.
 - Mr. Engler, 40B consultant for the appellant, said that parking ratios have typically been going down lately.
 - Mr. Zarette believed that clubhouse visitors would find adequate spaces during the day while residents are at work.
- Ms. Cossette asked for more detail on snow removal.
 - Mr. Zarette answered that it would be handled efficiently. Residents would be informed when to move their cars for plowing. If excessive, the snow would be hauled off site.
- Ms. Cossette asked how steep the access drives would be in Phase 2. Eight percent (8%) in meeting Stoney Hill Rd, and three percent (3%) in meeting Route 20.
- Mr. Rosen asked if the retention basins would have fencing around them.
 - Mr. Belec said, No, but they propose to put some thorny vegetation around them. Otherwise, they can tend to attract wildlife.
- Mr. Schaetzke commented that on Phase 2's four-story building, there seemed to be no roadway close enough to the building for emergency vehicles.
 - Mr. Bartash responded that a fire truck's hose has a one hundred fifty foot (150) reach, and that no point of the building is over that from either access point on Stoney Hill Rd or Route 20. Usually, most fire departments are comfortable with that.
- Mr. Rosen announced that the focus of the next meeting was to be on Water and Sewer.
- Mr. Gordon asked if they really needed the fourth (4th) story on the one Phase 2 building. He asked if the building could be longer instead and still retain the same unit count.
 - Mr. Zarette argued that other buildings in town seemed to be as tall as what they were requesting, but agreed they could take off the fourth (4th) story if need be.

Abutters

- Atty. Dan Hill, representing several abutters, expressed concerns on a number of issues including whether they had filed with MEPA (not yet), the slope on Phase 2 specifically the eight percent (8%) grade in the access drive meeting Stoney Hill Rd, parking, lot coverage vs. open space, waivers, setbacks, and their wetland filing.
- Joe Taylor, 132 Stoney Hill Rd, said there is an area on the southwest corner of the side where rainstorm runoff overflows and tends to freeze on the sidewalk.
 - Mr. Belec and Mr. Walsh discussed the technical ways the drainage could be tied into the proposed drainage system.
- Judy Vedder, 15 Pheasant Hill Dr, asked more about the height and type of vegetation.

- Primarily a mix of hardy evergreens – Norway pine, Blue spruce, etc. Will comply with the Town's requirements. Approximately ten to fifteen (10-15) feet tall. Spruce is fairly fast growing
- Dale Martin, 6 Pheasant Hill Dr, asked for more on what the view from his home to the site would be since his home is near the parking lot for Phase 2. He also said there is an intermittent stream that does not appear to be drawn on the plans. The Town had even removed a beaver from there at one time.
 - Mr. Belec described what he believed would be his view and defined intermittent vs. perennial streams.
- Steve Danielson, 75 Stoney Hill Rd, asked if the grading plan accounted for additional water runoff coming down from Route 20.
 - Mr. Scott said there will be a berm along much of this area of Route 20. There will be a break in it before the intersection where runoff will be captured in a catch basin and treated on site.
- Scott Payne, 70 Stoney Hill Rd, said MassDOT has plans to widen that area of Route 20 to become a four (4)-lane highway, but that it seems not to be reflected or projected onto the plans.
- John Vedder, 15 Pheasant Hill Dr, expressed concern for the steep grade of Stoney Hill Rd and the life safety issues for emergency access.
 - Mr. Bartash said there would be an NFPA suppression system put in place.

Board Discussion

- Ms. Cosette signed the Mullen Certification letter, as did Mr. Zarette and Mr. Rosen. This attests that she watched the video recording of the December 28, 2015 meeting for which she was unable to attend.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Gordon moved to continue the hearing for the Comprehensive Permit for 440 and 526 Hartford Tpke to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Schaetzke seconded. Motion carried.

Hearing 7: The hearing for 440 and 526 Hartford Tpke was continued to February 29, 2016 at 6:45 PM in The Presentation Room at Shrewsbury High School.

New Business:

193 Boston Tpke & Abutting Parcels – Grossman Development Group – Request for Extension Variance – Implement a site specific signage design

The sign Variance granted in February last year is due to expire on February 27, 2016. With the Lakeway Commons project still due to get underway, Grossman Development Group has requested in writing to be granted a six-month extension.

VOTE TAKEN:

Motion: Mr. Schaetzke moved to grant the six-month extension for the sign Variance for 193 Boston Tpke and abutting parcels. Ms. Cossette seconded. Motion carried.

New Business: The Variance extension for 193 Boston Tpke and abutting parcels was unanimously approved. The Variance is now due to expire on August 27, 2016.

Old Business:

Master Plan Update

The Master Plan Steering Committee will meet January 28, 2016 to plan for the hearing before the Planning Board on February 4, 2016. They will also be before the Board of Selectmen in February, although no specific date is set yet. Once adopted, implementation will be discussed.

Correspondence:

None.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00PM.

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