

**PLANNING BOARD  
OCTOBER 6, 2011  
MINUTES**

Chairman Burke called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

Members present: Burke, Barringer, Capes, Giger, Parent, Perkins and Wilson

**PUBLIC HEARING – SPECIAL PERMIT, AT&T, GIBBET HILL TOWER**

The Board continued the public hearing to consider the application submitted by AT&T to add three antennae on the Gibbet Hill tower at 150 ft AGL. Frank Kelly of SAI Communications represented AT&T at the public hearing.

Mr. Kelley submitted revised plans dated September 20, 2011 showing a reduction in the size of the “T” arm from 10 ft to 3 ft as shown on Sheet A-2.

Member Capes asked how the reduction in the size of the antennas would affect performance. Mr. Kelly said the RF engineers said it is difficult to quantify.

Member Giger asked about the width of the mounting bar and height of the antenna. Mr. Kelly said the mounting bars would be 96” by 11.8” installed at a centerline of 148 ft. as shown on Sheet A-3. Member Barringer asked if this would be two feet above the top of the monopole. Mr. said, “yes.”

The Board thanked Mr. Kelly for his efforts to address the concerns expressed at the public hearing on September 15, 2011.

The Board voted unanimously to close the public hearing.

**RECOMMENDATION TO SELECTMEN – CHAPTER 61A**

The Board will act on the recommendation to the Selectmen on the Chapter 61A Right of First Refusal for the Croteau Property located at 66 North Street at its meeting on October 13, 2011.

**PUBLIC HEARING – CROSSROADS PLAZA SPECIAL PERMIT MODIFICATION**

The Board received a letter dated September 30, 2011 withdrawing the application to modify the special permit for the Crossroads Plaza commercial development located at 788 Boston Road. The Board voted unanimously to close the public hearing.

The motion was made by Parent, seconded by Capes, to accept the withdrawal of the Crossroads Plaza application without prejudice. The motion passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARING – SPECIAL PERMIT, BOYNTON MEADOWS, 134 MAIN STREET**

*(Member Giger stepped down because he missed two sessions of the public hearing.)*

The Board held the continuation of the public hearing to consider the special permit for the Boynton Meadows mixed use development project at 134 Main Street.

Applicant Robert France, David Valletta, design engineer Bruce Ringwall, architects Brent Mangel and Steve Wychorski, and landscape architect Lorayne Black were present. Additionally, Selectman/Affordable Housing Trust member Joshua Degen; Conservation Commission members Nadia

October 6, 2011

Page 2

Madden, Peter Morrison, Craig Auman and David Pitkin; Historic District Commission members Richard Chilcoat and Laura Moore were present.

Chairman Russ Burke thanked members of the Conservation Commission for attending the public hearing to discuss alternative plans. He made it clear that the Board wanted to meet with the Commission as early as possible to discuss various options. He presented power point slides showing Chairman Burke said the Board was concerned about five driveway cuts and multiple garages along the right side of the access road. He showed the various options shown as Alternative A, C and D. Alternative F was rejected because it encroached into the 50 ft buffer zone. Alternative A + C reduces the number of curb cuts facing the road but result in more impervious surface in the 100 ft buffer zone. It is similar to the original concept plan presented to the Spring Town Meeting. Alternative D was rejected because there is not enough parking. Chairman Burke said Alternatives A, B and A+C are still under consideration.

Commission Member Peter Morrison said the Commission has been working with the applicant to minimize the encroachment in the buffer zone. Alternative A+C results in more encroachment in the buffer.

Conservation Commission Chairman said there is still controversy over the existing plan and the amount of disturbance in the 100 ft buffer. Chairman Burke said the Planning Board did not discuss its preference yet – it wanted to meet with the Conservation Commission first.

Member Barringer asked if there is a difference between disturbing a natural area and a previously disturbed area of the buffer zone. Mr. Morrison said the previously disturbed provision is part of the local Wetlands Protection By-law. Chairman Burke noted that the buffer zone at 134 Main Street is maintained turf.

Commission Member Craig Auman read Section 215-7 Presumptions of the Wetlands Protection By-law. He added that many alternatives were explored with the applicant. The Commission has made progress thanks to the peer review performed by Mass Audubon. He stated the Commission is only concerned about work in the buffer zone.

Member Wilson said the Planning Board would like to understand the constraints of the Wetlands Protection By-law and possible mitigation measures. Commission Member Peter Morrison said the goal is to move everything out of the 100 ft buffer zone, if possible. Option E is the best option at this point. The Commission requested a peer review by Mass Audubon on this option. It is up to the applicant to negotiate mitigation measures with the Commission.

Member Parent asked about the proposed mitigation measures under discussion. Commission Chairman Nadia Madden said the applicant is proposing to remove invasive vegetation and make a contribution to the Conservation Fund. Member Parent asked if any consensus had been reached on the mitigation. Commission Chairman Madden said it is still under discussion – the Commission has not taken a vote yet.

Chairman Burke said current design E is under review by the Conservation Commission. Alternatives A and B are comparable. Alternatives A and C increase work in the buffer zone, but are the best design from the Planning Board's perspective.

October 6, 2011

Page 3

Architect Brent Maugel said there are compromises and trade-offs. The applicant understands that the Commission would like greater distance from the wetlands. He said they could move buildings 10 ft closer to the street, but it would increase the amount of impervious surface. Design engineer Bruce Ringwall said they are trying to avoid placing driveways too close together.

Member Barringer asked if buildings B and C could be moved forward. Mr. Ringwall said this would change the design and result in steeper driveways.

Chairman Burke asked if the Commission's issues could be resolved with options A and B. Commission Member David Pitkin said additional mitigation measures would be required. The proposal (option E) is close to resolution with the mitigation measures discussed with the applicant. Commission Member Peter Morrison explained the difference between mitigation and wetlands replication.

Member Perkins noted that the Planning Board is in a holding pattern until mitigation measures are resolved with the Conservation Commission.

Member Capes asked about the reduction of the number of garage spaces proposed for the units and what the impact is on the project. Mr. Maugel said option A loses three garage spaces which reduces the value of the project. The applicant prefers option B with option A as the second choice.

Chairman Burke said with such limited parking, where will friends and visitors park. There is no available on-street parking with Option E. He said Options A and B work best visually and for traffic circulation, but there would be more disturbance in the buffer zone than with Option E.

Commission Member Auman asked if the units would have basements. Mr. Ringwall said, "yes." He asked if garages could be placed underneath the units. Mr. Ringwall said the driveways would be steeper and there would be more impervious surface.

Applicant Bob France said they have made many changes to the plan since the concept plan was presented in February. Mr. Ringwall said changes were made in response to the changes in the wetlands delineation by the Conservation Commission. The applicant is not allowed to fill and replicate wetlands because the project is located in an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). Mr. Ringwall said the applicant worked on moving buildings around after many meetings with the Conservation Commission and Design Review Committee. There has been no change in proposed work in the buffer zone since the plan was submitted on July 18, 2011.

Chairman Burke noted that much of the negotiations with the applicant took place at the pre-submission stage. Mr. Ringwall said the applicant has also addressed concerns of the Historic Districts Commission since the July 18<sup>th</sup> submission.

Chairman Burke said the joint meeting with the Conservation Commission helped everyone understand the other's jurisdiction and objectives. He thanked the Commission members for attending.

Chairman Burke said Options A and C increase work in the buffer zone unless there is a change to the plans. Mr. Ringwall said Options A and C are "untested" for impact on the drainage system. There would be an increase of 1600 SF of impervious surface. The size of the a bioretention area and swale would have to be increased which would put part of the drainage system in the 50 ft buffer zone. More fill and grading would also be required.

October 6, 2011

Page 4

Connie Sartini said with the constraints of the Wetlands Protection By-law, do the Design Guidelines play a secondary role. Chairman Burke said, "yes."

Member Wilson said the Conservation Commission should make its decision before the Planning Board votes on the special permit. Chairman Burke agreed and added that the Board assume that Option E will move forward.

Historic District Commission Member Richard Chilcoat said the HDC review is focusing on the proposed changes to the existing building at the present time.

The Board discussed a variety of changes to the plan.

Member Barringer asked if Building B could be rotated. Mr. Ringwall said it would increase the amount of impervious surface.

Chairman Burke asked if services alleys could be constructed in the rear of the buildings. Mr. Ringwall said there is not enough space with the 15 ft setback from the property lines. The grades change in the rear of the site so there is not enough area to maneuver, and there would be no outdoor living space.

Member Wilson said the plan is too suburban in style. He asked if garages could be consolidated. Mr. Ringwall said this concern was raised by the Design Review Committee. They tried putting parking underneath the buildings, but it did not work without creating more impervious area and more disturbance in the buffer zone.

Chairman Burke asked if the driveway cuts could be reduced or moved. Mr. Ringwall said, "yes," they could move driveways.

Chairman Burke asked whether the guardrail around the constructed wetland is still on the plan. Mr. Ringwall said, "no."

Member Perkins asked if the area in the center could be reduced. Mr. Ringwall said, "No," because the turning radius is required for fire trucks and the drainage area is needed.

Chairman Burke said he preferred Option B over E. He asked if the surfaced material for sidewalks could be changed where it crosses the driveways to buildings A and B. Mr. Ringwall agreed.

Member Capes asked about Options A and C. He said he did not prefer Option A because it mixes retail and residential parking and reduce garages.

Board members all agreed that they preferred Option B.

Mr. Mangel described the architectural changes made at the request of the HDC. The height of the buildings has been reduced to under 35 ft. The 12 pitch roof has been changed to 10 pitch. He said the applicant would like more windows in the historic Kilbridge building and they are working with the HDC on the details. The color scheme of the triplexes has been changed to a monochromatic scheme with subtle variations.

October 6, 2011

Page 5

-

Lorayne Black presented the landscaping and lighting plans which include subtle bollards similar to those installed at Groton School.

Mr. France said the outstanding issues to be resolved are:

- Signage – Mr. France asked the Board to approve the plan with a condition that signage be approved by the HDC and Planning Board at a later date when the tenants are identified. The Board said the location of the signs should be shown on the site plan with the review of the design details to be done by the HDC at a later date.
  
- Hours of lighting – Mr. France requested that the hours of lighting be different for residential and business uses. The Board agreed.
  
- Affordable units – Mr. France said the three affordable units will be located in the existing building, Building A and Building E.

The Board voted unanimously to continue the public hearing on October 27, 2011 at 7:30 PM.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Collette  
Land Use Director/Town Planner