



# Town of Northborough

## Planning Board

63 Main Street

Northborough, Massachusetts 01532-1994

(508) 393-5019 Office (508) 393-6996 Fax

[planning@town.northborough.ma.us](mailto:planning@town.northborough.ma.us)

Approved 7-26-06

### Planning Board Meeting Minutes July 11, 2006

**Members Present:** Rick Leif, George Pember, Don Hewey, Bob Rosenberg, Michelle Gillespie

**Others Present:** Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Fred Litchfield, Town Engineer; Bill Farnsworth, Inspector of Buildings/Zoning Enforcement Officer; Kate Rugman, Omnipoint; Mark Donahue, Fletcher, Whipple & Tilton; Daniel Clarey, The Gutierrez Company; Robert Weidnecht, Beals & Thomas; Peter Latta, A. Duie Pyle, Richard Kane, Zoning Board of Appeals; Fran Bakstran, Board of Selectmen

Chairman Leif opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

#### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Pember moved to approve the minutes of May 2, 2006 as amended. Mr. Hewey seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

Ms. Gillespie moved to approve the minutes of May 16, 2006 as amended. Mr. Hewey seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

Mr. Hewey moved to approve the minutes of June 26, 2006. Mr. Rosenberg seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

Mr. Hewey moved to approve the minutes of June 30, 2006. Ms. Gillespie seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

#### **Continued Public Hearing to Consider Site Plan Review Application of Omnipoint Communication Inc. to install and operate a wireless communications facility of up to nine panel antennas and the placement of ancillary radio equipment on the rooftop of 4 West Main Street, Map 63 Parcel 72.**

Applicant: Omnipoint Communications Inc.  
Date Filed: January 24, 2006  
Decision Due: July 11, 2006

Attorney Kate Rugman, representing Omnipoint Communication, Inc., explained she had originally been before board on March 7<sup>th</sup>. A letter requesting a continuance of the decision deadline to July 30, 2006 was submitted to the Planning office earlier in the day.

Ms. Rugman stated the Board wanted the cabinetry inside the building, which had originally been proposed to be located outside on the back of the building. On June 12<sup>th</sup> the Board received revised plans showing the proposed antennas behind the white gated area on the top of the building. The new location for the equipment inside the building will be in a room on the

continued on page 2

fourth floor, which will be leased by T-Mobile. They will be able to put a conduit there for power and a coaxial cable will run through the room and the ceiling and go to each of the six antennas on the roof.

Mr. Farnsworth read a memo from the Fire Chief and stated the Chief is generally in agreement, but still needs to see the final layout. That will happen when the building permit application is reviewed.

Ms. Rugman confirmed the number of antennas has been reduced from nine to six.

Mr. Rosenberg stated the Design Review Committee had some concerns about the equipment being located outside and asked the Application to move it inside.

Mr. Leif stated the process is to accept continuance, get input from the Design Review Committee and vote on July 26<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Rugman stated ultimately, this is what the Design Review Committee wanted.

Mr. Leif read Ms. Rugman's letter requesting an extension of the decision deadline to July 30, 2006.

Mr. Hewey moved to grant the decision deadline extension to July 30, 2006. Mr. Pember seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

Mr. Rosenberg moved to continue the hearing to July 26, 2006. Mr. Pember seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

Ms. Joubert will draft a decision prior to the next meeting.

**Continued Site Plan Review for 210 Bartlett Street**

Applicant:	A. Duie Pyle, Inc.
Engineer:	Beals and Thomas, Inc.
Date Filed:	May 26, 2006
Decision Due:	August 23, 2006

Attorney Mark Donahue, of Fletcher, Tilton & Whipple, Dan Clarey, of The Gutierrez Companies, Peter Latta, Chairman, A. Duie Pyle and Robert Weidknecht, of Beals & Thomas, were present. A letter and a Supplemental Narrative had been submitted to the Planning office after the June 26<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting, which were in response to questions and requests by the Board.

Mr. Donahue explained the letter, dated July 6, 2006, summarizes what A. Duie Pyle does and how it runs the business. It breaks down truck traffic by the time of day and shows that the record of activity for the time of day is consistent with what he told the board before. The site is quiet from 10 am – 3 pm, when there is essentially no traffic. Off-hours are also shown on the graph and shows the traffic drops at these times and is limited almost exclusively to long-haul trucks from the interstate or heading to the interstate.

Mr. Leif stated the numbers are taken from their Webster facility. He questioned how the board would extrapolate those numbers for Northborough.

Mr. Clarey stated Northborough would be the exact same traffic as it is today. The growth of traffic will be relative to the growth of their business. The Northborough facility will be 40 bays larger than in Phase 1 than the Webster facility is today. Webster has 78 bays.

Mr. Clarey explained the Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB) report in the original package of information submitted had the wrong building size. The office had been counted twice. They recalculated the building size, which slightly reduced the number of trips.

Mr. Leif stated that is a difference of about 50% and questioned if that means they can expect that type of increase.

Mr. Latta stated the business would be expected to double in 11 – 12 years. When the Northborough site opens, Webster will close. They will not be open simultaneously.

Mr. Leif asked how long it will take to get the site running after approval.

Mr. Clarey replied that would be in April or May of next year. If the plan is approved in the next 30 days, it would be under construction in the fall.

Mr. Leif confirmed the difference in the traffic report is it takes into account the different building size, but has no major change in traffic.

Mr. Pember asked how trucks will access I-495.

Mr. Donahue stated the drivers who wish to head west will be instructed to take Lyman Street to Route 9.

Mr. Rosenberg stated in Table 4 on page 6 of the VHB report, it shows 2 trucks entering and 22 exiting on a weekday morning during peak hours. The chart shows that in Webster there are 37 vehicles departing, where VHB says 22.

Mr. Cleary stated VHB used figures from the Webster facility which are based on actual counts of traffic for that particular day.

Mr. Donahue stated there is no new data in the Supplemental Narrative. He stated he is aware of the Acting DPW Director's letter submitted today and they will provide the information Ms. Buzanoski has requested.

Ms. Joubert stated Town staff have reviewed the plans in-house and the assumption is the vehicle wash proposed will operate in the same way as two previous car washes that have been approved by the Water & Sewer Commission.

Mr. Litchfield stated the Conservation Commission is still working on review of the project and that he still needs to review the drainage calculations. He will provide the Board and Applicant with a review letter prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Rosenberg stated there is no list of cleaning chemicals attached to the report.

Mr. Donahue stated it was an oversight and he distributed the list to the board.

Mr. Donahue stated that, due to work and vacation schedules, A. Duie Pyle representatives won't be available to attend the next meeting. Mr. Donahue stated they would like to meet with Ms. Joubert and Mr. Litchfield and come back to the next meeting.

Mr. Leif stated they need to reach a decision by August 23rd.

Ms. Gillespie and Mr. Rosenberg asked about the procedure for clean-up of spills in the building.

Robert Weidknecht of Beals and Thomas stated they have designed a series of catch basins to conform to wetlands regulations. In the event of an emergency, spill prevention kits are provided in the building and heavy polyethylene mats are used over each catch basin. If spilled material gets into a catch basin before the mat goes on, it will be trapped in the basin.

Ms. Gillespie asked what flammable materials will be transported.

Mr. Latta replied the primary category for flammables is paint products, also glue for book binding and printing inks. There are also some flammable lubricants. Everything is either dry or packed in gallon containers. Also, they will be handling some products that fall under the category of corrosive, including cleaning compounds, pool chemicals and batteries. If breakable items, such as fluorescent lights, fell out of their corrugated boxes, they would be cleaned up, but no differently than if they fell out of a truck.

Ms. Gillespie stated its nothing different than Wal-Mart or Lowe's on Route 9.

Mr. Hewey asked Mr. Litchfield if there is any indication the Conservation Commission will have issues.

Mr. Litchfield stated the Commission discussed the project phasing in relation to some parking area which is in the buffer zone. The applicant will reevaluate it. It appears the Conservation Commission will most likely close the hearing at their meeting and vote to issue an order of conditions.

Mr. Farnsworth discussed the proposed noise levels at the site and stated sound does travel at night, including noise from air conditioning units, heating units and mechanical equipment. How it will affect noise is based on concerns and problems that have risen from facilities like NewCorr. He has been getting calls from people on Coolidge Circle asking about things going on in the I-290 Industrial Park. The Town needs to know what kind of noise will be generated at the site, including the location, nature of equipment and what the rating is. Before the actual construction and operation, a sound level should be established so if neighbors complain, they can go back and compare. The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) measures the sound at the property line. No industrial facility can generate noise 10 decibels over the baseline at the property line.

Mr. Leif stated it would make sense for the applicant to submit current noise levels. It would be handy to have the noise information as a baseline.

Mr. Donahue stated it makes sense to have a baseline taken when the building is built, traffic is created and when traffic is moving on Bartlett Street.

Mr. Hewey agreed it will be good to have the information to abate any possible noise issues in the future.

Mr. Hewey moved to continue the discussion to July 26, 2006 at 7:30 pm. Mr. Pember seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

### **Discussion with Northboro Center Plaza, LLC RE: CVS at 14 West Main Street**

Attorney Mark Donahue, representing Mike O'Hara of Northboro Center Plaza, LLC, stated the applicants intend to raze the existing building and rebuild a larger CVS. CVS is currently a tenant of the property. The parcel consists of 1.1 acres of land and the proposed building will be 13,041 square feet. There are 71 existing parking spaces on the site, but they don't all meet the bylaw and are not all on the subject property. The proposed plan shows 48 parking spaces, which meets zoning requirements. The site is challenging, is not easy to develop and is not a typical CVS site. The most significant issue is traffic. Traffic will enter the site from West Main Street or from the intersection of Church Street and Pierce Street and exit at Pierce Street or West Main Street. The existing plan shows right and left access to Pierce Street. The movement of entering the site from Church Street doesn't work well if a person is going to be making an illegal left turn onto Church Street from Pierce Street. This will be a subject of discussion with town staff and the plan may change before going to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The Applicant is working with Sawyers and the antique store about fencing and landscaping at the end of the passageways to stop cut-through traffic. A pharmaceutical drive-thru is proposed on the back of the building. The interior drive will be for full-service pharmacy use and the outside drive is a drop-off for prescriptions.

The Applicant has spent a lot of time with the Design Review Committee (DRC) regarding the location and appearance of the building. Several alternate locations on the property were considered for the building. Mr. Donahue showed pictures of the design closest to the final design of the building. The windows and dormers have a residential style and feel, which was a change requested by the Design Review Committee. Various materials and colors have been revised. Landscaping has changed from the original design. There will be a large landscaped area buffering the doorway and landscaping along Pierce Street has been added.

Regarding traffic, the store size is increasing, but it's balanced because only CVS is there now – not the other three businesses. They anticipate a peak hour increase of about 30 cars. There are no plans to merge with other company's products or have another company on the site.

The entrance driveway will be a little further from the old town hall lawn than the existing driveway and the curb cut will be more defined. The drive-thru will be accessed from the West Main Street driveway, down and to the left of the building. The drive-thru will be where the back entrance of the existing building is now, but closer to the service dock. There will be two-way traffic and landscaping has been designed to create a traffic pattern where they hasn't been one. Traffic may exit onto West Main Street. There may be a dedicated left-turn lane, but ultimately this will be Mass Highway's decision.

Mr. Donahue stated they looked at bringing the building near the front and still achieving enough parking spaces to meet the bylaw as well as the requirement of CVS. The site is not square and when they moved the building down, there were concerns about site distance and the right-

on-red turn going on to Church Street. They also looked at locating the building on the other side of the site, but they would not have enough parking spaces to meet the bylaw.

Ms. Joubert stated 10 Church Street is set back and Special Teas is also located back a bit, so even though staff talked about bringing buildings closer to the street, they looked at what else was built on the streets and bringing the building closer didn't fit design-wise with the other buildings.

Mr. Pember praised the Design Review Committee, stating the current building proposed is a significant improvement over the initial building.

Mr. Joubert stated the Design Review Committee worked hard on this project and CVS was very accommodating. It's been a good working relationship.

Mr. Rosenberg stated he thinks the downtown loses something having the parking lot closed off from the neighboring parking area. It will prevent people from using it.

Ms. Joubert stated it was a public safety issue, not a design review suggestion. For public safety, one cut-through will be eliminated and the Design Review Committee dressed it up with landscaping. Changes were done in conjunction with the abutting property owners.

Mr. Rosenberg stated the site plan is claustrophobic, with too much jammed into the site regardless of the materials. The existing cut-throughs are more downtown friendly, and eliminating them just moves traffic down to Pierce Street.

Mr. Rosenberg read from the zoning bylaw regarding the Planning Board's authority over this special permit site plan review.

Ms. Joubert stated the Zoning Board of Appeals is the special permit granting authority for a Special Permit Site Plan Review for buildings over 600 square feet.

Mr. Donahue stated no other variances are needed. The plan complies with the zoning bylaw.

Mr. Rosenberg asked about Opticom installation.

Mr. Joubert stated since the mitigation proposed by Stop & Shop is on hold, they are now in discussion with CVS regarding installation of Opticom equipment and the reconfiguration of Church Street/Pierce Street. Indications are that they are amenable, but those would be conditions the Zoning Board of Appeals would attach.

Mr. Rosenberg asked if there was any reason why they can't include the whole Church Street/Pierce Street/West Main Street area as a controlled intersection.

Ms. Joubert stated the Fire Department has the ability to control the signal at Church Street and West Main Street, but by the time they press the button and get out of the station, the light has changed. The emergency vehicles come out on the wrong side of the island, which is a scary situation. There are many conflicting movements with both traffic in general and traffic with the emergency vehicles included.

Mr. Donahue stated every solution to these traffic issues has a consequence. The community has lived with the condition for over 20 years. Possible solutions need to be thought out and worked out as a community.

Mr. Leif stated the board needs to send their individual ideas, suggestions and concerns to Ms. Joubert over the next week or two and then form a comment letter from the Board to send to the Zoning Board of Appeals. There will probably be an additional meeting of the ZBA after their July 25<sup>th</sup> meeting so they can review the revised traffic report after it's submitted.

Mr. Donahue stated their traffic report and analysis was reviewed in detail with the ZBA and they have been working with the town's traffic consultant and will continue to work with them. The Planning Board is not the permit-granting authority for this project.

Mr. Leif stated the zoning bylaw provides an opportunity for the Planning Board to comment on the site plans submitted to the ZBA and the Planning Board wants to review the final recommendations from the traffic consultant and town staff. They will give their opinion, whether they're fine with it or whether they have other comments. They can't require the changes they may suggest and do not intend to drag this out or hold up the project. They will provide comments to Ms. Joubert prior to their July 26<sup>th</sup> meeting in order to put together a draft comment letter. They may want to make changes after seeing the report from the consultant.

Mr. Pember questioned how the board can submit a comment letter when they haven't seen the consultant's report.

Mr. Leif stated he thinks some of Mr. Rosenberg's comments were interesting and doesn't think there's a problem submitted those concerns even though they haven't seen the reports.

Ms. Gillespie stated the Police Chief approved the design of the traffic flow. She asked Ms. Joubert if she could get the report from Chief Leahy so the Board can see why it was designed as it is.

Ms. Joubert stated they have a staff letter which incorporates what they see as key points and anticipate submitting a second review memo after they include site traffic information.

Ms. Gillespie wanted it noted that the Police Chief did come to the Design Review Committee meeting and the traffic plan was designed based on his recommendations.

Ms. Joubert noted both the Fire and Police Chiefs have been involved with the traffic design.

Mr. Hewey asked how this site compares to the Westborough site.

Mr. Donahue explained the Westborough site has one entrance and one exit. The Northborough site is slightly smaller.

Ms. Joubert stated the date of the next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting after their July 25<sup>th</sup> meeting is August 22<sup>nd</sup>.

## **Old/New Business**

### **REQUEST FOR BOND REDUCTION FOR STIRRUP BROOK ESTATES**

Mr. Litchfield stated the developer asked for amendments to the subdivision approval to modify the end of the turnaround to accommodate the wall. This has been done. Some stabilization still needs to be done, but work in the right of way has been completed. They have relocated the electrical transformers. Some areas of sidewalk need to be completed. Curbing has been put in. Driveways have not been topped. Quite a lot of work has been done and there hasn't been a request for a bond reduction since 2004. The developer is requesting a reduction of \$94,850, which would make the remaining bond amount \$106,150. All that remains is the final coat and drawings. It is nearing completion and the reduction requested is more than a reasonable amount.

Mr. Rosenberg moved to approve the bond reduction of \$94,850. Mr. Pember seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

### **REQUEST FOR BOND REDUCTION FOR MAYNARD WOODS**

Mr. Litchfield proposed a reduction in the bond amount of \$60,000.

Ms. Gillespie moved to approve the bond reduction of \$60,000. Mr. Rosenberg seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

### **PLANNING BOARD DISCUSSION RE: ZONING STUDY**

Ms. Joubert reviewed her July 9, 2006 memo to the Board outlining the proposed structure and schedule for the zoning bylaw reorganization. Discussion followed with the Board regarding the subcommittee, time frame, and the hiring of Judi Barrett from the land use consulting firm Community Opportunities Group Inc to perform this work. COG and Ms. Barrett worked with the Town approximately two years ago to complete the Community Development Plan.

Mr. Farnsworth added he would like to see the following areas addressed if possible: accessory apartments, conflicts in parts of the bylaw with the groundwater bylaw, non-conforming lots & structures, parking, and signs.

Ms. Fran Bakstran, member of the Board of Selectmen, stressed the need to work with a subcommittee to assist with accomplishing this goal for the 2007 Annual Town Meeting.

Based on tonight's discussion, Ms. Joubert will revise the memo prior to the July 26<sup>th</sup> meeting and discuss the hiring of the consultant with the Town Administrator. After the July 26<sup>th</sup> meeting, a memo will be sent to the various boards explaining the project and the need for a member to be assigned to the subcommittee.

Respectfully submitted by,

Debbie Grampietro

