

Sutton Planning Board  
Minutes  
April 22, 2013

Approved \_\_\_\_\_

Present: W. Whittier, R. Largess, S. Paul, T. Connors, D. Moroney  
Staff: J. Hager, Planning Director

**General Business:**

Motion: To approve the minutes of 4/8/13, D. Moroney  
2<sup>nd</sup>: T. Connors  
Vote: 3-0-2, R. Largess and S. Paul abstained as they were not present at this meeting

**Filing:** The Board acknowledged the filing of an application for a detached accessory apartment above a two car garage at 16 Mumford Road.

**Form A Plans:** None.

**Correspondence/Other:** None.

**Public Hearing (Cont.) – Detached Accessory Apartment – 5 Dean Farm Road - Mason**

W. Whittier re-read the hearing notice as it appeared in The Chronicle.

The land owner/applicant, David Mason, explained he will be constructing the extension of Dean Farm Road and building a new home at 5 Dean Farm Road. His application requests a detached accessory apartment over a garage on this lot. The Board reviewed the floor plans and architectural drawings. Mr. Mason will likely building the garage/accessory apartment and live in it until the house is done.

The Board reviewed departmental comments. No other parties were present to comment.

It was noted the base course will have to be on the entire road before occupancy of a unit can be granted. Mr. Mason said it was his understanding that he would need base course down before he could even apply for a building permit.

Motion: To grant the Special Permit for a 1,200 s.f. accessory apartment over a detached garage at 5 Dean Farm Road with the following conditions: D. Moroney

1. Approval of all other local, state and federal departments, boards and commissions, especially the Board of Health.
2. Clearly number house and apartment.
3. The entire Dean Farm Road extension will be completed through base course before occupancy can be granted on any structure erected on these lots.

2<sup>nd</sup>: R. Largess

S. Paul confirmed there will be a separate driveway to the house and to the garage w/apartment. W. Whittier asked if there would also be a garage in the house? Mr. Mason stated there will probably also be a garage attached to the house. S. Paul expressed concerns with in effect the possibility that on these two new lots there could be four separate dwelling units with their own driveways.

It was noted two of the structures have to look like garages and/or barns. Mr. Paul doubted this was what the Board was picturing when they supported this bylaw change.

Vote: 5-0-0

### **Public Hearing (Cont.) – Pleasant Valley Crossing (formerly South Town Crossing) – 171 Worcester Providence Turnpike**

Attorney Larry Brodeur was present on behalf of Galaxy Development to continue discussion on Pleasant Valley Crossing. Also in attendance were development team members William Scully of Green International Traffic Engineers, Eric Bazette of Heritage Design, and Architect Lou Allevato.

The Board received comments late afternoon from Stop & Shop and RK Associates regarding various concerns with traffic circulation and the traffic study. As there were additional concerns expressed about traffic at past meetings, Attorney Brodeur suggested beginning the meeting by having Bill Scully overview the traffic and proposed off-site improvements. Mr. Scully reviewed changes along both Route 146 and Boston Road. He explained the issue that has been the focus of the most effort is the driveway geometry and lane configuration from the Route 146 site drive north to Pleasant Valley Road. MassDOT also suggested that the developer pull traffic light conduit west to Pleasant Valley Road along Boston Road and MassDOT will pull conduit east along Boston Road to this intersection so that the wiring will exist if it is determined a traffic signal is necessary at this location in the future. The Board is in receipt of an email from District #3 MassDOT stating they are in agreement with the latest conceptual plans. Mr. Scully noted that Galaxy will need to complete the permit process with MassDOT by filing and amended Section 61, a Design Exception for width of shoulders in front of the project on Route 146, and the final design and construction plans. As MassDOT has been consulted throughout, he does not anticipate any issues with this permitting.

Mr. Scully responded to concerns raised in correspondence from Stop & Shop and RK Associates. He stated that the decision to eliminate left turns onto Boston Road when traveling northbound was purely a MassDOT decision and was not influenced by this project. He stated that MEPA has issued a letter that no further MEPA review is required. He acknowledged the traffic generation from the proposed Stop & Shop project was not specifically included in background growth in his traffic evaluation but that MassDOT's study was utilized and it was his understanding that this study included the Stop & Shop project. He expressed confidence that Boston Road will have plenty of reserve capacity to handle the combined traffic from the two proposed retail projects.

J. Walsh of Graves Engineering, the Town's consulting engineer, agreed that the traffic calculations appear consistent with past studies, and the proposed mitigation actually exceeds the previously approved proposal. He noted the biggest difference was the elimination of the left turn for north bound traffic which is part of MassDOT's project.

R. Largess stressed that the proposed MassDOT work is only a temporary fix, that the grade separated interchange at Boston Road and Route 146 must be pursued and that it would make sense to just do it right once. He also expressed concerns about the safety of kids on the soccer fields on Pleasant Valley Road.

On a question from the Board J. Hager reminded the Board of traffic impact concerns Ms. Hasting had relative to her home at 138 Boston Road. Ms. Hager noted that she provided Ms. Hastings with detailed MassDOT plans including roadway cross sections showing proposed plantings and re-grading of her driveway. Since that information was provided she has not heard more from Ms. Hastings.

Architect Lou Allevato presented architectural renderings for all buildings in phase one of the project. He noted the use of similar materials and styles to tie the grocery and retail components together. Unibank has its own identity that it is using on new locations in Grafton and Worcester, but this architecture is complimentary to the larger project architecture. He showed the Board actual material samples and photographs of some of the materials and colors that will be utilized. Architecture for other buildings will have to be approved as these tenants become known.

Todd Lornel of 31 Douglas Road expressed three concerns: 1) the entrance on Boston Road abutting the soccer fields appears to have an hourglass geometry and noting trucks will be directed to this entrance, it does not appear like this entrance will function properly, 2) How high is the retaining wall over the brook at this entrance and what will it look like, and 3) Why is a white fence shown along the property line between the soccer fields and the project, is it a spite fence?

Bill Scully responded that the traffic study shows the Boston Road entrance will function properly. Eric Bazette stated the retaining wall that is part of the box culvert will be a maximum of 8' high and J. Hager added the applicant will have to show a typical block detail on the final plans to ensure this feature is aesthetic. The wall will likely have at least a guardrail, if not a higher fence on top to prevent falls. J. Hager added the white fence is shown on the plans as it was requested by the Bowden's during the last project approval. Mr. Lornel indicated the Bowden's would prefer its removal.

Mr. Lornel also asked for confirmation that the traffic study also included home improvement traffic even though this is likely a second phase of development. It was confirmed this traffic was included in the traffic evaluation. On a question as to whether or not the State would be sending a representative to discuss their project, J. Hager stated she was told the State would not send someone as it's against policy. It was noted their project was advertised for bids on April 13<sup>th</sup>.

Attorney Tim Sullivan of Goulston & Storrs asked if the applicant will provide a written response to traffic concerns. It was confirmed the Board will expect a written response.

Patrick Doherty, P.E. of Midpoint Engineering arrived on behalf of the applicant.

The Board reviewed waiver requests:

**IV.B.I. Parking and circulation in the setbacks.** The applicant has requested a waiver noting this project was granted a similar waiver for the previously approved plan.

Motion: To grant a waiver to allow a limited amount of parking and circulation in the front setback along Route 146 and the side setback along the Bowden property line as shown on the 3/14/2013 plans, having found the intrusion will have minimal impact and related landscaping has been supplemented.

2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Moroney  
R. Largess

Martin Bowden of Putnam Hill Road asked if trees along the western property line will still be protected. It was noted this could be included as a condition.

Vote: 5-0-0

**IV.B.3. Table 4 Reduction in the amount of parking provided for the home improvement store.** The applicant noted they had reduced the amount of parking down to industry standards and did not feel they could reduce the number of spaces further as requested by the Planning Director.

W. Whittier noted issues with inadequate parking at the Market Basket grocery store in Oxford. He asked if the applicant was confident these issues would not occur at this location. P. Doherty stated Market Basket actually draws twice the industry standard for parking. He noted Midpoint has done several projects with the same grocery chain that is proposed here and they are confident parking will be adequate on a regular basis. Jeff Walsh of Graves Engineering stated the applicant has provided a minimum of 110% of the required parking for all uses except the home improvement. They show 67% of the required parking for this use. He added there is always the potential for holiday type issues, but with a home improvement use with different peak hours directly adjacent, overflow parking can be easily accommodated during these unusual instances. S. Paul expressed skepticism with the amount of parking and asked how things would be fixed if the grocery is more successful than expected? Mr. Doherty responded as there is a phase II, this phase would be scaled back to allow for more parking for phase I.

Motion: To grant the waiver to allow less parking for the home improvement use than what is required as shown on the 3/14/13 plans having found that other uses exceed the required parking standards and providing additional parking if necessary is not impossible, D. Moroney  
2<sup>nd</sup>: R. Largess  
Vote: 5-0-0

**IV.B.3. Table 5 Reduction in the number of loading spaces.** The applicant has requested less loading spaces noting they are providing what each client needs based on similar long standing operations.

Motion: To grant the waiver to allow fewer loading spaces use than what is required as shown on the 3/14/13 plans, having found that what is shown is consistent with loading spaces provided for these same tenants at other locations where operations have been ongoing for some time,  
D. Moroney  
2<sup>nd</sup>: T. Connors  
Vote: 5-0-0

**IV.B.4.e. Driveway wider than 30'** The applicant noted the driveways are 30' throughout, but widen to greater than 30' at the entrances to accommodate multiple travel lanes.

Motion: To grant the waiver to allow the driveways to be wider than 30' at the entrances having found this is necessary to accommodate multiple turn and stacking lanes, R. Largess  
2<sup>nd</sup>: S. Paul  
Vote: 5-0-0

**V.D.4.a.3. Allow work on slopes greater than 15%** The applicant noted the only work on slopes over 15% is removal of existing stock piles from past earth removal operations on this site and some limited slope work along wetlands that is being regulated by the Conservation Commission. It was noted full erosion and sedimentation control measures are being utilized to prevent short and long term damage to abutting resources.

Motion: To grant the waiver to work on slopes over 15% having found this work is limited and the applicant has erosion control and sedimentation plans in place and will be required to file and comply with a Storm Water Pollution Prevention(SWPP) plan that will mitigate any potential negative effects, D. Moroney  
2<sup>nd</sup>: R. Largess  
Vote: 5-0-0

**V.D.4.c.1.c. Reduction in the width of walkways to less than 6'.** The applicant noted 6' is excessive for walkways, actually exceeding ADA requirements. J. Walsh noted that he is fine with less than 6' everywhere except where parking spaces are up against the walkway as cars can overhang the walk by as much as 2'.

ADA requires 4' clear width and allows 3' for limited stretches. T. Connors felt there should be sidewalk connections out to Boston Road and from the soccer fields to accommodate safe and adequate movement of children on foot or bicycles.

Motion: To grant the waiver to allow walkways of 5' having found that 5' exceeds ADA standards and will still provide safe clearance with cars overhanging the path, R. Largess  
2<sup>nd</sup>: S. Paul

Vote: 4-1-0, T. Connors felt strongly that bicycle and pedestrian traffic should be accommodated from off site.

**V.D.4.C.3.b. Reduction in the amount of parking provided for the home improvement store.**(see IV.B.3. above)

Motion: S. Paul  
2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Moroney  
Vote: 5-0-0

**V.D.4.C.3.d. Parking in front of structure as opposed to side or rear.** The applicant noted they have utilized parking both behind in front of structures creating a central parking field. Grocery and home improvement uses don't have rear entrances. With proposed landscaping the "sea of pavement" effect has been mitigated.

Motion: To grant the waiver allow parking in front of structures having found parking behind the home improvement and grocery is not practical and landscaping will mitigate much of the expansive parking lot effects, S. Paul  
2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Moroney  
Vote: 5-0-0

**V.D.4.C.3.f. Use of concrete for walkways.** The applicant noted there are several locations where brick or block walkways are impractical like in front of the grocery store where shopping carts are utilized. They also asserted that the use of concrete where proposed is tasteful, economical and better for long term maintenance and repair..

Motion: To grant the waiver to use brick or block, or a material that simulates them, around the retail, bank and restaurant, tinted concrete in front of the home improvement and grocery store, and plain concrete elsewhere, having found patterned surfaces are impractical and even unsafe in certain locations and un-necessary in more isolated locations, S. Paul  
2<sup>nd</sup>: R. Largess  
Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: To continue the public hearing to May 6, 2013 at 7:20 P.M., D. Moroney  
2<sup>nd</sup>: S. Paul  
Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: To adjourn, R. Largess  
2<sup>nd</sup>: T. Connors  
Vote: 5-0-0

Adjourned 9:25 PM