

## **Medway Planning Board Meeting Tuesday, September 23, 2008**

Present: Andy Rodenhiser, Karyl Spiller-Walsh, John Williams, Chan Rogers  
Absent with Notice: Bob Tucker and Tom Gay

Also Present – Gino Carlucci, PGC Associates and Susy Affleck-Childs, Planning Board Assistant

Chairman Rodenhiser called the meeting to order at 7:07 pm

**CITIZEN COMMENTS** - None

NOTE - We do have a quorum of regular members. John Williams, associate member is also present.

### **Reissue Lot Release for Sledding Hill Way**

A motion was made by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, seconded by Chan Rogers to issue a new lot release for Lot #2 as shown on the Village Acres Definitive Subdivision Plan. APPROVED.

### **Invoices**

\$517.50 for VHB for construction inspection services at Ishmael Coffee Estates to be paid from developer's construction observation account. Motion by Chan Rogers, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh. APPROVED.

\$341.45 for WB Mason for office supplies, to be paid from the Planning Board's General Fund budget. Motion by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, seconded by Chan Rogers. APPROVED.

### **Construction Inspection Invoice for Birch Hill**

Susy recommended the Board approve an estimate of \$8,805 for additional construction inspection services (\$3,805) and legal services (\$5,000) for the Birch Hill subdivision. A motion was made by Chan Rogers, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh to approve the estimate. APPROVED.

### **Public Hearing – Williamsburg Condo OSRD and Affordable Housing Special Permits**

7:18 pm – Introductory comments by Andy Rodenhiser - Attach.

A motion was made by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, seconded by Chan Rogers to dispense with the reading of the public hearing notice. APPROVED. (Notice is attached).

Andy Rodenhiser - There will not be additional notices mailed to you (abutters). We will announce it at the end of each hearing. You need to be at the hearings.

Susy Affleck-Childs - Note that members Bob Tucker and Tom Gay are not in attendance tonight. They will view the notes and videotape.

Chan Rogers – The applicant did present to us previously in a required pre-application meeting.

Paul Yorkis – I am associated with Patriot Real Estate and I represent Greg Whelan who is the owner and applicant.

NOTE - Paul described the entire parcel and displayed a map.

The teal colored represents areas covered by the wetlands protection act. The area in green is uplands. The area in yellow is part of 100 year flood plain/wetlands protection act. There is a certified vernal pool very close to West Street.

The applicant is proposing to develop only the light green portion of the site.

The existing driveway to the left of the veterinary clinic is where we propose that the driveway exit onto West Street.

The original number of units we are applying for is 18. But we are now proposing to eliminate the one single family dwelling so the configuration would be 6 two family structures and 2 three family structures.

A drawing showing the revised layout was distributed.

At the recent town meeting, the Town adopted a bylaw that requires Affordable Housing to be included in any project that is 3 dwellings or more. There is a formula. Our proposal has been reviewed and there would be 3 affordable units.

NOTE – Paul displayed some concept drawings of the buildings.

These are simply for illustrative purposes only. The actual style would be similar to this. There is a requirement that the applicant present plans for the exterior to the DRC. Before we do that, we wanted to make sure that the PB in its initial review was comfortable with the proposed layout of buildings and once they agree, then we will finalize the exterior designs.

Andy – Any questions for Paul?

John Williams – Are there any vernal pools in light green area?

Paul Yorkis – No. ConCom has confirmed the wetlands boundaries.

Gino Carlucci - I have reviewed the application and plan in light of the zoning bylaw to see if it complied. My first comment concerns the purpose of the OSRD bylaw. There are 11 specific purposes listed. The application (narrative) did not address these specifically but I feel they meet at least 8 of the purposes.

I checked eligibility of the parcel. It is in the ARII district; there are 4 contiguous parcels; and a condominium is allowed.

A pre-application meeting is required. That has occurred.

There is a 4 step design process that is required to be followed to determine the resources on the site to be preserved and what areas are most suitable for development. The applicant did demonstrate that the 4 step design process was used.

The bylaw requires a narrative statement to indicate how the proposal meets the general purposes of the bylaw and why this is better than a conventional subdivision. That has been provided.

I did note that the concept plan is required to be prepared by a registered landscape architect. The plan was prepared by an engineer. The plans should be stamped by the landscape architect.

Also I note that the proposal is for an 18 foot driveway with one way traffic only.

The (OSRD) bylaw contains a formula to determine the maximum number of dwelling units. As Paul noted, there is a separate bylaw that requires an affordable housing component. Based on the OSRD bylaw, this site would be eligible for 17 OSRD units. The AH bylaw requires that 15% of the units be Affordable and offers a density bonus of market rate units to offset the affordable units. 3 units would need to be affordable. This proposal is requesting only one additional bonus market rate unit.

I reviewed the open space requirements. 50% of the tract is required to be open space. This concept plan clearly meets that standard. A separate section of the bylaw states that the minimum required amount of open space cannot have a higher percentage of wetlands than the entire parcel has. I calculated the amount to be uplands. 23% of the site is wetlands/floodplains/vernal pools. They are required to have 5.3 acres in uplands. They show 5.71 acres of uplands.

Greg Whelan – David Faist said that the property could generate 21 units/

Gino Carlucci – There is also a requirement for a narrative statement. That was provided.

I had a couple of general comments. The landscape needs to review the concept plan. I suggest he recommend some landscape buffer areas within and around the site. Also, there are some stone walls on the property. They should identify where those stone walls could be moved to. I suggest they be used to form a boundary around the buffer area of the vernal pool to provide a little more protection. Also, significant trees should be identified and saved.

I noted that the elevation plans of the buildings do not match the building footprint as shown on the concept plan.

I suggested that a trail thru the open space be included in the plan

Andy Rodenhiser – Is the application complete?

Gino Carlucci – I did an earlier completeness review and found it acceptable.

Andy Rodenhiser – You mentioned that they meet 8 of the 11 purposes.

Gino Carlucci – Generally they are advancing. I think you could certainly make a case that they meet a minimum of 8 of the 11 purposes.

Andy Rodenhiser - Any questions for Gino?

Paul Yorkis – I have a few comments to make.

First regarding Mr. Carlucci's concern about having the registered landscape architect review concept plan. I would share with members of the board and staff that we have a letter from the landscape architect that he has stamped. His stamp/seal will be shown on a future plan.

Regarding Item #10 in Gino's letter. We have additional recommendations from the landscape architect. What we would like to do is keep the stone walls there that don't need to be disturbed. We would relocate the ones that do not need to be disturbed elsewhere on the site.

With respect to the idea of a trail. We would prefer to not have a trail there at all. Some entities today don't have a formal trail but periodically mow a trail during the season. I would ask you consider a mowed area that could regenerate itself and then another mowed trail at a different location another year, etc.

There are two different kinds of meadows here. Much of it close to Hopping Brook is a wet meadow. More in the middle is an upland meadow. There are different kinds of birds in both areas. I would like to leave it as natural as it is.

Greg Whelan – It is one of the nicest areas on the site.

John Schroeder, 6 River Street, Open Space Committee – We like it when trails are put together that they lead somewhere. I wonder if we could look at this as an easement for a future trail that might run up Hopping Brook and connect with other trails. So perhaps not build a trail at this time, but allow for it. Let's be forward thinking. Also, if we could access to the site, we would like to walk the site.

Paul Yorkis – OK to have access to the site.

Andy Rodenhiser – Perhaps you might be able to meet with the Open Space committee and try to hammer something out. The area that you have designated for open space visitor parking, how would you propose to handle that?

Greg Whelan – We would have to do some sort of trail to get from the parking area out to the meadow area.

Andy Rodenhiser – maybe a bench?

Greg Whelan – Absolutely. A good idea.

Andy Rodenhiser – There was a recent Boy Scout project off of Deerfield Road. It is a very nice resource for the neighborhood.

Jan Fish, FinCom – I would like to speak to the vernal pool. You may want to reconsider putting a stone wall around it. Before you take that action, talk to ConCom.

Andy Rodenhiser – I think ConCom will have something to say about that.

Paul Yorkis – We aren't doing anything there. We are going to leave it alone. The amphibians that may use the vernal pool have been documented to travel as much as 1700 feet. The less obstructions the better. We want to leave leaves/branches for habitat. We literally are leaving it untouched. That is our preference.

Jim Wickis, 74 West Street - I am concerned about the impact that this would have on West Street. I am assuming it will go thru which means maybe 18 families/50-60 more people. West Street is getting busier for walkers and joggers. The street has no sidewalks and no shoulder and it serves as a shortcut from Route 109 to Route 126. To me it would be good to think in terms of sidewalks. Maybe a suggestion would be made to reduce speed limit on the street by 5 miles an hour or to install a stop sign at Granite Street, to reduce danger for pedestrians.

Tina Wright, 2 Memory Lane – I just noted on the other side of the road is where the sewer extension will go. Are we taking any land away from industrial development? Is this residential or is it more natural for industrial use?

Andy Rodenhiser – It is zoned ARII.

Greg Whelan – The animal hospital is just to the right of the exit, opposite Holbrook Street.

Jeff Senson, 60 West – We have a strong concern about the volume of traffic with 18 residences and probably 36 cars. We are very concerned about the impact on us. We live next to the driveway (planned exit). We agree with the concern about West Street not having any sidewalk or shoulder. There are only 50 residences on West Street. This will have a drastic change on the nature of the neighborhood. We ask the board to consider that impact.

Andy Rodenhiser – Something that we should talk about is the history of this site and what has been proposed here in the past. Could you speak to that?

Paul Yorkis – Prior to this application, the applicant had received approval from the Town of Medway (ZBA) to build a 40B project which would have contained 22 dwelling units and would have used up more of the parcel in terms of development than what is proposed now. That was approved about 3 years ago. This application is a little less dense in terms of the number of units but it also provides a greater amount of open space for the community to take advantage of. The open space would be used by folks that live here and for the community at large.

I understand your concerns about traffic. We have received a copy of a letter from the Town's Safety Officer and I will be meeting with him.

NOTE – The letter from Safety Officer Jeff Watson was distributed. ATTACH.

Greg Whelan – I would like to add the thought of the road being 18 feet wide is to slow things down. That is the reason we did that. Regarding sidewalks, I feel as though being one way, it will be a safe road to walk on and therefore sidewalks are not needed here. We could even paint a sidewalk along the road for a 4 foot side area. I don't want it to be a wide runway. I want to encourage people to drive slower.

John Schroeder – Don't you think it would provide a clear walkway?

Paul Yorkis – If you go to the site, there is a greater sight distance with the road exiting where we propose it.

Andy Rodenhiser – I don't think any of us pretend that we will make a decision on this tonight.  
Greg Whelan – This is the reason why I changed the site design, to move the houses further away from the closest neighbors.

Reh Berry, 60 West Street - I am a distance runner. It is very difficult for people. I would think about sidewalks. It is a very windy road.

Andy Rodenhiser – I have talked to folks on Holbrook Street. There are kids have to come out of Granite Street and go up to Alder Street for the bus.

Andy Rodenhiser – They will either have to construct a sidewalk (along West Street) or pay into a fund.

Paul Yorkis – I don't know about that.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Do you know the paved width of West Street?

Greg Whelan – I don't know for sure. It is narrow.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Is there is a 50 foot layout?

Chan Rogers – There is no mechanism to build sidewalk on.

Paul Yorkis – You can't build a sidewalk there because of a vernal pool.

Andy Rodenhiser – But that doesn't mean there can't be a contribution to the sidewalk fund.

Paul Yorkis – That is the case for conventional subdivision, but this is not a conventional subdivision.

Andy Rodenhiser – That is something we need to look at.

Chan Rogers – There are other streets that are similar. Fisher Street is narrower and has more subdivisions on it. We have bad turns there. You cannot expect a developer to step up and build sidewalks where there are none.

Reh Berry, 60 West Street – It is not the same. People don't go as fast on Fisher Street. West Street is a cut off between 109 and Village Street. It is a very different situation.

Andy Rodenhiser – Speed is an enforcement issue.

Paul Yorkis – I was going to make the suggestion. Typically Officer Watson works the 11 pm to 7 am shift. If you do call him in the evening, he would be happy to talk to folks. I would encourage you to do that. He is the person who can influence where radar is set up for enforcement measures.

Andy Rodenhiser – I would second that. He listens well.

John Williams – I am counterpoint to Chan on this. I do think it is legitimate. The development will bring folks to the area. It is well within our rights to talk about fixing an issue that is going to be worse because of the development.

Chan Rogers – I disagree. We cannot disapprove this. Legally, it can't be done.

Andy Rodenhiser – There is room for some type of compromise somewhere.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I have a lot of comments and casual observations. What about the actual policing of the one way roadway? How can you police that? Where is the comfort level with this?

Greg Whelan – I don't see there is any real advantage to go opposite the one way route. It is small enough.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – The buildings on the crest of the curve have diagonal parking. I just can't see that kind of alignment. What about doing mutual driveways between the buildings and lose parking on the street. Put the parking areas to the sides of the buildings?

Paul Yorkis – I don't have an answer, but a response. The longer the driveway we have, the more drainage we have to deal with. We are also concerned about visitor/guest parking. Part of the concept of this is to have housing that is affordable. Those buildings (triplexes) have no garages. I will be glad to talk with David Faist (engineer) to see if he can come up with something.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I have a lot of concerns about the diagonal parking. We are not necessarily advocating garages. Consider side parking instead or a bigger visitor parking. I see it as a real danger, backing into the small street. I see it as a visual affront from the street. I would like you to look at that.

Paul Yorkis – We will. We are happy to make the road narrower. The narrower the street, the slower the traffic. This is really one of the questions. This is really up to the Planning Board. One of the things that can happen is that we can put some curve into the roadway/driveway to help slow things down. We will need some guidance from the PB on what we can do. The subdivision regs require more straight roads. Some of our hands are tied based on what you will allow us to do. We are looking at grass swales.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh - I like that concept of a meandering sidewalk internal to the subdivision.

Andy Rodenhiser – Particularly if there is less width in the pavement.

Paul Yorkis - I would rather not have a meandering sidewalk but have a sidewalk along the street. The area that is going to be open space is going to be mowed. It will serve as a common recreation area for the people who live there. There are a lot of different things we can do to be creative. Move sidewalk across the street. Install trees. We need direction from the Planning Board.

Chan Rogers – There are no internal lots?

Paul Yorkis – The open space areas will have a particular ownership and designation thru this process. That will be a separate parcel, ownership to be determined. The developed area is one lot and the maintenance of the infrastructure within the developed area will be the responsibility of the condo association.

Paul Yorkis – We are willing to consider a sidewalk. We are looking at low impact development for the drainage. We are trying to not spend a lot of money to explore things. We want to have a plan that meets the goals of the PB and meets your concerns. We want to have a good design. One of the questions I have is the layout of the dwellings. Other than the parking issue, is that acceptable? If so, we can start to work on building designs.

Greg Whelan – This is what I am getting from this meeting. I am thinking of narrowing the street to 14 feet and having a grassy swale 4 feet wide for a sidewalk. We could adjust from there.

Reh Berry, 60 West Street – There is a 6 foot hedge that gives us some privacy. We want to have a natural barrier.

Greg Whelan – I would be glad to leave that.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Don't forget, if you need a better buffer, think outside the box a bit. There are lots of possibilities.

Reh Berry, 60 West Street Neighbor – Is there going to be a retention pond there?

John Schroeder – We have to get back to our meeting. There is a very nice paragraph in the applicant's proposal. It is proposed that the open space be deeded to the town conservation Commission but the maintenance would be the responsibility of the condo association.

Chan Rogers – The duplexes with garages have aprons, but triplexes do not.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – How do we feel about general layout? I would suggest realigning the buildings to get the parking off the street.

Greg Whelan – I would like to make it all duplexes.



Paul Yorkis – Could we get some direction on the road width and the general layout? If we could get that much this evening, that would allow us to get with the engineer to begin the process of fine-tuning and coming back with a plan or some options. We would like the Board's support to get the layout done so we can figure out the house dwelling part of this.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – The most crucial element is the internal sidewalk. It is imperative that there be something. And the parking spaces on the street are a real issue. I think one affects the other. What the road width should be I am not so sure.

John Williams – A general comment. I wonder how the board feels about the parking spaces for the open space visitors. It is very close to somebody else's house. I think it would be more approachable if the open space parking was set apart a little bit. Visitors would feel more inclined to use it if it is farther away.

Greg Whelan – I agree.

Andy Rodenhiser – That might address the intensity Karyl was talking about.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – There are trail systems that link and there is a purpose in them. But I personally think that not all open space has to function as recreational land for the public's use. Some of it can be just open. We have to be careful of visitors. I have lived with public lands behind my house. I think there needs to be a concept. What are they going to do there? Will there be a trail around? How will that effect the development? I don't know if I see a huge advantage in having some trails here. This site is unlike Daniels Village where there were connective possibilities. What do you think?

John Schroeder – What are we doing with OSRD to begin with if we are not somewhat encouraging the use of open space for the general public. If you feel like that cannot be accommodated here, maybe this doesn't fit the OSRD box.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Open spaces aren't just recreational; all sites aren't good spots.

John Williams – Would it be more inclined to promote public use of the space by having trails?

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – It seems like a contrivance – 3 parking spaces for visitors. That is very tight. Maybe it could be merged.

Greg Whelan – I have some ideas.

Andy Rodenhiser – If they go and visit with Open Space Committee, we can get a better view of the whole thing and how it can possibly link to the overall open space plan.

Chan Rogers – The idea of reorienting the building to be perpendicular? Does anybody else like that? I think that would be bad to have front, middle and rear units. Parking should be in front of the building and not at one end. The roadway should be directly connected to the parking as a way of organizing the units.

Paul Yorkis – I would like to address a couple of comments relative to open space. John Schroeder indicated earlier that he wanted to check about linking with other open space. We will dialogue with him. There are two different types of open space. I would like to use Idylbrook Park as an example. When the town acquired that land there was a decision to develop the inside for fields but around that entire perimeter is passive open space that provides substantial value. It is possible to have parking spaces and take advantage of passive open space. People walk thru nice vegetated areas without a path.

Andy Rodenhiser – So you are proposing passive recreational as opposed to active. I think that works at this site. We are running out of time this evening. How does the board feel about a narrower pavement? We need to run that by police and fire.

Paul Yorkis – I will do that. Also, we seek to do low impact design - no curbs and berms. We could have some parking spaces along the road.

Andy Rodenhiser – What is your feeling on pavement width?

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – As it stands now, not narrower.

Andy Rodenhiser – And if the parking concerns are addressed?

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – A possibility that I could go to narrower if you go to duplexes. Not 14 feet. OK for 16 feet.

Paul Yorkis – Why?

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – The small subdivisions we have done with reduced width with more than 3 houses are just too narrow.

Paul Yorkis – Are they one way?

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I just can't see 14 feet for this number of units.

John Williams – I agree with applicant's assertion that a tighter road would reduce speed. But I would like to see a continuous sidewalk

Chan Rogers – One way, 18 feet minimum plus a sidewalk

Andy Rodenhiser – I am OK with less width relative to keeping with low impact development standards. I concur with sidewalks and I concur with changing the parking.

Paul Yorkis – Is a variable width road something you would consider?

Andy Rodenhiser – Be creative. But I am very concerned about shielding the adjacent residents. I want to see you work out the traffic flow issues with Jeff Watson. There needs to be some really good screening to block lights.

Planning Board Meeting Minutes 9-23-2008  
Approved 10-14-2008

Greg Whelan – I agree, I also want to say that I want the road going the other way also. I wanted it to come in from the right and going to the left.

Andy Rodenhiser – Is that sufficient direction?

Greg Whelan – I would like entry to be narrower.

The public hearing was continued to Tuesday, October 28 at 7:15 p.m.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Country View Estates**

Greg Whelan – We have one pedestrian trail that goes over the sewer easement that hooks Broad Acres to Summer Hill Road. It comes out on Ken McKay's property. It goes right down their side lot line. With the changes in the deeds we have to make (for street acceptance) they would like me to change the pedestrian easement. The pathway is used a lot. They don't have a problem with it as it is. The problem they have right now is that the plan shows a 10 foot pedestrian easement and they want it to be just 5 feet. It is supposed to be walking only; it is a dirt trail. They don't want it to get any larger. It is still a 20 foot sewer easement. But they don't want the trail to be widened to 10 feet. I want you to vote right now that the pedestrian trail can be 5 feet. The as-built plan shows 10 foot. Please think about it.

Chan Rogers – What is on record?

Andy Rodenhiser – We have other appointments waiting, we will have to take this up at another meeting.

Break at 9:00 pm

### **Status Report – 4 Main Street Site Plan**

Bob Potheau – The site work on phase II has been completed. The parking lot is paved, drains are in and as-built plan is done. For the building work, the façade is going to be built next. We put the last pieces of granite. We did a custom railing that would be more suited to the granite walls. It is one piece all welded wrought iron that goes the entire length of the sidewalk. Installation is very soon. It is to be painted and custom fitted to the wall and the façade must be built. And some more landscaping and more flowers. The entire parking lot is paved on phase II and all the drainage has been marked and is shown.

Susy Affleck-Childs – We have received the as-built plans. I need some help on this to review. Somebody from the board or an outside consultant. Also, to look at the letter from the engineer Rick Merrikin.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I believe the decision (May 2008) specified that all work was to be done by September 21<sup>st</sup>; not just the site work.

Bob Potheau – We want to get the fronts done. I knew in May that the building would not be completed. I represented that the building work would not be done until December. I said we would get the parking lot done on phase II and that the building would wait.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – In looking at this last night in DRC, Mr. Potheau has some good reasons for wanting more signs. It is one lot that functions as 3.

Andy Rodenhiser – Karyl, you are a little ahead of us. We will get to the master sign plan after this.

Andy Rodenhiser – Relative to where we stand now with this project, this has come and gone.

Bob Potheau – I object. If you have a recording of that meeting. I have a very clear recollection of what was discussed.

Andy Rodenhiser – What would you suggest we do? I think we had a similar discussion about this the last time you were here.

Bob Potheau – We are not going to get an occupancy permit for the building until the building inspector inspects. There are 2 people working on this on a daily basis. I represented that I would have an as-built and the site work done by September 21. We are trying to do the best we can. I fully know what was discussed. We never expected the façade to be done by 9/21. That has come and gone anyway. The most important thing is to keep it moving forward.

Andy Rodenhiser – What are you asking for?

Bob Potheau – I have completed the site work. Look at the as-built plan and then let's discuss again. I would like to suggest it might only be a brief meeting. I don't expect the façade to be done until next May.

Andy Rodenhiser – There are aspects of this decision (May 2008) that are not in compliance at this time. Are either one of you (Chan and Karyl) prepared to extend the completion date?

Chan Rogers – What is missing?

Andy Rodenhiser – The façade of the building is not completed. The front of the building is off. It was supposed to be completed by 9/21. I am remembering a similar conversation in the past. This is a pattern. There is complete disregard for dates continually. This goes back over a great deal of time. It seems like dates comes and go.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – This is not my favorite building. The landscaping is nice. It does seem as though it is creeping along and in good faith. I would recommend an extension for completion.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I move we extend the deadline for completion for all work (site improvements and building of phase II until \_\_\_\_\_).

Chan – I don't see any advantage here.

Andy – There is a guy in the back/lower level that is a car wash that got an occupancy permit before the façade was done.

Bob Potheau – The materials are there for the façade. We are doing the railing and the façade. What choice do we have? Do we swim forward?

Andy – everything related to this decision for the deadline

Bob Potheau – I am asking the board for some further explanation. Can we put this off?

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I withdraw my motion.

John Williams – Do you want us to do that?

Bob Potheau – I would like to postpone my answer. I would like to continue this to another time.

Andy Rodenhiser – Find out when the work will be done. When you come back, Bob Tucker will be here.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – It better be realistic.

Chan Rogers – There is no advantage to forcing you to not finish.

Andy Rodenhiser – He already has a building permit. He can't get a building permit for the build out. He is not going to stop working on it.

It was agreed to discuss this again on October 14<sup>th</sup>.

---

## **4 Main Street Master Sign Plan**

Bob Potheau - In the zoning area we are currently in and for this type of multi use dev, the town of Medway has certain sign guidelines for multi use developments. It suggests a master sign like at Medway Commons and then a directory sign near the businesses. The maximum height of a primary development sign is 12 feet. The common thing with that kind of multi tenant development is that every interior driveway is connected. You can access internally. The topography of my place is such that we have 3 driveways. It is just under 2 acres. The driveways are not connected. To have a sign that big would dwarf the buildings. One common development sign creates a traffic hazard.

Andy Rodenhiser – The driveways used to be connected and you have created this thing in front.

Bob Potheau – What I am proposing with a master sign plan is to not have a larger primary development sign, but to have one sign at each driveway (3).

Andy Rodenhiser – How does it not comply?

Susy Affleck-Childs – The bylaw allows for one development sign per street frontage.

Chan Rogers – Do we have the legal authority to resolve this?

Bob Potheau – When I first came to you, there was no requirement for a master sign plan with the site plan approval. We have a sign problem. I am in great favor with all the changes to the sign code. So, I want input from the Design Review Committee and I want input from the PB on what would be best. Only the ZBA can grant relief. We are looking for a recommendation for how you feel about this. I am looking for input.

Andy Rodenhiser – Has the DRC looked at this?

Susy Affleck-Childs – We received an email communication today. ATTACH.

Andy Rodenhiser – What is left to do on the site?

Bob Potheau – We need to address the middle building in some fashion. I would like to knock that down.

NOTE – Susy Affleck-Childs presented an outline of comments and suggestions on the proposed master sign plan.

John Williams – I think the board is very fortunate to have Susy spend this time and depth to work on this. I would like to see the façade on the building to see where the units are for the wall signs.

Andy Rodenhiser – I want an agreement on what is going to happen to the whole thing. Whether it is a modification. Whether the middle building is going to stay or go. We need to deal with very strict interpretations and written agreements. I don't want to deal in abstracts. It doesn't seem to work. It is out there with all kinds of grey and fuzzies. I want definitives.

Bob Potheau – My signage as a master sign plan for the entire property of 500 feet is all that I am proposing for signage. That is all the signage that I would propose for the property, no matter what I would do with the middle. I would like the board to look at this. I am looking for your opinion.

Chan Rogers – Is your proposal valid for the future development of the site?

Andy Rodenhiser – What is the status of the house? What is going to happen to that?

Bob Potheau – I live in that house. Nothing is going to happen there. We need to take a look at the approved site plan.

Chan Rogers – I would suggest we put this off until the applicant digests the DRC comments. Let's look at doing this on October 28.

Andy Rodenhiser – We can make a recommendation based on the premise that nothing is going to happen to that (middle) building. If he intends to do something in the future, well that may or may not happen.

Chan Rogers – I suggest we postpone this a few weeks.

Bob Potheau – I don't believe that I can come up with a plan for what will happen with that (middle) building in 2-3 weeks. But I can have a discussion in several weeks. I expect I will ask for the building to be demolished. That is a decision that is difficult for a property owner to make to demolish a nonconforming building. I am willing to live with a master sign plan that will be set in concrete. I am willing to address it over the winter. We need some engineering to look at the building and options. The Design Review Board would want some say so if there was a new building.

Andy Rodenhiser – The value of your rents would go up dramatically if you were to do a new building.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Have you ever thought of eliminating that building and taking down the house and doing a new building with housing above?

It was agreed to discuss options for the middle building on October 28<sup>th</sup>.

NOTE - Bob Potheau showed an example of the flower design to be included on the top of the signs.

Passed out inspection reports for ICE and for Birch Hill

### **Other Business/Reports**

Susy Affleck-Childs – I was at the BOS meeting last week to start the roadway layout process. Some conflict has arisen on street acceptance for Freedom Trail and Independence Lane (Ishmael Coffee Estates) with the Conservation Commission. Jurisdictional questions. ConCom is opposed to the streets being accepted. Apparently there is a superseding Order of Conditions from Mass DEP.

Andy Rodenhiser – Everybody has been made aware of it. The BOS, ConCom, Suzanne, Dave Travalini.

Andy Rodenhiser – I had gone before the selectmen the week prior and they are going to enter into negotiations with the Williams to form a public private partnership re: the development of the bottle cap lots.

Andy Rodenhiser – Susy and I met with Hal Davis from New England Economic Development. They helped do the TIF agreement for AZIT. He told us about the idea of a master TIF agreement for priority development sites and some pending legislation (40T) -

NOTE – Send out information on TIF to PB members.

Planning Board Meeting Minutes 9-23-2008  
Approved 10-14-2008

Susy Affleck-Childs – We are soliciting members for a new economic development committee.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I am working with the Affordable Housing Committee. They are proposing the use of town owned property at 9 Walker Street for affordable housing, perhaps with Habitat for Humanity.

John Williams – It would be better to try to find a previously developed lot that has an eyesore vs. opening up an undeveloped piece of property in town.

Andy Rodenhiser – Some of the selectmen believe the lot should be sold for cash.

A motion was made by Chan Rogers, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh to adjourn the meeting.  
APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Susan E. Affleck-Childs  
Planning Board Assistant



## Opening Comments - Williamsburg OSRD Public Hearing Andy Rodenhiser 9-23-08

Good evening,

We will now open the public hearing for the proposed Williamsburg Condominium development to be located at 66-72 West Street. The applicant is Broad Acres Management Trust and they are seeking an Open Space Residential Development special permit and an Affordable Housing special permit.

For the benefit of those present in the audience, I would like you to be aware that this meeting is broadcast live on local cable access.

I am Andy Rodenhiser, chairman of the Planning Board. I would like to introduce my fellow Planning Board members who are here tonight – Karyl Spiller-Walsh to my right and Chan Rogers and Associate member John Williams to my left. Also at the table with us are Gino Carlucci, our planning consultant, and Planning Board Assistant Susy Affleck-Childs.

The legal notice for this public hearing was published in the *Milford Daily News* on September 9 and 15. Copies of the public hearing notice are available for your review.

The public hearing notice was sent by certified mail to the owners of property in Medway located within 300 feet of this property.

May I have a motion to dispense with the reading of the official public hearing notice?  
Thank you.

I would like to review with you how the public hearing will proceed.

The applicant's representatives will introduce themselves and make a brief presentation to describe their proposed development project.

That presentation will be followed by questions from the Planning Board.

Our planning consultant, Gino Carlucci, will summarize his review comments and questions.

Then the public will have its opportunity to speak. All speakers and responders will be recognized by the chair. Please raise your hand. When called upon, please stand, state your name and address so our secretary can have accurate information for the record. You may offer comments, ask questions, or read a prepared statement. If you have a prepared statement, please provide a copy to our secretary.

Any comments or written communications from Town staff or other boards will then be entertained.

As we proceed, if anyone has a specific question for the applicant or his representatives, I will allow the applicant's representative to respond.

We will then return to Planning Board members for comments and further discussion.

Planning Board Meeting Minutes 9-23-2008  
Approved 10-14-2008

Based on the information gathered and comments received tonight, we will determine our next steps. Most likely, we will continue the public hearing to a future date and time.

With that, let us begin.



TOWN OF MEDWAY  
Planning Board  
155 Village Street  
Medway, Massachusetts 02053

*Andy Rodenhiser, Chairman  
Robert K. Tucker, Vice-Chairman  
Cranston (Chan) Rogers, P.E., Clerk  
Karyl Spiller Walsh  
Thomas A. Gay  
John W. Williams, Associate Member*

*September 3, 2008*

**TOWN OF MEDWAY PLANNING BOARD  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

***Williamsburg Condominiums - Open Space Residential Development (OSRD)  
Application for OSRD and Affordable Housing Special Permits***

In accordance with the Medway Zoning By-Law, Section V. Use Regulations, Sub-Section T. Open Space Residential Development (OSRD) and Sub-Section X. Affordable Housing and the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 40A, Sections 9 & 11, notice is hereby given that the Medway Planning Board will conduct a Public Hearing on ***Tuesday, September 23, 2008 at 7:15 p.m. in Sanford Hall at Town Hall, 155 Village Street, Medway, MA***, to consider the application of Broad Acres Management Trust of Millis, MA for an Affordable Housing Special Permit and an Open Space Residential Development Special Permit and Concept Plan entitled *Williamsburg Condominiums Open Space Residential Development Special Permit Concept Plan* dated August 20, 2008, prepared by Faist Engineering of Southbridge, MA.

The applicant proposes to develop an eighteen (18) unit condominium community on a 13.86 acre site at 66A, 70, 70R and 72 West Street. The property is located on the north side of West Street across from Holbrook Street in the ARII zoning district. Owned by the applicant,

the site is comprised of four (4) parcels - Medway Assessors Map 2 - Parcels 7B, 6-1-B, 6-1-2, and 6-1-3. On site features include wetlands, a tributary to Hopping Brook, a vernal pool, wooded areas, open fields and stone walls.

Telephone: 508-533-3291      Fax: 508-533-3287  
email: [medwayplanningboard@townofmedway.org](mailto:medwayplanningboard@townofmedway.org)

The proposed development is to be comprised of three (3) triplex buildings with nine (9) townhouse units, four (4) duplex buildings with eight (8) townhouse units with attached garages; and one (1) detached single family home. Three (3) of the eighteen (18) units will be affordable. Units will have 2-3 bedrooms. The proposal includes stormwater drainage facilities including low impact features, sub-surface infiltration systems and surface storm water basins. The proposal includes approximately 8.7 acres of dedicated open space to be publicly accessible. Site access from West Street is proposed to be provided via an eighteen foot (18') wide U-shaped one-way private driveway running approximately 1134 linear feet.

The applications and plans for the Williamsburg Condominium Open Space Residential Development Special Permit and an Affordable Housing Special Permit are on file with the Medway Town Clerk at the Medway Town Hall, 155 Village Street, Medway, MA and may be inspected Monday through Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and Fridays from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Any person or party who is interested or wishes to be heard on this proposal is invited to review the plans and express their views at the date, time and place so designated for the public hearing. Written comments are encouraged and may be forwarded to the Medway Planning Board at 155 Village Street, Medway, MA 02053 or emailed to: [medwayplanningboard@townofmedway.org](mailto:medwayplanningboard@townofmedway.org).

Andy Rodenhiser  
Planning Board Chairman

To be published in the *Milford Daily News*: Tuesday, September 9, 2008  
Monday, September 15, 2008

cc: *Planning Boards* - Bellingham, Franklin, Holliston, Milford, Millis and Norfolk

Planning Board Meeting Minutes 9-23-2008

Approved 10-14-2008

*Medway Town Officials/Departments* – Board of Selectmen, Board of Assessors, Board of Health, Building Inspector/Zoning Enforcement Officer, Community Preservation Committee, Conservation Commission, Design Review Committee, Fire Department, Police Department, Public Services Department, Town Administrator, Water/Sewer Department, Zoning Board of Appeals.

# Medway Police Department

315 Village Street  
Medway, MA 02053

Phone: 508-533-3212  
FAX: 508-533-3216  
Emergency: 911

**Allen M. Tingley**  
Chief of Police

September 23, 2008

To: Medway Planning Board

From: Sgt. Jeffrey W. Watson  
Safety Officer

Ref: Williamsburg Condominiums

---

I have taken the time to look at the "Williamsburg Condominiums" special permit concept plan. The following would be my concerns and or recommendations regarding the plan.

1. I have a concern with the flow of traffic. I would like to see the flow go in the other direction. The way it is currently set up has traffic exiting onto West Street just past a bend. I have concerns that the vehicles traveling West Street would not see the vehicles exiting the private way in time as they come around the bend. If the flow was reversed there would be more sight visibility and would not interfere with the flow of traffic.
2. I also have a concern that there are no proposed sidewalks. This would cause a safety issue for those residents wanting to walk, also those children who have to walk to West Street for the bus stop.
3. I would also like to see two extra "one way" signs be placed inside the complex.
4. The signs that are marked and proposed for stops, speed, caution children, do not enter, and one way are all in the proper area.

If you have any questions please contact me.

Planning Board Meeting Minutes 9-23-2008  
Approved 10-14-2008

**From:** Jacob, Gary [gary.jacob@shawgrp.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 23, 2008 4:18 PM

**To:** Susan Affleck-Childs

**Cc:** Beth McDonald; Master Plan. Committee; Gary Jacob ; Gwen Hendry; Julie Fallon ; Karyl Spiller-Walsh; Matt Buckley ; Rachel Walsh; Susan Affleck-Childs; Beth McDonald; Tortorello Katie; Kelli Ployer

**Subject:** Medway Planning Board - 4 Main Street sign recommendations  
Medway Planning Board

At its September 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting, the Design Review Committee (DRC) was asked to review a submittal by Robert Potheau of 4 Main Street (Route 109 at the east end of the Town of Medway. This submittal consisted of a Master Signage Plan and three (3) individual sign applications. The three individual sign applications were for free-standing – Multi Tenant Development signs.

As the size, style, placement and number of free standing signs was very much dependent on the requirements of the overall Master Signage plan, we spent much of our time discussing the master plan. Mr. Potheau explained to us that, unlike a traditional commercial development, the site has three separate curb cuts each servicing separate independent portions of the site. He also explained to us that, because of the heavy traffic issues on Rte 109 the safety of patrons tuning into and moving between the three different portions of the site was an issue.

After a lengthy discussion the DRC decided to make the following observations and recommendation to the Planning Board:

- As it is not the role of the DRC to approve or disapprove the Master Signage plan presented by Mr. Potheau, and although we generally approved of the sign design and appearance of the three individual signs, without an approved Master Signage plan the DRC can not yet act on the application of the individual sign applications.

That having been said, the DRC also makes the following observations and recommendations regarding the Master Signage plan:

- The development in question is not a typical development as envisioned by current Medway Zoning Bylaw, as it predates the regulations;
- Developments created under current zoning would generally have a well defined primary entrance, with the possibility of a well thought out secondary entrance, as does Medway Commons;
- With a primary entrance, the site would logically have a primary ‘development’ sign and could then have secondary directory signs, as appropriate;
- Without a primary entrance and considering the inability to move from one portion of the site to another and the traffic safety issues on Rte 109, this site clearly needs an approach not covered by the typical interpretation of the current sign regulations;
- That being the case, we recommend that the Master Signage plan being presented by Mr. Potheau be approved with the following additional considerations;

Planning Board Meeting Minutes 9-23-2008

Approved 10-14-2008

- It should be agreed that no more than a total of three (3) free standing signs be allowed for the entire development, even if additional structures are added or otherwise made available in the future;
  - If plausible, one of the three signs along the road could be considered as a single sign for a single business, this being Metro West Auto; the other two signs could be considered as a primary development sign and a secondary development sign;
  - Consideration be given to reducing the size of the wall signs mounted directly on the individual places of business to compensate for the large size of the primary / directory signs along the road.
- This agreement would have a life expectancy of at least 10+ years.

**Gary A. Jacob, PWS, CPESC**

Senior Lead Scientist

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure

88C Elm St.

Hopkinton, MA 01748

(508) 497-6129 – direct

(617) 589-2154 – Stoughton/Randolph

(508) 596-8788 – cell

(508) 435-9641 – Fax