

Town of Franklin

355 East Central Street
Franklin, Massachusetts 02038-1352



Phone: (508) 520-4907
www.franklinma.gov

PLANNING BOARD

July 10, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Chair Gregory Rondeau called the above-captioned meeting held via Zoom to order this date at 7:00 PM. The public had the option of dialing into the meeting using the provided phone number or participating by copying the provided link. Members in attendance: Gregory Rondeau, Chair; William David, Vice Chair; Beth Wierling, Clerk; Rick Power; Jennifer Williams, Jay Mello, associate member. Members absent: None. Also present: Michael Maglio, Town Engineer; Amy Love, Town Planner.

7:00 PM **Commencement**

Chair Rondeau reviewed the Zoom platform call-in phone number and the Zoom link which were provided on the meeting agenda. The meeting was audio and video recorded.

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*

15 Liberty Way

Site Plan Application

Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

TO BE CONTINUED

Chair Rondeau stated that the applicant was requesting a continuance.

Ms. Love stated that the applicant requested the hearing be continued to the last meeting in August which is August 21, 2023. She stated that they would like to get further along with the Conservation Commission before returning to the Planning Board.

Motion to Continue the public hearing for 15 Liberty Way, Site Plan Application, to August 21, 2023. Rondeau. Second: Power. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

General Business

A. Field Change: Plansee, 115 Constitution Boulevard

Ms. Love stated that there have been discussions with the applicant's engineer, BETA, and Town Engineer Michael Maglio. There are several field changes and many seem minor. She stated that they are here tonight to present the changes. She stated that neither the town engineer nor BETA seemed to have an issue with it. She stated this is for the Planning Board to be aware of.

Mr. Doug Hartnett, principal of Highpoint Engineering, representing their client Plansee LLC, discussed that they were here for modifications to the Site Plan Approval previously granted by the Planning Board. He reviewed that the applicant is preparing their site work construction schedule and in doing so has reconsidered certain site improvements depicted on the approved plans. He reviewed the proposed site plan revisions as outlined in his letter to the Planning Board dated June 21, 2023, which was provided in the meeting packet. He shared his screened and showed and discussed the proposed changes including increase parking, minor adjustments to the curb lines, eliminate small green area proposed in front of generator,

displacement of a grass area, increase impervious area approximately 1,849 sq. ft., reduce the size of the employee outdoor seating area, and minor adjustments to the landscape. He stated that he has received no objections from BETA or the town engineer. He explained that Highpoint requests the Planning Board find that this work is minor in nature and can be considered a field change; this field change will be documented in the final as-built plan to be submitted to the Planning Board upon completion of construction.

Mr. Maglio stated that he reviewed the submitted materials for the subject project and does not have any objections to the proposed field changes. He noted that while the proposed changes will result in an increase in impervious area over what was originally approved, the increase still results in a net decrease in impervious area over what was originally constructed at the site.

Chair Rondeau asked about the elimination of the wheel stops. Mr. Maglio stated that he has no objections. Ms. Williams asked about the tire stops and noted concern about the overhangs related to maintaining clearances for the ADA parking spots and requested that the tire stops remain. Mr. Maglio stated that this is a valid concern regarding vehicles overhanging the sidewalk and should be taken into consideration. Chair Rondeau stated that he would like to see the wheel stops left in place. Mr. Hartnett stated that it is really a maintenance issue and is common to not have wheel stops in commercial areas. He stated that he does not see the need for it; it is not a high turnover area.

Ms. Wierling asked about the wheel stops and employee area. She stated that parking spots were being added to the courtyard area. She stated that she recommended wheel stops as you are having people sitting at tables in chairs in that area. Chair Rondeau stated that if not wheel stops, at least bollards should be put there. He stated that they are looking at both overhanging the sidewalk and safety regarding the wheel stops. Mr. David stated agreement with the rest of the Planning Board; if that proposes a maintenance issue, then he would consider the bollards. Ms. Wierling agreed that she is not concerned with the cars hanging over, just the area of the courtyard. Ms. Williams stated that she is concerned about the three ADA spots. Mr. Mello discussed the direction of plowing for snow and ice removal regarding the wheel stops and stated that he would be against the wheel stops for that reason. He stated that he would recommend bollards along the patio area.

Chair Rondeau asked if the bollards would be able to be put in. Mr. Hartnett stated that he would rather do wheel stops. Chair Rondeau suggested wheel stops at the three handicap spots and bollards on the rear section where the seating is. Discussion commenced on wheel stops. Mr. Hartnett noted the applicant is not here. He suggested a solution for easier maintenance is a 7 ft. walkway to avoid this situation so this mirrors what is going on the other side and do the bollards, and wheel stops would be kept out of the plow aisles. Planning Board members agreed. Chair Rondeau confirmed the sidewalk would be widened in the front and the bollards in the back. Mr. Hartnett stated yes. Chair Rondeau asked the bollards be spaced so that a car cannot creep between them. Mr. Hartnett stated understood, and he reviewed the locations on the plan. Mr. David asked if a wooden guardrail be more beneficial to the applicant and take care of our thoughts about safety and overhanging vehicles. Mr. Hartnett said it was a good suggestion. He stated that he did not know what the applicant would want to do; it will take a little design thinking. Mr. Maglio commented about the fence to restrict the overhang; access would be an issue and bollards may be more appropriate for that. Chair Rondeau stated let's stick with the bollards as that is what we have done in the past. He stated the applicant would do two additional feet out front and the bollards in the back.

Motion to Accept the proposed changes for Plansee, 115 Constitution Boulevard, as discussed with the addition of bollards as minor modifications, and the correction of the sidewalk out front, which will all be part of the as-built plan. Wierling. Second: Power. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Wierling. Second: Power. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Meeting adjourned at 7:31 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi,
Recording Secretary

Town of Franklin

355 East Central Street
Franklin, Massachusetts 02038-1352



Phone: (508) 520-4907
www.franklinma.gov

PLANNING BOARD

July 24, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Chair Gregory Rondeau called the above-captioned meeting held via Zoom to order this date at 7:00 PM. The public had the option of dialing into the meeting using the provided phone number or participating by copying the provided link. Members in attendance: Gregory Rondeau, Chair; William David, Vice Chair; Beth Wierling, Clerk; Rick Power; Jennifer Williams, Jay Mello, associate member. Members absent: None. Also present: Michael Maglio, Town Engineer; Amy Love, Town Planner; Gary James, BETA Group.

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

Chair Rondeau reviewed the Zoom platform call-in phone number and the Zoom link which were provided on the meeting agenda. The meeting was audio and video recorded.

A. Presentation of the Open Space and Recreation Plan – Draft

Ms. Love stated that Conservation Agent Breeka Li Goodlander would give a presentation on the Open Space Plan. She stated that she provided a letter with a link to the draft. She stated that the Planning Board is requested to submit a letter of support.

Ms. Goodlander (via Zoom) narrated a slideshow presentation on the Open Space and Recreation Plan. She stated that she is seeking a letter from the Planning Board. She read aloud her slides and reviewed the following: what is the Open Space and Recreation Plan, the overview and benefits of the OSRP, OSRP requirements, OSRP update process, state and staff still reviewing, and Section 8 identified goals. She encouraged all to read the OSRP draft.

Ms. Wierling stated that she was impressed with the amount of work done. Chair Rondeau stated that he was comfortable with what he has seen.

Motion to Recommend the Open Space and Recreation Plan as drafted. Wierling. Second: David. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

B. Endorsement: 230 East Central Street

Ms. Love reviewed that the applicant was before the Planning Board a few weeks ago, and there were several conditions to be met prior to endorsement of the plan. The following conditions have been completed per the Certificate of Vote: Soil logs and test pit locations be shown on the revised plans from M.F. Engineering & Design to verify results, for the retaining wall. The appendix is not specifically noted in the O&M plan. The long-term Operation and Maintenance plan should be a stand-alone document. Therefore, Appendix 11 should be directly incorporated into the plan and reference, along with the sample inspection for and a plan of the BMPs. The manifold invert be raised to elevation 278.95. This would provide an additional 12" of sediment storage in the separator row and further protect the long-term viability of the system. If any disturbance is shown on Hill Avenue, then the applicant is to submit an alternative plan to the Planning Board that shows no disturbance on Hill Avenue. The owner has added a deed restriction to the property allowing for four (4) affordable units. A geotechnical plan has been received and reviewed by BETA. The applicant is before the Planning Board for endorsement.

Mr. James confirmed that he is comfortable with what has been put before him for paperwork on this. He stated that he is not sure about the ledge elevation, but it may not affect the wall at all. Mr. Maglio stated that he has no outstanding issues.

Chair Rondeau stated that there is a letter from the owners, although he wished it was from an attorney, about Hill Avenue. He stated that he wants to make sure all the data from the testing reports is tied back to the original drawings and the Geotech report. Ms. Amanda Cavaliere stated that everything is connected.

Motion to Endorse 230 East Central Street. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

C. Meeting Minutes: June 5 & June 26, 2023

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for June 5, 2023. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for June 26, 2023. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
Zoning By-Law Amendments
23-898 – Attachment 9 – GRV Impervious & CI 3-Family
23-899 – Marijuana Use Overlay District Map
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Wierling. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love stated that recently there have been some changes to zoning to accommodate more housing and the MBTA requirements. She reviewed details of the letter from the Department of Planning and Community Development to the Planning Board dated June 14, 2023. She provided a summary of two issues and proposed changes including recent changes to multifamily housing density and recent zoning changes. She stated that they have changed some square footage to what is allowed to be buildable; this is the cleaning up of some of that. She stated that for the GRV they have increased square footage requirements, but the impervious was very low. She reviewed the percentages. She stated that this went through the EDC.

Ms. Wierling discussed the EDC members recommending an increase beyond what was recommended by staff regarding structures and impervious to maximize GRV development. She stated that she would like to see it stay at what the Planning Department recommended as a lot of thought and reasoning was put behind that. She stated that the staff who reviewed it are the professionals versus increasing it arbitrarily to 45 percent/55 percent just because it looks good as a larger percentage. She stated that it can always be increased after the fact if it is found that nothing is happening, but let us stay with what was recommended by our staff.

Mr. Mello asked if there was a plan to increase impervious coverage in other areas to increase housing. Ms. Love stated that there has been no discussion on this at this time. Mr. Mello discussed that this increases impervious in just one area. Ms. Williams stated that she is in the same camp as Ms. Wierling; she appreciates the thought that has gone behind all of this. She asked about coming up with the percentages of impervious to the impact on stormwater and drainage overall or just to increase density of housing. Ms. Love stated that they will have to comply with existing stormwater management in place right now.

Mr. Maglio stated that stormwater takes affect on anything over one acre. Mr. Power stated that it is difficult to make an informed decision without knowing what documents the EDC looked at to make their decision. He stated that he would be inclined to leave it at what the DPCD recommended. Chair Rondeau stated that he

agrees with what the Planning Department recommended; if it needs adjustment after, it can be adjusted afterwards.

Motion to Approve Zoning By-Law Amendment 23-898 – Attachment 9 – GRV Impervious & CI 3-Family back to the numbers that the Planning Department came up with at the 35 percent/45 percent. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love stated that the marijuana overlay map is another thing the EDC looked at updating. She stated there were some parcels to add and some parcels to take away. She reviewed details of the letter from the Department of Planning and Community Development to the Planning Board dated June 14, 2023. Recommended Marijuana Use Overlay District map changes are as follows: 1. Forge Park. The proposed changes in Forge Park are removal of two parcels within 200 ft. of the Hockomock Area YMCA, and addition of five parcels that meet the location criteria in §185- 49(5); 2. Grove Street Area. The largest proposed change within the Marijuana Overlay District Map is the removal of four parcels on Grove Street, made necessary with the siting of a new school at 122 Grove Street. In addition, one parcel on the west side of Grove Street was added, as it meets the location criteria in §185-49(5); 3. Franklin Industrial Park. Proposed changes in Franklin Industrial Park include removal of one parcel on Constitution Boulevard, as it directly abuts a daycare at the corner of Upper Union and Constitution Boulevard. In addition, three properties along Upper Union Street are being proposed for addition to Marijuana Use Overlay District Map, as they meet the location criteria in §185-49(5). She stated this is trying to re-sort out the land for what makes sense for the marijuana.

Mr. David asked about the add locations; he noted that it used to be in the industrial parks and his concern is that it is getting out of the industrial parks. Ms. Love stated that all lots that are for add are zoned industrial. Mr. David said that as long as it is staying there, he is fine with it.

Chair Rondeau asked if all landowners were notified about this public hearing. Ms. Love said they did the public hearing notice, and it was posted on the website. Chair Rondeau stated this was cleaning up loose ends from the previous. Ms. Love elaborated on the adds and deletions.

Motion to Accept Zoning By-Law Amendment 23-899 – Marijuana Use Overlay District Map. Rondeau. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Recommend Zoning By-Law Amendment 23-899 – Marijuana Use Overlay District Map to the Town Council. Rondeau. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Wierling requested to return to discuss additional recommendations regarding the previous zoning bylaw amendment noted as Zoning By-Law Amendments 23-898 – Attachment 9 – GRV Impervious & CI 3-Family. She reviewed note 7 and other language from the proposed as provided in the meeting packet. Ms. Williams contributed discussion about the proposed language. Ms. Love stated that they have stricter setbacks. She stated that it allows for a denser development with the CI regulations versus the GRV setbacks.

Motion to Recommend to Town Council the exception regarding note 7 as written for Zoning By-Law Amendment 23-898 – Attachment 9 – GRV Impervious & CI 3-Family. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
 5 Hemlock Lane
 Special Permit & Site Plan Application
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Wierling. Second: David. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love reviewed that the site is in the Rural Residential II Zoning District. The site is currently a single-family residential house. The applicant is requesting to construct a pool cabana which will increase the impervious surface within the lot. A Special Permit is required under Section 185-36 – Impervious Surfaces. She reviewed her comments including 1. The site is currently at 24.2 percent impervious, were 25 percent impervious is allowed. The applicant is requesting to increase the impervious area to 28.5 percent. 2. DPCD has not requested BETA to review the Site Plan. 3. DPCD defers to Town Engineer Mike Maglio for review. 4. The applicant is requesting that the Site Plan application fee of \$1,500 be waived. The applicant paid the Special Permit fee of \$750.

Chair Rondeau confirmed that Planning Board members agreed to waive the \$1,500 fee.

Ms. Amanda Cavaliere of Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. addressed the Planning Board on behalf of the applicant. She stated that they have provided a plan showing the current house, pool, lawn area, and septic system. She stated that the only proposed increase to impervious coverage is for the pool cabana which is shown on the plan. She stated that to mitigate the impervious coverage below the 25 percent, we have added a Cultec chamber unit which will capture the runoff to get below the 25 percent. She stated that they are requesting a Special Permit from the Planning Board to allow for the increase in impervious coverage with mitigation to get below the 25 percent.

Mr. David stated that he is all for this. He stated that he is confused about the three different numbers on different documents regarding impervious. Ms. Cavaliere stated that the total impervious coverage is 28.5 percent, and they will be mitigating below that to 24.2 percent.

Ms. Williams asked what is being added to the site that is impervious. She stated that some of the increase comes from the proposed cabana, and there is already some impervious under that, and there is some overlap. Mr. Milke Hassett of Guerriere and Halnon, Inc. (via Zoom) reviewed the color site plan.

Mr. Maglio stated that the submitted materials for the Special Permit to allow for an increase in impervious coverage above the allowable 25 percent within a RRII zone were reviewed. He reviewed that Zoning Bylaw Section 185-36 states that greater coverage may be allowed if stormwater runoff from the site will not be increased following development. Although Section 185-36 does not specify which storm event is to be analyzed in determining whether there will be any increase of stormwater runoff, standard practice for this type of analysis is the 100-year storm event. He noted some new information he obtained since he wrote his letter indicating that based on that information, the proposal meets the criteria.

Chair Rondeau requested Ms. Cavaliere to add the color drawing to the final packet. Ms. Cavaliere stated yes.

Motion for Approve the Site Plan as submitted for 5 Hemlock Lane for Special Permit & Site Plan Application. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion for Waive the \$1,500 fee for 5 Hemlock Lane for Special Permit & Site Plan Application. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

ROLE CALL VOTE:

This determination shall be in addition to the following specific findings.

(1) Special Permit: To allow impervious surface increase to 28.5% under Section 185-36.

Ms. Wierling read aloud the following.

a) Proposed project addresses or is consistent with neighbor or Town need.
David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES; Rondeau-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

b) Vehicular traffic flow, access and parking and pedestrian safety are properly addressed.
David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES; Rondeau-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.
David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES; Rondeau-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

d) Neighborhood character and social structure will not be negatively impacted.
David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES; Rondeau-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.
David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES; Rondeau-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.
David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES; Rondeau-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.
David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES; Rondeau-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.
David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES; Rondeau-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
 Maplegate North Solar
 Site Plan Application
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Ms. Love stated that the applicant has been before the Planning Board a couple of times with their plan to build the solar. She stated that there were concerns about lot 2 as there is a vernal pool in the middle of it. She stated that she has spoken to Conservation about this. She noted that there were concerns at the last meeting regarding plantings on the cart path that they were going to remove. She recommended that should the project move forward potential conditions should be considered: 1. Applicant shall enter into a monetary agreement (PILOT) at the sole discretion of Administration and the Town of Franklin prior to commencement of construction, and 2. A surety bond in a determined amount shall be issued by a surety company acceptable to the Town of Franklin prior to commencement of construction for decommissioning purposes.

Mr. Maglio stated that he reviewed the most recent plans submitted and his previous comments have been addressed. He stated that in reviewing the latest drawings, it was noted that the detail for the outlet control structure shows the proposed orifice as per design. The dimensions of the orifice should be identified in

accordance with the stormwater calculations, which call out the opening as 11” w x 3” h with an invert of 203.00; it is recommended this be noted on the final version of the plans.

Mr. James reviewed that he has two significant items remaining. He stated that they are still looking for test pit data in the proposed retention basin. He reviewed areas that the applicant could use for this test pit data. The second item is that it was noted that they are removing quite a few of the cart paths on the north side, and he would like to see some time restraints on that. He stated that it is outside the primary work area and if they are going to do it, he recommended there should be a timeframe of about 7 to 14 days. He stated other than that it is just housekeeping.

Chair Rondeau recommended a small mini excavator to do the test pits to be least disruptive. He noted that this would make a difference with Conservation Commission as well. He noted that he thought this was resolved. He stated that he agrees with Mr. James.

Mr. Greg DiBona of Bohler Engineering and Mr. Daniel Serber of NextGrid addressed the Planning Board. Mr. DiBona stated that for the big picture he is addressing the comments and recommendations provided. He stated that since the last meeting, they worked to address the last comments such as the grass shoulder. He stated that previously, there were comments as to whether they had to do some mitigation on the noise. He stated that they feel they can put some sort of single wall structure/noise barrier on the west side of the equipment pad. He stated that they tried to do the hand auguring approach regarding the soil tests, but it did not work due to hard compacted surface. He knows they need to use an excavator and will work to get that resolved. He stated that there are some calculation items they need to follow up on, and they can add timing to the sequence notes. He noted other items that he has no problem addressing as well. He addressed the Department of Planning and Community Development letter to the Planning Board dated July 19, 2023, and stated that he has no problems with the items in the letter as potential conditions and meeting those conditions. He stated that there are items related to comments that they are still working with which he reviewed. He noted lighting for the area that is for potential public use, and they are working to get the easements in place. He stated that he feels they are really close to addressing everything in the letters and getting final plans in. He stated they have a follow-up meeting with the Conservation Commission. He noted a 307 sq. ft. area that they are reviewing with Conservation Commission and stated they are seeking a variance to fill that wetland and discussing where they will have 2:1 compensation for it.

Chair Rondeau asked if the applicant is being held up by Conservation or the Town. Ms. Love stated that the applicant also filed for Maplegate South. She stated that she would like to see something offered sooner than later. She stated that getting an answer out of Conservation Commission regarding the vernal pool would be nice to know if they are going to allow the public access there. Ms. Wierling suggested that it could be something we can recommend as a condition of approval.

Ms. Williams stated that it seems like from the last BETA report that there is still a lot outstanding, and we should see Conservation Commission’s approval to make sure they fully support it before we approve it. Chair Rondeau asked about the bond for the decommissioning and projected numbers and a bond for the tree plantings as it is close to 10 acres that is being cut. Mr. Serber asked who should prepare that. Chair Rondeau asked if the applicant could prepare that.

Motion to Continue Maplegate North Solar, Site Plan Application, to August 21, 2023. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
 100-200 Financial Way
 Site Plan Modification Application
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Ms. Love stated that they have responses for the stormwater management, not so much for traffic. She stated that there was concern about the curbing throughout the site that it was not consistent. She stated the Planning Board was concerned about the height of the building and to provide height of buildings on the site plan. She stated that the applicant indicated they will be filing an ANR plan for the site.

Mr. Maglio stated that they reviewed the latest submission. He reviewed that there are two runs of HDPE pipe called out on the plans, one 30" diameter along the south side of Building #1 and one 18" diameter along the north side of Building #2. The Planning Board typically requires reinforced concrete pipe for on-site drainage systems; if the applicant proposes to use HDPE for some of the drainage pipes, a waiver should be requested. He discussed that Building #1 calls out for a van ramp into the building; a gas trap should be identified on the plans where any interior floor drains are connected to the sewer system. He discussed that there are several different types of curbing called out on the plan: vertical granite, concrete curb, sloped granite edging, and cape cod berm. The applicant should indicate to the Planning Board which type of curbing is to be used, where, and why. He noted that it appears that the total amount of retained runoff does not meet the Town Bylaw 153-16B requirement of 1" x the total amount of post-construction impervious area.

Mr. James reviewed some of the applicant's responses. He stated that he met with Highpoint Engineering about two weeks ago. It appears that quite a few comments have been addressed. He noted a few issues remaining; he noted that the applicant has the ability to develop some groundwater contours. He stated that he will go through it all. He stated that he thinks they put all the curbing to vertical granite or pre-cast concrete across the entire site. He stated that he will have a letter for the Planning Board within a week.

Mr. Doug Hartnett, principal of Highpoint Engineering, representing the applicant Berkeley Partners, addressed the Planning Board and introduced team members Mr. Brendan Pellerin, asset management director of Berkeley Partners, and Mr. Jonathan Quinn of Rode Architects, both attending in person, as well as other team members attending via Zoom. Mr. Hartnett narrated a slideshow presentation reviewing the project status updates at the Planning Board and at the Conservation Commission. He noted that the Planning Board wants the Conservation Commission decision. He discussed comments from the last meeting including that the Planning Board wanted better comparisons from the proposed plan to as it exists today. He showed and reviewed Site Plan revisions. He stated that they commissioned the ANR plan from their surveyor. He explained the impervious coverage existing and proposed and the building coverage existing and proposed as noted on the Site Plan revisions documents. He asked for direction from the Planning Board regarding the recalculation compliance for parking based on the use. He showed and explained a slide labeled grading and drainage which shows their reengineering of stormwater; he stated they have done a redesign using the Cultec system. He stated that Mr. Daniel Mills of MDM Transportation would discuss the onsite driveway configuration and the offsite King Street/Washington Street studies that have been conducted.

Mr. Daniel Mills (via Zoom) stated that some of traffic concerns were discussed at the last meeting, and he wanted to provide an update. He showed a slide labeled Traffic Improvement Concepts – Financial Park Entrance. He stated that they have responded in writing to BETA review comments. He stated the matter is that tractor trailers exiting the driveway to the right encroach on the opposing travel lane. He discussed that they are proposing to realign the driveway shifting it to the north which allows them to increase the radius such that the tractor trailers can maintain in their lane. They will revise the plan and resubmit for review. He discussed a slide labeled Traffic Improvement Concepts – Washington Street at King Street. He stated it was commented that tractor trailers were getting stuck in the intersection. He stated that they did some monitoring over two full days and 98 percent of the tractor trailers negotiated it without any issue. There were about 2 percent that did clip the median on the Washington Street approach in some fashion. He stated that they still feel that it can be improved upon. Their recommendation is to remove the raised island and install a more flush island and enhance the pavement markings. He stated that it is probably due to inexperienced truck

drivers. He stated that they also planned to repair the malfunctioning detection at the intersection. He noted the DPW is going to install video detection.

Chair Rondeau asked if the presenter could show the previous slide and show the actual truck route to get to the actual loading docks. Mr. Hartnett reviewed the site plan revision drawing and showed the truck route starting at the entrance of the project site and the truck exit route as well. Chair Rondeau asked about the retaining wall and if trucks would be able to back into the last space. Mr. Hartnett reviewed the spaces and the location and height of the retaining wall. He said he would add that detail information to the plans. Chair Rondeau asked about snow storage. Mr. Hartnett stated that he would follow up with a separate snow storage. He reviewed parking spaces.

Mr. Maglio noted that it has been requested in the past for a waiver that applicant's show capability for parking spaces and where it could be expanded at the site if it is determined that the need is there. Ms. Wierling discussed finding a reasonable number of parking spaces required versus a significant excess. Chair Rondeau asked for a reserve location on site just in case and stated that this is what has been done in the past.

Ms. Love stated that a report was provided today; therefore, it was not in the meeting packet regarding their responses. Ms. Williams asked if additional sidewalks were looked into on the site to improve the pedestrian experience. Mr. Hartnett said they considered it, but they are uncomfortable introducing the public into an industrial site of this magnitude, so they did not look any further into adding sidewalks into the ring road, and it is a liability issue as well. He stated that what they did look at is getting some kind of connectivity along Washington Street, and they are still looking at that and will have some more information at the next meeting. Ms. Williams asked about getting to the Charter School from the Washington Street side, and do they have a safe place to walk. She asked if they would be providing curb stops so the vehicles would not be overhanging on the sidewalks near the buildings, specifically at the accessible spots. Mr. Hartnett stated that there is a pedestrian access plan through the site that connects the buildings and goes around the pond so people can walk around; it is intended for employees who come to the property. He stated that regarding the Charter School, it is all drop off. He stated that he would be happy to get a confirmation from the Charter School that this situation still exists. Ms. Wierling asked about where the scored concrete would be for the roadway change. She asked that if you are taking out a raised median and putting something in that is flat regarding the trucks that are already crossing over, how is that safer. Mr. Mills stated that it is still a visual delineator. He stated that the island is only so long at the intersection, but we would continue the scored concrete all the way back. Chair Rondeau stated that there are a lot of questions for them to work through.

Ms. Maureen Sullivan, Washington Street, abutter, stated that we have so many parks and recreation, we do not need to ask them to put in sidewalks for the community to use. She asked that if there are school walkers, shouldn't they have sidewalks to get to school. She stated that she has seen children walking to and from the Charter School. Chair Rondeau stated that someone who works in the building would have a safe place to walk, and it is not intended for the public.

Mr. Jonathan Quinn of Rode Architects showed and reviewed the buildings and the site diagram of the existing conditions; he then showed and reviewed the site diagram of the proposed development. He discussed the truck access, employee access, site features, and landscape approach. He stated the goal is to create a 21st century modern industrial park.

Mr. Nick Campanelli, landscape architect of MDLA (via Zoom), stated that he was requested to show some site sections. He reviewed the site section layout slide and explained the elevations of the north/south side. He pointed out that buildings 1 and 2 are at the same elevation as 300 Financial Park at the left. He stated that they do not want to go any taller than adjacent buildings. He reviewed the next slide which he said runs west to east and explained the elevations.

Motion to Continue the public hearing for 100-200 Financial Way, Site Plan Modification Application, to August 21, 2023. Rondeau. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Wierling reminded all that there are three seats on the Planning Board for the November election and papers can be pulled on August 1. Ms. Williams stated that the Master Plan Committee has started meeting, and they are two meetings in. She stated that as it starts going, the Planning Board will be updated on how it is going. Ms. Love stated that the Master Plan Committee has a meeting this Wednesday at 6:30 PM; hopefully people will watch or join the meeting.

Motion to Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Meeting adjourned at 9:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi,
Recording Secretary