



TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

Town Hall Offices • 63 Main Street • Northborough, MA 01532 • 508-393-5019 • 508-393-6996 Fax

Approved 7.7.15

Planning Board Meeting Minutes May 19, 2015

Members in attendance: Theresa Capobianco, Chair; Leslie Harrison; George Pember; Amy Poretsky; Michelle Gillespie

Others in attendance: Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Fred Litchfield, Town Engineer; Elaine Rowe, Board Secretary; Brian Marchetti, McCarty Engineering; Pat McCarty, McCarty Engineering; Michael Whitmore, Roundel 47 LLC; David Sadowski, Sadowski Engineering; Shawn Citro; Paul Marrone; Beryl & Lewis Krouse

Chair Capobianco called the meeting to order at 7:02PM.

Public Hearing to consider Site Plan Approval and Earthwork Permit for 454 Whitney Street

Brian Marchetti and Patrick McCarty from McCarty Engineering and Michael Whitmore from Roundel47 LLC appeared on behalf of Justice Resource Institute seeking site plan approval for a proposed rehabilitation facility. Mr. Marchetti explained that the site has a long permitting history, dating back to 2002 when permitting was acquired to construct a professional office building on lot 3 and an office and testing facility on lot 2. At that time, installation of utilities, water, sewer, and underground detention basins commenced but the project was never completed and the site has been vacant until now. Mr. Marchetti noted that Justice Resource Institute has expressed an interest in purchasing lot 3 for their proposed rehabilitation facility.

Mr. Marchetti discussed plans to build a 7900 square foot building with associated parking, to include access through the site, significant landscaping, concrete walkways along the front of the building and bituminous concrete berm back to the curb cuts. He indicated that the project will include 35 parking spaces, which exceeds the requirement, and a large fenced area in back of the building to allow an outdoor use for patients. He noted that the facility will be similar to that of an adult day care, operating 7:00AM to 6:00PM, with no overnight use. He explained that the facility will offer an educational program for adults with developmental and physical disabilities.

Mr. Marchetti stated that there will be a 10,000 square foot reduction in impervious cover over the previous project. He indicated that they have already met with the Fire Chief and Design Review Committee (DRC) for their feedback. He also stated

that there is more than adequate water pressure, the existing underground detention system is sufficient to handle the roof runoff, and calculations have been submitted to the Town Engineer to confirm this.

Mr. Marchetti discussed input received during the Design Review process. He noted that, when originally proposed, the plan did not include any irrigation because the landscaping plan was designed to be drought and insect repellent. He stated that the DRC had asked them to explore the possibility of including a private well for an irrigation system, but the applicant has decided to stay with their original plan and will include an Operation and Maintenance Plan to ensure that the landscaping will be adequate for the site.

Mr. Marchetti noted that the applicant was also asked to install additional granite curbing, but is proposing to keep granite in the front and maintain the bituminous concrete berm along the back. He cited concerns about snow plowing and snow storage, which will be both easier with the proposed berm.

Mr. Marchetti reiterated that some utility work has already been done, and he is proposing to provide utilities to lot 2, whenever developed, through lot 3 so easements will be provided to meet that need. He noted that there is forced main sewer up to the site, which can be connected to lot 2 when needed. Additionally, part of the water line will need to be relocated based on the new plan.

Mr. Marchetti stated that, based on comments from the Fire Chief, another fire hydrant has been added. He explained that he received comments from the Town Engineer earlier today that will be addressed, and noted that none of them will require alterations to the plan.

Ms. Joubert commented about the Design Review process, and noted that the DRC has indicated that this project should be used as a model for anyone coming through for site plan review, as it was clear that the applicant read and followed the regulations.

Mr. Whitmore noted that the site is a triangular-shaped parcel located at the intersection of Whitney Street and Whitney Avenue. He discussed plans to preserve the mature trees and maintain the mature green buffer along Whitney Avenue. He indicated that the site is level with good soils, so no difficulties are expected.

Mr. Whitmore stated that, in the site planning process, he strove to provide elevations to Whitney Street and Whitney Avenue that would allow some variety and open the building to the outside to present a look into the building and bring in some light. He indicated a desire to give some visual relief, given the size of the building. He also noted that the landscaping plan includes a split rail fence area, to be well planted with a variety of shrubs and grasses. He explained that access for clients will be off of Whitney Street, with a drop off area along the front of the building to allow people to filter in through the main entrance that will include a canopy to provide cover during inclement weather. Mr. Whitmore emphasized that access was designed for safety, allowing access to the building without having to encounter traffic while

offloading. He also mentioned that access was designed for two-way traffic but will function as one-way during drop off and pickup times.

Mr. Whitmore explained that the building is a one-story structure, with a number of classrooms that open up to an outdoor area with some covered porch areas. He noted that Justice Resource Institute (JRI) offers a similar program in Westborough (Dayhab) and also has vocational programs for people living in JRI residences that go out into the community.

Mr. Whitmore noted that elements were incorporated into the plan to create some shadows and use columns to break up the mass and counter the horizontal structure. The plan also includes an open dining area with large windows and an enclosed area for the dumpster and maintenance shed.

Ms. Joubert asked Mr. Whitmore to touch on the comments from the DRC with regards to dressing up the front of the shed and adding texture.

Mr. Whitmore explained that there were changes made to the spacing of the siding. He noted that the main body of the building will have 6-inch exposure but at the porches and entrance canopy it will be reduced to a 4 inch exposure in a different color to give some variation.

Michelle Gillespie arrived.

In response to a question from Ms. Capobianco, Mr. Whitmore indicated that the roof will be metal standing seam roof in a bronze color to have body without being too reflective.

Ms. Gillespie asked about the irrigation that was requested by the DRC. Mr. Marchetti reiterated that the applicant has opted not to add irrigation, but has conferred with the landscape architect to beef up the planting and bedding materials and provide an Operations and Maintenance Plan to provide for a very sustainable design using drought tolerant plants. Ms. Capobianco asked Mr. Gillespie about the DRC's concerns. Ms. Gillespie noted that the site currently looks like a dust bowl, and there was concern that nothing would survive beyond a year or two without adequate irrigation so DRC member Dave Veron requested that irrigation be installed. She also noted that the bylaw only requires that the landscaping be maintained for a year, so there is no means for the Building Inspector to enforce beyond that time period. Mr. Marchetti explained that the site was cleared 15 to 18 years ago in anticipation of a build out. He commented that JRI takes pride in their properties, and he remains confident that the irrigation is not needed based on the plan devised by the landscape architect.

Ms. Gillespie explained that this applicant is the first to appear before the DRC for a project in the industrial area, and complimented the applicant for a job well done. She indicated that, even if the board opts not to require irrigation for this project, a decision needs to be made about how to handle the issue moving forward. Ms. Harrison stated that she would prefer to hear Dave Veron's opinion before

rendering a decision. Mr. Whitmore reiterated that the landscaping plan includes species that will be more drought, insect, and disease tolerant. Ms. Gillespie suggested that the board ask for 5 years on the landscaping to ensure that the viability of the plantings will be as indicated by the applicant. Ms. Joubert confirmed that the Planning Board has the authority to extend the landscaping requirement. Ms. Capobianco noted that the planting schedule is quite extensive, with 30 trees, 40 shrubs or more, and grasses being included. Mr. Marchetti noted that the applicant is only required to put in 12 trees, so the planting plan represents a significant increase over what is required. Ms. Capobianco asked if the applicant would be agreeable to a 5 year requirement on the landscaping. Mr. Whitmore voiced his opinion that they would be.

Ms. Capobianco asked about traffic impacts. Mr. Marchetti indicated that there will be a low volume, with the 35 parking spaces being primarily for staff. Mr. Whitmore noted that the main flow will be in the morning, but arrival will be organized to maintain traffic flow. In response to a question from Ms. Capobianco, Mr. Whitmore indicated that there will be approximately 40 students daily who will arrive in 8 vans between 8:00AM and 8:30AM and depart between 4:00PM and 4:30PM.

Ms. Gillespie asked about the curbing. Mr. Marchetti reiterated that the applicant proposes to maintain granite curbing along the front of the buildings, walkways, and at the curb cuts, with bituminous concrete berm along the back side.

Ms. Capobianco asked if there is adequate room for snow removal and storage without losing any parking. Mr. Marchetti indicated that there is likely more snow storage on this site than what exists in much larger developments. However, in the event of heavy snow accumulation, he stated that the applicant will simply truck the excess offsite.

In regards to the 5 year landscaping requirement, Ms. Joubert discussed Mr. Litchfield's suggestion that the applicant submit an annual report about the landscaping and the town can do inspections to confirm its continued integrity.

Mr. Litchfield discussed his comment letter that was sent to the applicant earlier today. He noted that most comments pertain to offsite issues but there is an issue with the current landowner who posted an earthwork bond years ago that he would like to get back. Mr. Litchfield explained that the original bond covered two lots, but since the proposed project now involves only one lot he would suggest releasing half of the original bond now and the remainder once the other lot is stabilized and an as-built plan is provided.

Mr. Litchfield stated that his comment letter indicates that site plan approval is appropriate and he is asking that the infiltration system on site be verified to be working properly. He also noted that the granite curbing along the frontage seems to have significant areas where it has been removed, and the DPW would like to have that reinstalled at the applicant's expense. Ms. Capobianco asked how long the curbing has been missing. Mr. McCarty stated that the original site work was done in

2002, and the curb that is there currently is what has been there all along. He also emphasized that this will add significant cost to the project.

Mr. Litchfield discussed a bend in the pipe in the drain line that comes across the property and ties into the drainage system, and noted that the DPW has asked for the drainage system to be inspected to ensure that it is working properly and that the structures are clean and free of debris. He is also requesting an as-built plan be provided when the project is complete to confirm that it was built in accordance with the approved plans.

Ms. Joubert noted that the agenda for tonight's meeting included reference to an Earthwork Permit for this project, but the applicant will now be going before the Earthwork Board based on changes approved at Town Meeting. She also stated that the Fire Chief's comments were relatively straight forward and his comments have been incorporated into the plan. In addition, elevations were revised to reflect input from the DRC.

Ms. Gillespie asked if the applicant is in agreement with the conditions in the Town Engineer's comment letter (copy attached). Mr. McCarty asked the board to consider condition #5, relating to the replacement of the granite curbing, to be outside of JRI's responsibility. Ms. Joubert commented the board has the discretion to determine which comments to impose as conditions in the decision.

Ms. Capobianco agreed that the granite curbing issue should not be the applicant's responsibility. These are town roads and the town is responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of these roads. She voiced her opinion that it is unfair to require developers to address issues such as this, and these extraordinary expenses that are not factored in from the beginning are very detrimental to projects. She reiterated that she has no issue with omitting condition #5 as long as the other conditions are adopted. Mr. Pember asked for clarification about whether there is granite curbing everywhere except along the front of the property. Mr. Litchfield confirmed that this is the case. Mr. McCarty disagreed, and noted that the curbing does not continue down the roadway toward Berlin. Mr. Litchfield stated that it appears that pieces of curbing were removed at some point, though he is not sure exactly when that occurred. Mr. McCarty indicated that he would be willing to clean up sections where the vegetation has grown up over the curbing, and infill any areas that he can with available material, but reiterated that he should not be responsible for the entire area.

Michelle Gillespie made a motion to accept the site plan as presented with the following conditions

The water mains and sewer system currently on site must be tested and approved by the Northborough Public Works Department prior to any connections being made. The sewer force main in Whitney Street shall also be pressure tested prior to any connections.

The infiltration system currently located on site should be verified to be functioning properly in accordance with the original design.

The drain line onsite shows a change in horizontal direction without using a drain manhole and a drain manhole should be installed or the drain line should connect directly to existing DMH 4.

The drainage system in Whitney Street and Whitney Avenue should be inspected and cleaned by the applicant if required.

The applicant shall submit an as-built plan. The as-built plan shall include, at a minimum, and as applicable to the project, elevation of all pipe inverts and outlets, pipe sizes, materials, slopes; all other drainage structures; limits of clearing, grading and fill; all structures, pavement; contours; off-site improvements and all dates of fieldwork. Upon approval by the Town Engineer one (1) Mylar and three (3) paper copies of the as-built plan shall be submitted in addition to an electronic copy compatible with the Town's GIS system.

Approximately 30 feet of granite curbing on Whitney Street is to be replaced, and existing curbing is to be cleared of vegetation.

Landscaping plantings, as proposed, must be maintained for a minimum of 5 years; with annual inspection reports to be submitted to the town and any plantings that are not thriving are to be replaced.

George Pember seconded; vote unanimous.

Ms. Joubert noted that the Town Engineer has suggested that the board release half of the original Earthwork bond to Michael Kane. She explained that the applicant will be required to post a new bond for their project as part of the Earthwork process. Mr. Litchfield confirmed that he is comfortable with returning \$6500 to Mr. Kane and retaining \$6500 for the stabilization of the other parcel.

Leslie Harrison made a motion to release \$6500 currently being held for the original project. Michelle Gillespie seconded; vote unanimous.

Public Hearing to consider Site Plan Approval for 16 East Main Street

David Sadowski of Sadowski Engineering discussed plans to construct a 2-story structure on top of the existing foundation. He noted that the second floor will be used as office space by Shawn Citro. He explained that there will be one-way traffic from Route 20 to East Main Street, with no traffic access from East Main Street. He also noted that the septic system was recently upgraded and there are currently 8 parking spaces.

Mr. Sadowski offered the following responses to comments provided by Fred Litchfield:

Dumpster location - The dumpster was to be located on a second driveway, but Mr. Citro now envisions using that additional driveway to access his office. In addition, since access to the dumpster would require that the driveway is at least 18 feet wide, Mr. Sadowski is proposing to eliminate the dumpster in favor of curbside trash removal. Mr. Sadowski stated that Mr. Citro is not in favor of eliminating the dumpster as trash and debris will accumulate. Ms. Capobianco asked if it is possible to relocate the dumpster elsewhere on the site. Mr. Litchfield noted that the issue is not with the dumpster, but is more about the width of the driveway. He explained that the driveway as shown on the plan is 9 feet wide, but the bylaw requires 10 feet for one-way traffic and 18 feet for two-way traffic. He also noted that a separate access drive requires a separation of at least 200 feet, and backing out onto East Main Street is discouraged. He suggested some type of turnaround or a slight widening of the driveway. He indicated that, if the parking space is eliminated, the trash truck can back down the driveway to empty the dumpster. He also noted that the bylaw requires a dumpster for a business.

Ms. Poretsky asked if the dumpster can be located on the other side. Mr. Citro stated that the dumpster was originally located on the other side but the town asked that it be relocated and enclosed. Ms. Harrison asked about the rationale for one way traffic. Mr. Sadowski voiced a desire not to create a log jam on Route 20, and noted that a wider curb cut would be needed for two-way traffic.

Relocation of two “do not enter” signs - Mr. Sadowski confirmed that the applicant has no issue with complying with this request.

Replacement of sidewalk along frontage of property, installation of new asphalt berm, and replacement of a 3-foot wide grass plot - Mr. Litchfield explained that the DPW is seeking this assistance. Mr. Citro asked about the cost involved. Mr. Litchfield indicated that he is not sure what the cost will be. Ms. Joubert noted that MassDOT is not in favor of doing just sections of sidewalk at a time, mainly because they do not want to be responsible for maintenance of random areas of sidewalk, so they are looking to pass this responsibility on to the town. She commented that the town is not in the position to be able to do pieces of sidewalk along Route 20.

Mr. Sadowski indicated that the applicant would be agreeable to repairing or replacing sidewalk on East Main Street but does not agree with replacing the berm if there is no berm any place else. Mr. Litchfield indicated that the berm would be located between the two driveways, and noted that it will also help to keep cars off of the grass plot.

Width of proposed driveway - Mr. Sadowski agreed to make the driveway 10 feet wide and to include some restrictions on the dumpster at the end of it. Mr. Litchfield reiterated that the bylaw stipulates a 10 foot width for a one way, and the driveway is not necessarily one way if there is to be traffic travelling in and out. Ms. Capobianco asked if a turnaround can put in the green space. Mr. Sadowski commented that doing so would eliminate a good amount of grass, so he would prefer to evaluate the possibility of relocating the dumpster. Mr. Citro reiterated the need to keep the dumpster hidden from view. Ms. Joubert asked if the section of walkway

shown on the plan was for access to the one car that might park on that side. Mr. Citro indicated that the walkway had been added at the Building Inspector's request.

Mr. Litchfield suggested that the hearing be continued for two weeks to enable him to meet with the applicant to try to resolve some of the issues and come back to the board with a better defined plan. Ms. Capobianco stated that she is in favor of what the applicant is trying to do since it is a big improvement over what previously existed on the site. She indicated that the board wants to be able to approve the project, but needs to have a plan that they can approve. Mr. Citro agreed to the continuance.

Beryl Krouse explained that she and her husband own the home at 22 East Main Street, where her son and his family currently reside. She voiced concern about the continuance, given the dangerous conditions that currently exist on the site. She indicated that she has provided the town with a letter detailing her concerns. Ms. Capobianco noted that the applicant had tried to address the issues but was stopped from doing so because the gas company has not come out to shut off the gas line. Ms. Krouse noted that the site is terribly dirty, and there is additional debris being dumped there every day presenting serious health concerns.

Ms. Capobianco asked Mr. Citro to clarify why he cannot remove debris from the Site. Mr. Citro explained that there was a delay getting the gas company to come in and cap the gas line for the demolition of the existing house. Mr. Krouse asked if the town can put any pressure on the gas company. Mr. Litchfield agreed to make a phone call, but noted that he cannot make any guarantees.

Ms. Capobianco asked if Mr. Citro can communicate with his neighbors over the next two weeks so that they will have a higher level of comfort. She also expressed a desire for the applicant to start removing some of the debris from the site. Mr. Citro agreed to do so.

Mr. Krouse stated that, in the 68 years he has lived in town, there has never been a berm on either side of East Main Street.

Ms. Gillespie asked the applicant to provide a snow removal plan so that the abutters will have some degree of comfort.

Michelle Gillespie made a motion to continue the meeting to June 2, 2015 at 7:00pm. George Pember seconded; vote unanimous.

Draft Decision for Crossroads Industrial Park at 0 Bartlett Street

Ms. Poretsky asked about the street lights that were discussed during the public hearing included in the decision as a condition of site plan approval that the applicant shall install appropriate lighting at the entrance drive. Ms. Gillespie questioned whether two lights are needed, given the length of the driveway. Ms. Capobianco suggested that the matter be subject to the Town Engineer's approval.

The decision was revised accordingly and the Board signed the decision.

Old/New Business

Worcester Registry - Ms. Joubert presented the board with the annual registry form, and requested that each member sign in the two places as required.

Reappointment of Fred Philcox to the Earthworks Board - Ms. Joubert explained that Fred Philcox, the Planning Board's appointee to the Earthworks Board, needs to be reappointed.

Michelle Gillespie made a motion to appoint Fred Philcox to the Earthworks Board for a term of 3 years and requested that a letter of appreciation be sent to him for sitting on that board. Amy Poretsky seconded; vote unanimous.

Consideration of Minutes - George Pember made a motion to accept the Minutes of the Meeting of March 17, 2015 as amended. Leslie Harrison seconded; vote unanimous.

ZBA Applications - Ms. Joubert noted that there will be no ZBA meeting in May, as the applicant for 370 Southwest Cutoff requested a continuance to the June meeting. Ms. Poretsky requested that the applicant come back to the Planning Board as she believes there have been considerable changes to the plans. Ms. Joubert agreed to ask them to do so, if the applicant does move forward with the project.

Master Plan Update - Ms. Joubert indicated she will begin working on the RFP for the Master Plan this fall.

Zoning Amendments - Presently we are awaiting final approval of the zoning amendments from the Attorney General's office.

Summer Meeting Schedule - Members of the board agreed to a summer meeting schedule as follows:

June 2, 2015
June 16, 2015 (tentative)
July 7, 2015
August 4, 2015 (Leslie Harrison excused)

CPC Update - Ms. Gillespie noted that the CPC approved funding to allow the Historical Commission to hire a consultant to do a market analysis on the White Cliffs. She also stated that they had approved funding to allow the Town Common group to have appraisals done on two properties. Ms. Poretsky asked if the appraisals have been ordered. Ms. Joubert explained that she needs to meet with the town's assessor to put together a scope for the Town Administrator's review and approval. Ms. Poretsky asked how long that process might take. Ms. Joubert indicated that it is currently being worked on.

DRC Update - Ms. Joubert indicated that the online forms and design guideline need to be updated based on the amendment approved at town meeting to include the industrial district.

Subdivision Bylaws - Mr. Pember mentioned that the board had previously discussed having a meeting with Dan Nason to discuss revising the Subdivision Rules & Regulations and asked whether there is a timeline to do so. Ms. Joubert indicated that she can invite Mr. Nason to an upcoming meeting. Mr. Pember suggested that the board consider revising the bylaw to address situations where waivers are consistently requested and granted. Ms. Capobianco stated that she had planned to have a real discussion during the first meeting in October, to allow the Engineering and Planning Departments time to prepare. Ms. Joubert commented that managing both this project and the Master Plan will be challenging, but town staff will make every effort to be ready for the October 2nd meeting.

Next Meeting, June 2, 2015 - Ms. Joubert noted that agenda includes the review of the preliminary subdivision plan for the project at 172 and 172A Howard Street.

CPTC Workshop - Ms. Poretsky explained that she, Ms. Gillespie and Mr. Pember had attended the recent CPTC workshop and she found it very interesting. She noted that the brochure that was provided addressed use variances and noted that they are not advised. She voiced her desire to pursue the possibility of eliminating them in our bylaw. Ms. Gillespie asked if this can be discussed during the Master Plan process since that will involve representatives from a variety of town boards and committees. Ms. Joubert commented that, since the Master Plan process will look at zoning, it does not make sense for the town to make any zoning changes while in the midst of that process. Ms. Poretsky stated that there are other matters that she would also like to broach this year. Ms. Harrison agreed that a moratorium on zoning changes for a period of two years seems unreasonable.

Adjourned at 9:05PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Rowe
Board Secretary