



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

May 9, 2016

**LOCATION:** Selectmen's Room, Town Hall

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

**STAFF PRESENT:** Matthew Sarcione, Assistant Town Planner  
Jeff Howland, Town Engineer (in audience)

Mr. Rosen opened the meeting at 7:00 PM and reviewed the procedures.

**Minutes:**

The minutes were not ready for approval.

**Sign Bills:**

Mr. Rosen announced the following bills:

- \$7,181.80 to Weston & Sampson Engineers for the Sewer Peer Review.

**VOTE TAKEN:**

**Motion:** Mr. Schaetzke moved to approve the bill, which he acknowledged is paid out funds provided by the applicant. Mr. Gordon seconded. Motion carried.

**Bills:** The bill was unanimously approved and signed.

**Hearing 1: *Cont'd from 12/14/15, 12/28/15, 1/25/16, 2/29/16, 3/21/16, 3/28/16, 4/11/16, 4/25/16***  
**440 & 526 Hartford Tpke – Smart Growth Design, LLC**  
**Comprehensive Permit – Construct a 280-unit, multi-family apartment community**

Acting board members included Mr. Confalone, Ms. Cossette (serving for Mr. George, who had recused himself), Mr. Gordon, Mr. Rosen, and Mr. Schaetzke.

Town Consultants Present: Atty. Paul Haverty, Blatman, Bobrowski, Mead & Talerman, LLC (40B); Jennifer Conley, Conley Associates (Traffic); Hillary Lacirignola, Weston & Sampson (Sewer); Kent Nichols, Weston & Sampson (Sewer); Iric Rex, Davis Square Architects (Architecture)

**Introductions**

- Developer Fran Zarette, Smart Growth Design, LLC, was present, as was owner Atty. Rod St. Pierre in the audience. Also present for the appellant were:
  - Site Design – Wayne Belec, Waterman Design
  - Architecture – Peter Bartash, Cube 3 Studio
  - Traffic – Nancy Doherty, Tetra Tech
  - Sewer – Tom Parece, AECOM

**Architecture Presentation**

- Mr. Bartash spoke in response to the Architecture peer review report, which Mr. Rex had given at the last meeting. Mr. Bartash responded to the substantial changes made from that feedback.
- Since Mr. Rex had noted some of the building design elements were inconsistent, specifically on the east end of Phase 1, the revised elevation of the wall assembly is more in keeping with the rest of the buildings now.
- Since there had also been concern for the landscape buffers and sightlines to the nearest houses, Mr. Bartash displayed revised site plans with both cross sections and sightlines shown. The sightlines shown were from the view of a pedestrian. The elevations also showed the vegetation buffer at both one to three (1-3) years after planting and at maturity.
- Mr. Bartash reminded the Board that all the buildings are slab on grade, and that the energy code requirements - for insulation, etc. - will meet or exceed the minimum. Some detail was also provided on the exterior wall and roof assemblies.

**Architecture – Peer Review Response**

- Mr. Rex expressed some concern about the grade of Phase 1 and asked if fill would be brought in. Yes.
- He hoped that the materials used in the buildings would be durable, e.g., fiber cement.
- He thought the new drawings were helpful, but that not all of the concerns were fully addressed.
- He also asked if they had newly revised site plans yet. Mr. Belec replied they were working on them.

**Board Questions**

- Ms. Cossette commented that the parking lots that abut the neighborhood may need buffering.
  - Mr. Belec said they would be.

**Abutters**

- One abutter was concerned that if fill was brought in the buildings would tower over the surrounding houses.
- Atty. Dan Hill, representing the abutters, commented that the screening and buffering shown on the plans still seemed deficient.
  - Mr. Belec replied that the abutting area between the site and the neighbors is Town land. Deciduous trees are planned for the interior of the site and evergreens for the perimeter (such as blue spruce, Norway spruce, and Canadian hemlock). At maturity, the evergreens would grow to be approximately fifty-sixty (50-60) feet tall with a fifteen to twenty-five (15-25) foot spread, depending on the species. Hinoki cypress would be planted closer to the Route 20 side, for both privacy and as a sound barrier.
- Atty. Hill followed with he hoped for more landscaping and fencing on the developer's land, acknowledging that plantings could not go into the detention basin.
  - Mr. Belec replied that landscape architects would be involved in this. He believed there would be good density considering staggering the placement of the plantings and in the specific types of trees used.
- Atty. Hill also believed there were still unresolved issues to do with storm water.

**Sewer Presentation**

- Mr. Parece gave a follow-up presentation on the sewer system capacity analysis.

- His summary was that all three (3) pump stations have capacity and that there is one (1) insufficient area of pipe to be addressed - the Route 9 interceptor, namely the segment labeled 2B-23 to 2B-22. This section seems to be overcapacity even without the proposed project.
- The analysis is based on the standards set in TR-16 and is considering 248 units, which would have an estimated flow rate of 141 gallons per day per unit.
- This is also based on average daily flows and peak flows, the topographic survey, and an 80% pipe capacity rate for all pipes.

#### **Sewer – Peer Review Response**

- Ms. Lacirignola and Mr. Kent disagreed with the analysis summary that the pump stations had the capacity to support the project. They agreed in that the issue remained unresolved, that more analysis and discussion should take place. Ms. Lacirignola reminded the Board that the photos shown regarding manhole surcharging were taken in 2013.

#### **Board/Town Staff Questions/Comments**

- Mr. Rosen asked if it was possible that the surcharging situation could have improved since then.
  - Ms. Lacirignola said it could be possible if cleaning had been done.
- Jeff Howland, Town Engineer, reminded the Board that the recent data collection had been in March. He also said that the Stoney Hill station was at capacity now and that this project would double its capacity.
- Dan Morgado, Town Manager, commented that the developer had originally presented the sewer situation as having no issues. Why do there seem to be issues now?
  - Mr. Zarette said that in conducting these studies and gathering more data, e.g., on the pipe sizes, more information has been learned.
  - Mr. Rosen summarized what the peer reviewers had said, that the system is insufficient before the project takes place.
  - Ms. Lacirignola added that the Town has been complying with what it needs to for now.
  - Mr. Kent clarified Weston & Sampson's stand that the pump stations were at capacity now, but would be over once more flows were added.
- A technical meeting was suggested for the next week in order for both parties to re-analyze the findings and reach agreement on the sewer issues.

#### **Abutters**

- One (1) abutter questioned if it was at capacity now, and there seemed to be no alternatives offered now, what happens next?
  - Mr. Rosen replied that some form of mitigation would be necessary.
  - Atty. Hill suggested the project may not be able to be permitted until the issues are resolved.

#### **Traffic Presentation**

Nancy Doherty reviewed the five (5) current traffic pattern options for Phase 1 (since Phase 2 would have full access in and out of a T or 4-legged intersection):

- Concept 1 – Access on Stoney Hill Rd and Route 20 - Right In / Right Out / No Lefts, with deceleration lane and sidewalk.
- Concept 2 – Access on Route 20 - Left In / Right In / Right Out.
- Concept 3 – Access on Route 20 - Right In / Right Out / No Lefts. This is the simplest, easiest to build, but there have been concerns regarding illegal turns/workarounds, e.g., going through the neighborhood to reach the light at the other end.
- Concept 4 – Access on Stoney Hill Rd and Route 20 - Signal at West end of Stoney Hill Rd. However, MassDOT is against this because of the lack of necessary volume and the hill.
- Concept 5 – Access on Route 20 and Stoney Hill Rd/East – Signal and modifications to Stoney Hill Rd/West. This option was not well received with regard to bringing traffic through the neighborhood.

- Conclusion - Her recommendation is Concept 1/Access on Stoney Hill Rd and Route 20. Again, the data has shown occasional queues, but not that these queues are unreasonable. The crash rate is still below the average at an unsignalized intersection. For the minor delays involved, this is safest option.
- Mr. Zarette added that he had approached some of the owners regarding selling their land so that some site modifications could be done. But he reported that they had not been willing to sell at any price. For one business owner, the reasoning was that his lot was already pre-existing non-conforming. Mr. Zarette presented these letters of denial to the Board.

### **Board Questions**

- The various pluses and minuses of each concept were discussed, including what might be MassDOT's preference.
- Mr. Schaetzke suggested that a Concept 6 be created, because none of the options seemed satisfactory. He asked if there were any areas where a dedicated u-turn could be put in.
  - Mr. Zarette and Ms. Doherty, No, Route 20 would need significant widening in order to accommodate trucks doing u-turns as well.
  - Mr. Howland reported that when the Town staff had met with MassDOT, he was under the impression that all five (5) concept options were still on the table for discussion.
- Mr. Gordon asked about the effect of the AM and PM school bus runs.
  - Ms. Doherty, We will work with the School Department.

### **Abutters**

- Six (6) abutters, as well as the attorney for the abutters, spoke with questions regarding:
- Left turn lane turn accommodation.
- Prediction that if they don't have good sightlines, the accident rate will rise.
- Prediction/disagreement that the amount of resulting queuing will be more than presented.
- Promoting to MassDOT a reduction in the speed limit on this section of Route 20 to prevent those already on Route 20 from "barreling" up behind those just pulling out onto it.
- Some abutters liked/thought Mr. Schaetzke's suggestion of a u-turn was needed.
- Having traffic lights would be safer to make left turns less dangerous.
  - Ms. Doherty agreed.
- The increase in danger if there is snow and/or ice on the hill section of Route 20.
- Mentions of many near misses occurring, e.g., rear end collisions.
- Some discussion/confusion on who decides on the final traffic option.
  - Mr. Rosen and Mr. Haverty explained that this Board will make their decision to choose what they believe is the best option. However, ultimately MassDOT is the authority that will either confirm that choice or not. From the recent meetings with the MassDOT representatives, the applicant, and Town staff members, there is already a sense of which options MassDOT would and would not approve.
- There was a suggestion that perhaps Mr. Zarette did not go through the proper channels in discussing buying the abutting land for easements/modifications and whether the Town and/or abutters should get involved in the issue.
  - Mr. Gordon suggested that perhaps the company representatives approached might not have understood the full scope of what was being asked.
    - Owner, Atty. St. Pierre, confirmed it was the corporate offices that they had spoken to.
    - Mr. Haverty reminded them that even if the Town petitioned for this any modifications to Route 20 were under the State's control.
- The widening of Route 20.
  - Ms. Doherty explained this is prohibitively expensive to do on both sides. There is a lot of ledge present and retaining walls would be needed.

**Traffic – Peer Review Response**

- Ms. Conley suggested it could be independently verified that the abutters were unwilling to sell any portions of their property for the project.
- When asked if she saw a possible option 6, she replied that every option seemed to have pluses and minuses. She still saw three (3) of the options as viable, but agreed that having a signal for exiting the property would be safer.

Mr. Zarette said he was prepared to grant an extension for the hearing.

**VOTE TAKEN:**

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

**Hearing 1:** The hearing for 440 and 526 Hartford Tpke was continued to May 31, 2016 at 6:45 PM in the Selectmen’s Room in Town Hall.

**New Business:**

None.

**Old Business:**

None.

**Correspondence:**

None.

The meeting adjourned at 9:13 PM.

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