

Town of Franklin



Planning Board

**June 29, 2020  
Meeting Minutes**

Chair Anthony Padula called the above-captioned **Remote Access Virtual Zoom Meeting** to order this date at 7:00 PM. Members in attendance: Joseph Halligan, William David, Gregory Rondeau, Rick Power. Members absent: None. Also present: Michael Maglio, Town Engineer; Amy Love, Planner; Matthew Crowley, BETA Group, Inc.; Maxine Kinhart, Administrative Assistant.

*As stated on the agenda, due to the growing concerns regarding the COVID-19 virus, the Planning Board will conduct a **Remote Access Virtual Zoom Meeting**. The Massachusetts State of Emergency and the associated state legislation allows towns to hold remote access virtual meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. In an effort to ensure citizen engagement and comply with open meeting law regulations, citizens will be able to dial into the meeting using the provided phone number, or citizens can participate by using the Zoom link also provided on the agenda.*

7:00 PM **Commencement/General Business**

Chair Padula read aloud the Zoom platform call-in phone number and the Zoom link which were also provided on the meeting agenda.

**A. Decision: Panther Way – Special Permit & Site Plan**

Ms. Love stated the Planning Board closed the public hearing at the June 22, 2020 meeting. The applicant applied for two Special Permits and there are four waiver requests. She stated special conditions were discussed at the June 22, 2020 meeting. She noted the Planning Board waived the traffic study. Chair Padula stated the Planning Board did not go along with waiver #4 as listed on Ms. Love's memorandum to the Planning Board dated June 24, 2020; he reviewed the three Special Conditions listed on Ms. Love's letter.

Mr. Goodreau stated that at this time, the AC units are to be put in the attic space; however, if that changes, fence screening of white vinyl will be provided. Chair Padula recommended a Special Condition #4 be added: Body work will be by the applicant only. Planning Board members discussed the exact wording. It was confirmed that the Special Permit is strictly for the Holmes busing company and not for any other tenant.

***Waiver Requests:***

***Motion to Allow less than 42' of cover over the RCP drain pipe. Proposed Class V RCP. Halligan. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

***Motion to Allow the use of HPDE Pipe for drainage pond 1 and the roof drain collection system. Halligan. Second: David. No vote taken.***

***Motion to Allow index sheet to be at a scale 1"=60'. Halligan. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

***Motion to Waive sidewalk in front of building and traffic study. Halligan. Second: David. No vote taken.***

***Special Conditions:***

***Motion to Accept special condition that a Limited Site Plan is to be filed when a tenant, other than the Bus owners, occupies the building. Halligan. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

***Motion to Accept special condition to provide screening for any AC units that are added to the exterior of the building. Halligan. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

***Motion to Accept special condition that bus parking is to remain as shown on the Site Plans. The Bus parking is not to be relocated anywhere else on the site. Halligan. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

***Motion to Accept special condition that body work and all repairs and other to be by the applicant only. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**This determination shall be in addition to the following specific findings:**

**Special Permit VOTE:** Motor Vehicle leasing with repair under §185 Attachment 2, Use Regulations Schedule Part II, Section 2.6 and to allow Motor vehicle service leasing with and §185 Attachment 2, Use Regulations Schedule Part II, Section 2.7.c Motor Vehicle service, repair-other.

Chairman Padula read aloud the following.

- a) Proposed project addresses or is consistent with neighbor or Town need.  
**Padula-YES; Power-YES; Halligan-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)**
- b) Vehicular traffic flow, access and parking and pedestrian safety are properly addressed.  
**Padula-YES; Power-YES; Halligan-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)**
- c) Public roadways, drainage, utilities and other infrastructure are adequate or will be upgraded to accommodate development.  
**Padula-YES; Power-YES; Halligan-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)**
- d) Neighborhood character and social structure will not be negatively impacted.  
**Padula-YES; Power-YES; Halligan-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)**
- e) Project will not destroy or cause substantial damage to any environmentally significant natural resource, habitat, or feature or, if it will, proposed mitigation, remediation, replication or compensatory measures are adequate.  
**Padula-YES; Power-YES; Halligan-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)**
- f) Number, height, bulk, location and siting of building(s) and structures(s) will not result in abutting properties being deprived of light or fresh air circulation or being exposed to flooding or subjected to excessive noise, odor, light, vibrations, or airborne particulates.  
**Padula-YES; Power-YES; Halligan-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)**

- g) Water consumption and sewer use taking into consideration current and projected future local water supply and demand and wastewater treatment capacity, will not be excessive.

**Padula-YES; Power-YES; Halligan-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)**

The proposed use will not have adverse effects which overbalance its beneficial effects on either the neighborhood or the Town, in view of the particular characteristics of the site and of the proposal in relation to that site.

**Padula-YES; Power-YES; Halligan-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)**

***Motion to Approve Panther Way, Special Permit & Site Plan, with the approved Waiver Requests, Special Conditions, and Suggested Standard Conditions of Approval #1 through #10 as listed on pages 3 and 4 of Ms. Love's memorandum to the Planning Board dated June 24, 2020. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

7:05 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*  
***162 Grove Street***  
 Special Permit & Site Plan  
*Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.*

***Motion to Waive the Reading for 162 Grove Street, Special Permit & Site Plan. Halligan. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

Mr. Rick Goodreau of United Consultants, Inc.; Mr. Don Cooper, attorney representing the applicant; and Fran from New England Treatment Access addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Goodreau provided a review of the proposed construction of a building addition of 2,583 sq. ft. to the southwest of the existing building which is 13,504 sq. ft., entrance walkway to the retail component of the building, relocated driveway, parking lot expansion allowing for 141 parking spaces (89 retail customer spaces and 52 employee spaces), two stormwater systems, and site grading and landscaping. He stated the site is currently a trucking business and consists of approximately four acres of land with an existing building on the site. The site has parking spaces and pavement. There is a wetland located to the south and another to the east of the property. He clarified parking spaces 8 through 18 as shown on the plans with curb bumpers so vehicles could not go into the walkway. Mr. Halligan recommended bollards instead of curb bumpers. Mr. Goodreau stated they are proposing to keep the existing cape cod berm. Curbing for the proposed area was discussed. Mr. Goodreau explained the current stormwater system and the locations of the detention basins and provided a detailed review of the new drainage and stormwater system. He stated pre- and post-development conditions were evaluated and show a reduction in rates and volume of runoff. He stated that there are existing utility connections which will need to be relocated. He reviewed the proposed trees as shown in the planting schedule. He noted there would be one tree removed due to the driveway entrance relocation. He stated a traffic study was submitted. Review comments have been received by BETA for the Site Plan, Special Permits, and traffic study. He noted the traffic study indicated the applicant exceeded the parking calculation, and the area of the intersection of the roadway and the site driveway were adequate. He stated they have begun meeting with the Conservation Commission; the next meeting is scheduled for July 16, 2020.

Chair Padula noted snow storage is not seen on the plan. Mr. Rondeau stated traffic will be an issue and requested a letter from the Police Department. Mr. Maglio stated he reviewed the plans; he provided an overview of his comments as outlined in his letter to the Planning Board dated June 25, 2020.

Ms. Love reviewed items from her letter to the Planning Board dated June 24, 2020. She stated the applicant submitted to Design Review for a sign which should be shown on the plans. Due to COVID-19 regulations, the applicant may want to consider adding a queuing line outside the building. She recommended it be shown on the plans how the customers will enter and exit the building. Mr. Goodreau said there will be a separate entrance and exit which he will label on the plan.

Chair Padula read aloud the letter from the Fire Department.

Mr. Crowley stated some of BETA's comments have already been addressed; he reviewed items from his letter to the Planning Board dated June 25, 2020.

Ms. Jaklyn Centracchio, BETA Group Traffic Consultant, reviewed her letter to the Planning Board dated June 25, 2020 regarding BETA's peer review of the traffic study. She reviewed the methodology used for the traffic study and stated that the study area was found to be inadequate due to the number of vehicles trips generated by this project; additional intersections, including the intersections of Grove Street at Washington Street and Grove Street and Route 140, should be added to the study area. She stated that empirical trip data was collected at a similar NETA facility in Northampton and used as comparison. She discussed the number of daily trips, the number of developments on Grove Street, and a sight distance analysis. Regarding the parking, there are anticipated 128 spaces demand which is close to the 141 parking spaces proposed; BETA would like to see additional backup to support those numbers. Mr. Halligan asked about the population difference between Franklin and the Northampton facility used as a comparison, and if the traffic study included the other dispensaries in the area as they may take traffic away from this location. Ms. Centracchio stated that the population was not taken into account; however, the other competing dispensaries were taken into consideration. She thinks the volumes are an accurate depiction of what it would be. Chair Padula stated concern about the traffic on Grove Street and stated that a signal at the intersection of Washington Street and Grove Street should be looked into.

Mr. John Cetrano, 64 Bridle Path, stated there will be a great influx of traffic on Grove Street and Washington Street. He stated concern that people will drive through residential areas to get to Washington Street.

***Motion to Continue the public hearing for 162 Grove Street, Special Permit & Site Plan, to July 27, 2020. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

7:05 PM      **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*  
***Maple Hill***  
Definitive Subdivision  
*Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.*

Ms. Love stated this meeting will regard the traffic summary for the 59 single lot houses accessing through Kimberlee Avenue and Bridle Path.

Mr. Jeffrey Dirk of Vanasse & Associates, Inc., provided a slideshow presentation regarding the traffic study for the proposed residential community of Maple Hill. He noted that BETA provided a peer review of the traffic study. He reviewed the transportation impact assessment summary. He stated the study looked at traffic volumes, pedestrian, bike, and public transportation. He stated the traffic will be well distributed between Kimberlee Avenue and Bridle Path. There will be no significant increases in delays and queuing. Sight lines were reviewed and with the exception of Kimberlee Avenue at Maple Street, all met or exceeded requirements. At the Kimberlee Avenue intersection with Maple Street, there is a curvature to the north; however, it is appropriate to the speed limit of 30 mph, but at speeds of 40 mph, it is not good. Getting the vehicle speeds down to where they should be must be worked on. He reviewed the evaluated traffic area and the methodology for the traffic study. He provided recommendations to calm the traffic. He noted that BETA

had requested the applicant also look at the Lincoln Street/Main Street/Maple Street intersection. He stated that they found no changes; delays increased by less than two seconds and no significant increase in queuing. He reviewed the trip generation summary and stated that overall, the average daily trips would be approximately 630 vehicle trips—315 in and 315 out. He reviewed the trip distribution pattern and discussed the parameters used. He stated that about 50 percent of the project will use Bridle Path and 50 percent will use Kimberlee Avenue. He reviewed the traffic operations analysis summary. As a result of the analysis, they provided recommendations to reduce vehicle speeds including install radar speed feedback signs north of Franklin Springs Road and Kimberlee Avenue, provide speed enforcement, reduce the width of Franklin Springs Road, install a crosswalk across Franklin Springs Road and Maple Street, and install a crosswalk across Bridle Path and Lincoln Street. He discussed traffic calming measures for both Kimberlee Avenue and Bridle Path which he said the applicant has committed to design and construct. He stated they have responded to each of BETA's peer review comments.

Ms. Jaklyn Centracchio, BETA Group Traffic Consultant, stated that her comments are related to safety concerns. She discussed that the traveling speeds on Maple Street are 9 to 10 mph over the posted speed. She stated that the sight distance at Kimberlee Avenue should be reviewed and that a tree restricts a sight line. The proposed speed radar feedback signs were okay, but the sight distance at Kimberlee Avenue should be improved. She noted that if the Planning Board wants to install the suggested crosswalks, ADA complaint ramps should be installed.

Mr. Roy Cornelius, 25 Bridle Path, stated that a crosswalk at Bridle Path and Lincoln Street must be a school crossing, there should be no through traffic signs, and the Bridle Path road name should not be used in the Maple Hill development. He asked how the construction vehicles will access for phase I and discussed the repaving of Bridle Path last year with only chip seal. He asked why more developments are being put in as the Town does not have sufficient funds to maintain the roads and there are water bans. Chair Padula stated the water bans are due to a state mandate, not because the Town is out of water.

Mr. Bruce Stivaletta, 10 Surrey Way, stated that there are 13 different types of vehicles used for house construction; the weight of such trucks going down these old streets will destroy the roads and asphalt along the curbing. Chair Padula stated that once most of the heavy equipment vehicles arrive, they stay on site. He noted that the trucks have numerous tires to disperse the weight.

Mr. John Cetrano, 64 Bridle Path, asked what is a raised medium. Mr. Dirks explained that it is an island in the middle of the road. He said they are trying to avoid speed bumps and would like to reduce the roads to 22 ft. He discussed a raised intersection to slow vehicles down. Mr. Cetrano stated there is no information about traffic coming into Bridle Path where the development ties into the existing Bridle Path and Kimberlee Avenue. He does not want the Planning Board to waive the required sidewalks on both sides of the street especially with all the foot traffic due to COVID-19. Chair Padula discussed that islands used to be on Franklin roads but were removed because they were damaging the plows and making it difficult to plow. He noted there were rumble strips in the center of Town which were also removed. The bylaws require 32 ft. roads; the roads get narrower with snow and delivery trucks which are commonly parked in the street. He stated the Planning Board often waives the two-sidewalk requirement in order to get upright granite curbing, roundings in the driveways, and concrete sidewalks.

Mr. Lawrence Maggio, 4 Bridle Path, encouraged the Planning Board to require a temporary entrance off of Maple Street to be used for construction at least during phase I. He stated that he liked the idea of crosswalks and stop signs and advocated they be installed at the commencement of construction. Chair Padula stated he thought the Planning Board would make those recommendations for phase I. Chair Padula asked about a wetland crossing. Mr. Maggio stated he does not think there is one. Mr. Maggio discussed street sweeping during construction to keep the neighborhood clean. Chair Padula stated he does not like the idea of islands in the roads. He stated the Planning Board will resume the traffic discussion at the July 13, 2020 meeting.

***Motion to Continue the public hearing for Maple Hill, Definitive Subdivision to July 13, 2020. Halligan. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

7:15 PM      **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*  
***70, 72 & 94 East Central Street – Multi-Family***  
 Special Permit & Site Plan Modification  
*Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.*

***Chair Padula recused himself.***

Mr. Brad Chaffee, owner/applicant; Mr. Richard Cornetta, attorney representing the applicant; Ms. Liz Ranieri and Mr. Rob Marcalow of Kuth Ranieri Architects; and Mr. Rick Goodreau of United Consultants, Inc. addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Chaffee stated that from previous meetings, the Planning Board expressed concern regarding items such as the position of the building and access roads. He stated he has submitted a letter to the Planning Board dated June 24, 2020 regarding those challenges which he reviewed. He stated the house at 88 East Central Street would have to be demolished in order to move the new building forward; the current owners will not move out of their home. In addition, almost the entire property at 88 East Central Street is made up of solid ledge; the height of the building on top of that ledge would cause the building to be too high. And, if the proposed building were moved forward, the current residents at 70/72 East Central Street would be adversely affected due to their view. During the last three weeks, his team has looked at this in depth. He stated that the house at 88 East Central Street is registered with the Massachusetts Historical Society.

Ms. Ranieri presented the historical background of the house at 88 East Central Street and said the house is a piece of Franklin's history. They would like to preserve it and provide educational information about its unique past. She reviewed older buildings in the downtown area that are now gone. She stated that the restoration of historic buildings is encouraged rather than demolition. Such buildings will add richness to the community; the Town should have a mix of new buildings and historic preservation. Mr. Marcalow discussed proposed plans for the historic house at 88 East Central Street. He explained the house is intended to blend into the ensemble of buildings in the area. The historic home will serve as a reminder of the history and legacy of the Town.

Vice Chair Halligan stated that this house is not part of the plan that has been presented to the Planning Board. He reviewed the project from the beginning. He said it was a tight project and the Planning Board had concern about the parking, but the roadside parking in the Commercial zoning district complemented that. The second part of the project was that Mr. Chaffee wanted a modification to the existing two buildings as he felt he could not sell the garages in the back. The Planning Board granted the modification to eliminate the garages as long as the number of parking spaces was maintained. No future development was mentioned at that time. Then another proposal from the applicant to add another lot was presented. There was concern from the Planning Board regarding sidewalks throughout the project and possibly sliding the building forward as the Planning Board members felt it was a little tight in the back area. Now, there is conversation about the lot at 88 East Central Street being obtained. The Planning Board thought that maybe if that house was gone, it would open up the area and allow the proposed building to be moved forward. Now, the Planning Board learns that it is a historical building and will never be demolished. However, that home does not technically have anything to do with the plans submitted. He reiterated that he has recommended that the applicant return to the Planning Board with all three parcels as one Site Plan. Mr. Chaffee stated that he has been trying to address the concerns of the Planning Board. He would like to put the house on a modified Site Plan. He will look into the different levels of historical designation regarding what can be done with the home.

Vice Chair Halligan requested information as to the level of historical designation of the building. Mr. Rondeau stated he recommends a full Site Plan with the two lots, pulling the building forward, and making it

feasible for the neighbors. He noted the building as proposed is too big for the lot. He asked how much of said building is historical. Mr. Chaffee asked if he increased the setbacks for the building, would that be amenable. Vice Chair Halligan noted that if all the lots were combined, there would not be any setback lines. Ms. Love reminded the Planning Board that Mr. Chaffee would not own 88 East Central Street; she would have to speak with the Town Attorney about the process. Mr. Chaffee stated he will talk to counsel regarding the properties and make one Site Plan.

Mr. Cornetta stated that the original filing included all three parcels; the middle piece was already included. He noted that one challenge is that Mr. Chaffee would not obtain ownership of the parcel until the construction of the proposed building was completed. They recognize this is an issue they need to solve. They would like to continue this meeting and move forward with a comprehensive plan of all three parcels. Vice Chair Halligan asked if Mr. Chaffee does not own that parcel, how can the Planning Board issue a Special Permit including that parcel. Mr. Cornetta reviewed the process for that situation. Vice Chair Halligan stated it seems like to put all three parcels together is moving in the right direction.

Mr. David stated he would like to see the building moved forward. Mr. Chaffee stated they will be returning to the Planning Board with a new plan. Vice Chair Halligan noted that the building as proposed seems a little large. Mr. Chaffee asked if the setbacks on the rear and sides were increased, would the Planning Board be happy with that. Vice Chair Halligan stated that it seems like that would be the right direction. He requested clarification about the level of historical designation. Mr. Rondeau said he would like to see full drawings including drainage, catch basins, sidewalks, etc., not just a conceptual plan. Mr. Chaffee agreed it would be a full plan. Mr. David stated he does not want a dumpster in the back. Mr. Rondeau requested drive through access and parking around the building; the building should be pulled forward.

***Motion to Continue the public hearing for 70, 72 & 94 East Central Street – Multi-Family, Special Permit & Site Plan Modification, to August 10, 2020 at 7:05 PM. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 4-0-0 (4-Yes; 0-No).***

***Motion to Adjourn the Remote Access Virtual Zoom Planning Board Meeting. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 4-0-0 (4-Yes; 0-No). Meeting adjourned at 10:01 PM.***

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi, AL  
Recording Secretary

***\*\*\*Approved by the Planning Board on August 17, 2020***