

Medway Planning Board Meeting
November 2, 2006
Medway High School

PRESENT: Karyl Spiller-Walsh, John Schroeder, Andy Rodenhiser, Chan Rogers, Bob Tucker, Eric Alexander

ALSO PRESENT: Paul Carter, VHB; Susan Affleck-Childs, Planning Board Assistant

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 pm at the Medway High School library.

CITIZEN COMMENTS - None

Establish Construction Observation Fee for Rolling Hills Subdivision

A motion was made by Bob Tucker, seconded by Chan Rogers to approve the VHB estimate of \$ 7,938 for construction observation services for the Rolling Hills subdivision. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion on Proposed Fee Schedule –

The Board reviewed the updated proposed Fee Schedule dated 10-27-06.

A motion was made by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, seconded by Chan Rogers to adopt the fee schedule as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

Construction Observation

Paul Carter highlighted recent construction observation activity at Evergreen Meadow, Pine Ridge, Wingate Farm and Pine Meadow II.

The Board discussed the issue at Pine Ridge about the absence of a stone pad and how trucks are carrying dirt onto Candlewood Drive. Susy is to call Paul Yorkis re: CO report and ask him to take care of the problem. We want to avoid an escalation of the situation. They have been asked to do so twice already. Jack Lydon of VHB is usually out there 2 days a week for inspections. A question was raised whether or not this is a CONCOM issue? Can file a complaint to CONCOM? If this is not addressed, we will complain to CONCOM. Can the PB shut down the project?

ANDY RODENHISER – Can we ask Dave D’Amico about his authority re: stormwater stuff?

NOTE – Andy Rodenhiser passed out letter from Nick and Nancy Turi of 8 Fisher Street re: some issues re: the construction of Pine Meadow Road/Pine Meadow II subdivision. The road construction is overlapping onto their driveway. There was a meeting on 10/30/06 with Andy Rodenhiser, Susy Affleck-Childs, Mr. And Mrs. Turi, Jack Lydon and Gary Feldman, the new owner. They will be coming with some sort of proposed change to the entryway to address the problem.

Public Hearing Continuation – River Bend Village ARCPUD and Definitive Subdivision Plan

Rich Cornetta, Attorney
Mark Deschenes, Abbott Real Estate
John Spink, Coneco Engineering
Lee Bloom – Abbott Real Estate

Rich Cornetta – We want to take a moment at the beginning of the hearing to make sure we are not missing any other items of a non-engineering basis. Susy and I have started the beginnings of decision. Is there anything else outstanding that you need of us?

ANDY RODENHISER – WE have a note from David Travalini/CONCOM re: the embankments. CONCOM feels the construction of the stone wall would encroach on the wetlands and they cannot permit that. An alternative design that is less invasive to the wetlands is needed.

Mark Deschenes – We met with the DRC about a month ago to discuss the retaining wall. Originally, the walls were designed as using a versa lock system with a geogrid inside. I gave them 2 alternatives, one being a gravity stone wall using large boulders on the site with a total of 3-3.5 feet sloping back into the wetlands. The versa lock we propose is natural looking with a tumbled stone finish. Although the DRC didn't want to approve a versa lock wall, they did feel better about this particular alternative vs. other versa lock styles. Versa lock will also impact the wetlands, but less so. We would like to use that product.

John Spink– The boulder wall impacts about 4700 sq. ft of wetlands and the versa lock version impacts less of a wetlands area. The law says CONCOM has to minimize the impact as much as possible.

ERIC ALEXANDER – As much as it pains me to lose the natural stone wall, in his instance, to balance the interests of the Town with CONCOM, I don't find the tumbled versa lock objectionable.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – I would like to suggest that a poured concrete wall be considered with a stone finish.

Mark Deschenes – Any kind of concrete wall needs to have a foundation and that will impact the wetlands too.

ERIC ALEXANDER – There might be an interpretation difference here.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – Versa lock is not the only option. Do a precise concrete wall with a stone finish.

Mark Deschenes – Versa lock only needs crushed stone as a base and a concrete wall would encroach on the wetlands.

JOHN SCHROEDER – Where are we talking about using the versa lock?

Mark Deschenes – Only at the wetland crossings.

John Spink– We would use it at both crossings.

JOHN SCHROEDER – Can we use the versa lock where it is needed in the wetlands and use the DRC’s preferred stone/rock wall elsewhere?

Mark Deschenes – The longer wall is more visible and that is where there is the most impact on the wetlands.

John Spink– See pages C 15 and 16.

ANDY RODENHISER – C44 has wall details.

Paul Carter – C49 as well

ANDY RODENHISER – So versa lock will have less of an impact on the wetlands.

Paul Carter – One side is a head wall and the other side is more of a retaining wall.

Susy Affleck-Childs – So what is the spec for the versa lock?

Mark Deschenes – The one I submitted to the DRC. I will send you a cut sheet.

ANDY RODENHISER – Out of respect for the CONCOM, are we OK with this?

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – Yes.

John Spink– That particular versa lock product will show up in the next plan version.

BOB TUCKER – You really need to be careful with the base

NOTE – The locations for the smaller walls are all shown on the plans.

BOB TUCKER – Flag those walls that they have to comply with building codes.

Paul Carter – Will all the retaining walls will be versa lock?

John Spink- There are others throughout.

Paul Carter – You have field stone masonry headwalls.

ANDY RODENHISER – All of the drainage stuff has been reviewed?

Paul Carter – With this last submittal, they added 5 underground detention areas. There are still some recent comments they need to address. 2 systems that overtop the 100 year. They need to be made consistent between the plans and the details and the table and the hydrocad calcs. There are a number of inconsistencies among those elements and there are 2 where the design didn’t work.

John Spink– I changed it and flipped it over and it works. I have more revisions for you tonight. I changed the outlet structures.

ANDY RODENHISER – Does this work?

Paul Carter – John, does it work? It looks like we are moving in a good direction.

John Spink– I have fixed all the outlet structures

John Spink - Where do we stand with letters from other departments? The only open question is from the Fire Department re: alarm system.

ANDY RODENHISER – We have a letter now from the Fire Chief.

ANDY RODENHISER – Let’s ask Water/sewer if things are OK based on John’s recent version.

ANDY RODENHISER – Susy, please talk with Dave D’Amico and get an email from him that he is OK with everything.

JOHN SCHROEDER – We have today’s letter from Paul Carter dated 11/1/06 regarding their most recent plans submitted last week in response to VHB’s previous letter.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH –You said there are new underground weirs?

John Spink– We have cultec units with some sort of outlet control structure.

ANDY RODENHISER – Are there any other issues we need to address from your perspective?

Rich Cornetta – If Susy needs anything, she can let me know.

Susy Affleck-Childs – We had talked about having another entity as party to the conservation restriction.

ANDY RODENHISER – So we need one last meeting to hear from Paul Carter that everything is OK.

Rich Cornetta – We believe we have submitted everything we have. We would like to start to working on the decision.

Susy Affleck-Childs – Gino and I will work on the draft decision that Rich Cornetta sent me. . .

The public hearing was continued to November 14, 2006 at 7:15 pm. We expect to work on this some more at the 11/28/06 meeting.

The deadline for planning board action is 11/30/06 (on the subdivision).

2007 Meeting Schedule

The draft meeting schedule was reviewed. A motion was made by Bob Tucker, seconded by John Schroeder to approve the 2007 meeting schedule as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

Invoices

A motion was made by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, seconded by John Schroeder to authorize payment of \$3,025 to attorney Mark Bobrowski for legal services pertaining to the Marian Community ARCPUD project. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

REMINDER - SWAP Legislative Breakfast – November 17, 2006 at 8 am in Medway. Planning Board members are encouraged to attend. A flyer was distributed.

Susy Affleck-Childs – Paul Yorkis and I met with Suzanne Kennedy re: some public transit possibilities for Medway. This past summer, the Legislature approved a law that would allow communities like Medway who are assessed for the MBTA but do not receive any direct services, to direct part of those funds to another regional transit authority. The closest other RTA is GATRA (Greater Attleboro Taunton Area). So we could approach them. At the same time, there is a funding initiative called the Suburban Mobility Grant program. The idea being discussed is to establish 2-3 park and ride lots in Medway (at shopping center locations) and run a shuttle van to the Franklin MBTA station at morning and afternoon rush hours. Paul Yorkis has already made overtures to Joe Griffiths, the owner of Drybridge, who has agreed in concept to set aside some parking spaces. Paul has also contacted Karen Johnson of Charter Realty to see if Medway Commons would want to participate.

Public Hearing Continuation – Daniels Village ARCPUD

Jim Williamson, Barberry Homes
Rob Truax, GLM Engineering
Bill Scully, MLS Traffic Consultants
Kenny Labarre, Barberry Homes

Paul Carter - Rob Nagy is also here from VHB. He is our traffic guy and reviewed their traffic study.

Rob Truax – We went back to the drawing board and took your comments and have a revised the plan. We tried to address everything – density and massing, circulation, present natural features, preserve more open space, central area open for gathering. We now have 2 distinct entrances. One lines up across from Clover Lane. We slid the other entrance to the most northerly part of the site. This location provides a better sight distance because you are now at the top of the hill. On the interior of the site, we tried to maintain the same philosophy providing access to many of the units from the rear. Most are 3 unit triplexes but there are 4 single family structures along the front of the site/Winthrop Street with that have rear access. We have a 100 foot by 250 foot green area at the front of the site facing Winthrop Street. There are triplexes on the interior where the buildings face the street but access is from common driveways at the rear. We created a courtyard that 4 sets of 3 units will face. It is about the size of a football field, quite a large area of green space. Then we tried to align the houses in curvy fashion. We removed the straight line of houses and added in some road curves. Also, we left open the back field on the site (about 2 acres) and tried to maintain the most westerly existing tree line. We will keep the field mowed. We left a view from the courtyard out to the open space at the back. The courtyard is about an acre. All roadways are 22 feet. The common drives would be 16 feet. There is some off street parking for visitors. Every unit has 2 spaces in a garage and 2 spaces in a driveway. We were able to preserve the outer tree line for the most part. This has a totally different circulation pattern. We will need some waivers – on the cul de sacs and one for a curve in the roadway. We

will put a turning radius on it to make sure a truck can do it. We propose selective thinning in the tree line to see through. We want to keep the nice trees and give it a view out to the back. WE meet the parking standards.

BOB TUCKER – You are showing relatively little on street parking.

Rob Truax – We can add more.

ANDY RODENHISER – How will you handle the bylaw requirement for 2 types of ARCPUD residential units?

Jim Williamson – We will make one section a subdivision.

CHAN ROGERS - The layout is a tremendous improvement.

BOB TUCKER – How many units?

Rob Truax – 86.

BOB TUCKER – Karyl, how do you feel about the density?

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – This is so much more thoughtful and heading in the right direction, if not very close. Re parking, what happens when there are parties? Some parallel spaces in front of the triplexes would be good.

Jim Williamson – How many additional parking spots do you want?

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – A couple per triplex.

Rob Truax – We can provide some more parallel spaces.

ANDY RODENHISER - What kind of curbing?

Rob Truax – Concrete vertical curbing, so it wouldn't be parked on.

ANDY RODENHISER – Can we come up with a number of more parking spaces we are looking for?

Rob Truax – Right now we have 24 parallel parking spaces and we have 30 triplexes.

CHAN ROGERS - Ask VHB for their input.

Rob Nagy – Maybe spread out the additional parking. Parallel parking is probably the right choice.

JOHN SCHROEDER – Keep the ones you have, just add some more.

ANDY RODENHISER – In general, is everybody pleased with the overall layout?

Marshall Gustin, 76 Winthrop Street – There are 2 wonderful trees that look like they will be removed. They are probably over 100 years old.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – How possible would it be to accommodate those trees. Let's try to site them or well them please.

Rob Truax – If it lands in a position, we will try.

JOHN SCHROEDER – Please try to make an effort to save some of those.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – Those are magnificent trees. Why couldn't the road be morphed to save them? If they need to be welled, let's do it.

Rob Truax – We will try to do that.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – Just a comment at this early stage. We talked briefly last time about a signature statement at the front of the site (toward Winthrop Street). It looks like you have a foot in the door with 4 single family homes and walkway. I would like to see some kind of interesting architecture so the houses would be different one from the other.

Jim Williamson – We will now have our landscape architect go to work. We held back until you were happy with the overall site layout.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – I would like to see some replicated stone walls, maybe out of the same materials as existing walls on the site.

Jim Williamson – That is important to us as well.

Jim Williamson – WE did prepare a financial impact report for you, dated 10/24/06. We estimate the tax revenues would be \$374,708/per year.

ANDY RODENHISER – That is what the town would see as “new growth.”

Jim Williamson – I think the taxes right now on the property are about \$6,000.

Jim Williamson – We also looked at school impact. I checked 5 different over 55 developments in Sudbury, Southborough, Norton, Ashland and Bellingham – not a single child in the school system. The trend seems to be that these over 55 developments don't generate children. They only have 2 bedrooms.

BOB TUCKER – With the different site plan, you understand you will have to go back and redo the stormwater management? I would like to see that before we go on to the other items.

Rob Truax – you have seen the new layout. We feel you are happy with it so we will go ahead and do the engineering. We will revise the drainage study, regrade the site, and do the roads. This site layout ends up with less roadway so there will be less impervious surfaces.

BOB TUCKER – Could you give us an overview at the next meeting as to where you think the stormwater facilities will be?

Rob Truax – I may not be done with all that by November 14th.

Susy Affleck-Childs – Let's discuss at the November 28th meeting and move the design issues after.

Bill Scully with MS Transportation out of Framingham

Bill Scully - We prepared a traffic report. I thought I would briefly highlight the key elements. The scope of the study was set up to conform with the subdivision regs. We ran thru the process with VHB before starting. We collected traffic in mid September. We looked at Winthrop and Lovering Streets. We collected daily traffic and speeds and reviewed sight distances, crash experience, etc. We did a forecast out 5 years from today. Looked at background adjacent growth at Evergreen Meadow on Lovering Street. Then we projected traffic to be generated by this particular project and followed guidelines ITE using the senior housing land use code. We have done 7 or 8 counts at these types of facilities. What we have found is that they generate even less traffic than the ITE standard suggests. We then assign the traffic numbers to the abutting street network in the morning and afternoon. Winthrop carries about 3400 vehicles per day. The peak hour in the morning is 450-480 vehicles. It is much lower in the afternoon. You can get out of the side streets onto Winthrop with very short delays. The speed limit is 30 mph south of the site but we saw 44 -48 mph in actuality. We have suggested the northern driveway be relocated northerly. We worked with site engineer and applicant and made that change so we now satisfy the sight distance criteria at the new northern driveway location. In terms of operating conditions, people should be able to enter and exit the site with minimal delays.

In terms of our other recommendations re: stop sign control, we do want the side slope along the Winthrop Street frontage be cut back as you go northerly. Most of that cutting would be within the ROW. We also suggest the installation of advance warning signs about 350' north of the driveway to warn the southbound Winthrop Street traffic.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – Has everybody visited the site? Is everybody comfortable with the southerly entrance being 2 way? I think the sight distance is poor for exiting traffic.

Rob Scully – There is a 500 feet sight line in both directions from the (new) northerly driveway.

BOB TUCKER – What do we use as a traffic study model?

Rob Nagy – ITE has guidelines for traffic studies.

Paul Carter – The other model is ASHTO guidelines for sight distances.

Rob Nagy – This is more of a safety analysis.

Rob Scully – There will be 476 vehicle trips per day to be generated by Daniels Village.

ANDY RODENHISER – What is the capacity of Winthrop Street?

Rob Scully – Probably 2,000 vehicles per hour. There is plenty of room for this additional traffic.

BOB TUCKER – I don't see a major impact by any stretch in terms of impact of additional traffic.

Rob Nagy – The impact of the traffic from the development is insignificant. Our key concern is safety. I would like them to go out and redo the sight distances to show it can be met. One other comment re: the intersection of Lovering and Winthrop Streets. There is a little bit of a higher tendency for crashes there. Maybe they could look at some of the causes of those accidents and consider some mitigation measures.

BOB TUCKER – It sounds like speed is an issue.

ANDY RODENHISER – We do have a letter from Safety Officer Jeff Watson dated 11/2/06. He wants to wait for specific recommendations on internal markings and signage until there are street names to refer to.

ANDY RODENHISER – We have nothing from the fire department yet. We await his comments.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – Can we go back to the total unit numbers?

Jim Williamson – 86 dwelling units. We went from 118 originally.

ANDY RODENHISER – Rob, what do you suggest for mitigation at Lovering and Winthrop?

Rob Nagy – I would have the applicant go out and take a look and provide some suggestions.

Rob Scully – There are about 3 accidents per year at Lovering and Winthrop Streets.

ANDY RODENHISER – Please look at that and give us some recommendations.

BOB TUCKER – I feel like your (VHB) traffic review letter was sea grass. Tell us what you reviewed the traffic study against. Do they meet the guidelines or not?

Rob Nagy – In preparing our written review of a traffic study, we normally try to follow the flow of the traffic study itself. But I would be happy putting some closing remarks up front.

Mr. Gustin – Regarding moving the second entrance further north. . does the town have any limitations in terms of grade off a roadway? Will the police department still go by there with their same rate of speed and their lights on?

The public hearing was continued to 7:15 p.m. on November 28th.

FOLLOW-UP

1. Redo stormwater drainage calcs based on new site plan and present new stormwater plan
2. Recommend some mitigation measures for intersection of Winthrop and Lovering Streets to reduce accidents.
3. Look at ways to save 2 key trees on the site's interior
4. Look at distinctive architecture for the 4 houses facing Winthrop.
5. Add more on-street parallel parking spaces.

6. Develop street naming plan for review for Medway Street Naming Committee

BOB TUCKER - When we identify issues, we need to stop and address them before we go on to the next topic.

JOHN SCHROEDER – We got a revised site design and a traffic study. That was a lot of good progress tonight.

Public Hearing Continuation – Betania II ARCPUD

The public hearing was continued to November 14, 2006 at 8:30 pm.

Informal Discussion – Possible 2 lot subdivision at 37 Holliston Street

Mr. and Mrs. Cibotti
Paul J DeSimone (senior)

Paul DeSimone – We asked for an informal meeting to discuss their property on Holliston Street. The reason we came here is because back in August, the ZBA looked at two proposals for variances and both were turned down. The existing site is 55,868 sq. ft. and we are looking at ways to divide. I looked at the new subdivision rules and regs. Now that you are going along with private roads and allowing hammerhead turnarounds, I put something together and bounced it off of Gino Carlucci and asked him for his review to see if the PB would be willing to look at this.

ANDY RODENHISER – Why not just do a reduced width private road that goes into the parcel to create the frontage instead of the paper cul de sac on Holliston Street?

Paul DeSimone – We are trying to get a feel from the board.

ANDY RODENHISER – What is the feeling of the board?

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – How will you handle water issues? If a detention pond is needed, it has to be on a separate parcel.

Paul DeSimone – They may need a waiver in terms of the diameter of a cul de sac in the right of way.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – I drove by. It is a beautiful property.

Mrs. Cibotti – My father was the tree warden in town for many years. The house was built in 1880.

ANDY RODENHISER - Tell us what you need to do to make this work. We don't like the paper cul de sac. Give us a list of the waivers you need.

Committee Reports

JOHN SCHROEDER - Nothing to report for CPC different from town meeting.

BOB TUCKER - The CONCOM is meeting tonight.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH - Nothing from DRC.

ANDY RODENHISER – I would like to have a couple of joint meetings

1. Bob Speroni and Joe Musmanno re: zoning and try to establish some critical items that seem to bite us on zoning changes.
2. Joint meeting with the IDC - What needs relative to zoning do they see?

Continued Discussion – Possible Zoning Bylaw Amendments

JOHN SCHROEDER – I went to the IDC meeting when they discussed the idea to allow contractors quarters in the industrial parks. Their concern is that the change would reflect badly on the other properties in the 495 industrial park

BOB TUCKER – Bristol Myers Squibb is buying 35 acres of land at Devens. Another unnamed large pharmaceutical company came in and had discussions with Mass Development. What they realized when they came in is that the other company would take them to their maximum command and controls systems effective immediately. It would max out their sewer, water, power, etc. It would have taken it all up. One of the things that needs to be talked about is your infrastructure. There can be grandiose ideas but if you can't support it with the infrastructure, that's the problem

ANDY RODENHISER – In the west Medway industrial park, maybe 35 acres are available. The lots are all weird shapes with all variety of different owners. There is no one single big parcel of land.

JOHN SCHROEDER – Adding one more allowable use isn't going to dramatically change things up there.

ANDY RODENHISER – There is a possibility to designate an area for a 43D site to coordinate an expedited permitting project with the state. The idea is to go to the BOS and ask for a group to be put together to work on this, somebody from a variety of boards and try to enable something to happen.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I have to express some concerns about pursuing something like this. I really question if the town has the capacity to really pull off something like this right now.

ANDY RODENHISER – I will do whatever to make sure that they doesn't get dumped on you

Upcoming Meeting Schedule - It was agreed that the Planning Board would meet on Dec 5 and 12th.

Bond Reduction/Release for 2-4 Main Street Site Plan

Susy Affleck-Childs – We now have his engineer's certification. Bob Potheau has contacted the CONCOM to request a Certificate of Compliance so that is still to be done. Bob asks the Board to authorize a partial release of the funds.

ANDY RODENHISER – The site is a mess again.

A motion was made by Bob Tucker, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh to not release the bond for 2-4 Main Street. The motion passed unanimously.

ANDY RODENHISER – I will talk with him.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, seconded by Bob Tucker to approve the minutes of the September 26, October 2, and October 10, 2006 Planning Board meeting as presented.

A motion was made by Bob Tucker, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan E. Affleck-Childs
Planning Board Assistant