

## MEETING MINUTES FOR MARCH 1, 2012

### Milton Planning Board

The 15th meeting of the Planning Board for fiscal year 2012 was on Thursday, March 1, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. in the Carol Blute Conference Room, Milton Town Office Building.

In attendance, Planning Board members Emily Keys Innes, Chairman, Alexander Whiteside, Peter F. Jackson, Bernard J. Lynch, III, Edward L. Duffy, Planning Director William Clark and Administrative Assistant Jean Peterson.

#### 1. ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

The Planning Board approved the Meeting Minutes of February 9, 2012 and postponed the approval of the Meeting Minutes of February 23, 2012.

The Board confirmed the next meeting dates for March 22, 2012 in the Carol Blute Conference Room and April 12, 2012 in the John Cronin Conference Room. Meetings are scheduled to begin at 6:30 p.m.

#### 2. CITIZENS SPEAK

No citizens addressed the Board.

#### 3. TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT

- Legal preparations for wind turbine project.
- Review of site plan issues for 131 Eliot Street.
- Hillside Street open- space development.
- Affordable units at 36 Central Avenue.

#### 4. PUBLIC HEARING

6:45 (*continued hearing*) 131 Eliot Street Special Permit and Site Plan Review. Joint meeting with Conservation Commission. Conservation Committee Members in attendance: Chairman, John Kiernan and Members Judith Darrell-Kemp, Michael Blutt, Kenneth Naide, and Tammy Murphy.

Chairman Innes opened the Hearing. Topics discussed included updated traffic and massing studies, zoning, and revised landscape plan. Members of the Conservation Committee stated that they had ordered the tree to not be cut down. The Committee would like to replicate the environmental values that were on the site prior to removal of the black oak tree. The Planning

Board and Conservation Commission agreed that both Boards should work together reviewing a landscape plan.

Applicant Steven Connelly made a presentation on updates for the 131 Eliot Street project. Resident Paul Rege of 60 Rustlewood Road and Architect Warren Daniel presented along with Mr. Connelly.

**Traffic Study:** Jack Gillon, the project’s traffic engineer presented an updated traffic study, as requested by the Board.

Resident Peter Mullin of 19 Gaskins Road stated that he had difficulty understanding Mr. Gillon’s traffic study presentation. In an effort to explain the study to Mr. Mullin with more clarification, Mr. Gillon spoke privately with Mr. Mullin.

Mark Day of 70 Cliff Road stated that the Board seemed to be showing deference to the Traffic Engineer’s report and did not believe that the methodologies in the report are sound.

Margaret Donovan of 41 Central Avenue stated that she is amazed at the amount of time being spent on traffic issues rather than focusing on parking which she feels is more important.

**Landscape Plan:** Warren Daniel of Daniel Architect presented. He presented a revised landscape plan which includes a brick sidewalk, trees intended to replace the black oak, the creation of what he described as a foreground for the building, and the entry to the building.

**Massing:** Mr. Connelly stated to the Board that the building had been moved five feet further from Central Avenue and two feet further from the train tracks than originally proposed. He stated that he positioned the building so as to give it the best chance of success.

Resident Ellen DeNooyer of 83 Capen Street, an architect, spoke that she did her own site analysis and massing studies and offered her expertise to help the process move forward. She stated that it’s a terrific site and it deserves a terrific project. She pointed out that many surrounding buildings are one- story, and that fact should be taken into consideration.

Chairman Innes discussed a “Zoning Matrix” she prepared of zoning requirements for the site to try to create a common understanding of what the zoning requires. The Board members discussed the Matrix with Mr. Connolly and identified the following outstanding areas of discussion, but did not complete a full review of the matrix:

III.J.4.a.	Provision of public amenities such as an atrium or public meeting space
III.J.4.b.	All drawings to date based on Floor Area Ratio bonus provision – Applicant has not met 3-part test that would allow the Board to consider such a request
III.J.4.c.	Possible need for relief regarding parking requirements as the Applicant is unable to provide the required parking within the required setbacks on the residential lot (under Section VII F, G, and H). The Board and the Applicant did not discuss Section VII. F, G and H at the March 1, 2012 meeting due to time constraints

III.J.4.d.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●Whether the Application was in compliance with the height and story requirements</li> <li>●The height and placement of mechanical equipment on the roof</li> </ul>
III.J.4.e.	The adequacy of set-backs of Third and Fourth stories on Central Avenue
III.J.5.	Compliance with Design Standards cannot be fully discussed until the Board receives the updated plans, sections and elevations detailed in Section 1 of this memorandum
III.J.6.	DHCD requirements for the affordable housing units
III.J.7.	Location of business parking and number of spaces required – the Application is currently deficient, but the Board has the ability to grant relief under certain conditions. This will require a discussion of the types of businesses and parking sharing requirements. This item is also governed by Section VII.C.
III.J.10.	The Applicant submitted a Traffic Study dated December 2011 and a revised Traffic Study in February 2011. Public discussion on March 1 identified some questions regarding calculation methodology that remains to be clarified.
Section VIII.D.2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The dimensions of the residential lot are incorrect</li> <li>●The following items are missing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●Square footage of the lots</li> <li>●Survey control points</li> <li>●Hydrants</li> <li>●The business lot line</li> <li>●Location of the existing stairs</li> <li>●Location of the existing sidewalk</li> <li>●Location of the existing driveway opening</li> <li>●The 100' and 200' lines from Pine Tree Brook</li> <li>●Average grade (there was some discussion of average grade vs. average elevation which is of importance in the discussion of height mentioned in Section 2 below.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Other Boards	The Conservation Commission held a joint meeting with the Planning Board on March 1, 2012 to discuss their concerns regarding replacement of the black oak that was cut down in March 2011 and asked that the Board take that into consideration when reviewing site and landscape plans.

Traffic Engineer Mr. Gillon and Resident Peter Mullin re-joined the meeting and informed the Board that Mr. Gillon had addressed Mr. Mullin's questions relative to the traffic study with more clarity. Mr. Gillon then explained that there are 2 separate methods to measure traffic: using a straight line or using a parabola curve. Mr. Gillon will conduct a further Level of Service analysis of the intersection based on the higher traffic projections using the fitted curve measure.

Public Hearing on 131 Eliot Street continued to April 12<sup>th</sup> at 6:45 p.m.

**5. OLD BUSINESS:** none

**6. NEW BUSINESS:** none

**7. ADJOURNMENT:**

The Meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

-----

**Emily Keys Innes, Chairman**