

**Maynard Planning Board  
May 11, 2016, 7:00 p.m.  
Maynard Town Offices, 195 Main Street, Room 201**

Members present: Chair Bernie Cahill, Andrew D'Amour, William Gosz, Greg Tuzzolo, Samantha Paull, Brent Mathison

7:00 PM- Chair Cahill called the meeting to order

**Public Hearing (continuation) – 129 Parker Street The Planning Board will determine if it will recommend approval in its report to the Town Meeting (date TBD), of the proposed Concept Plan, including signage, for a mixed-use development at 129 Parker Street submitted by Capital Group Properties, 259 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772**

Chair Cahill opened the continued public hearing.

The developer stated that the concept plan has been revised from the comments of the last meeting. The architect will go thru the changes, then review traffic, landscape and signage the changes made.

Attorney John Witten and Engineer Wayne D'Amico were also present. Attorney Witten clarified what the Planning Board can request on the concept plan under the Neighborhood Business Overlay District (NBOD).

The Architect Rich Rankin presented the changes to the plan from the last meeting. The major change was to modify the location of the roundabout; the entryways were also modified, the North entrance was changed to right hand turn only, some monuments and signage were removed, the internal circulation was modified, based on the conservation meeting the parking was moved to stay out of the 100 ft buffer, created a stormwater management area outside the 50 ft buffer, the turtle nesting area was modified slightly.

The North buffer was modified, the plantings proposed are the same, the South buffer is not as well established, met with the abutters to address concerns about better screening, the proposed retaining wall and plantings were explained as shown on the plans.

The changes to the driveways were described, the roundabout has been shifted further into the site, the pedestrian circulation plan was modified to add crosswalks and a pedestrian bridge over the pond. The plans of the site driveways intersections changes were reviewed some of the entries were changed to one way.

Mark Rosenshein the design review engineer hired by the town spoke about the changes to signage based on the comments from the last meeting. The developer has revised the plans to reflect the changes discussed, pylon signs have been reduced, the allowable size of tenant signs was discussed.

Chair Cahill stated that the Board will now ask questions on signage, followed by questions from the public on signage, then will go over the landscape, traffic and design changes in the same format.

Chair Cahill commented that the public is still uncomfortable with the 16 ft sign, is there a way to reduce the sign by not including the tenant panels that are right along Parker Street. The developer responded that the tenant sign can have up to 24 tenant panels. Greg asked if there was any stated criteria that defines the size of the sign based on the speed limit of the road; the developer stated there is not, the size is based on the local regulations. Samantha Paull asked if there could be different size tenant panels in order to reduce the overall size of the sign. Andrew D'Amour asked about the lighting of the sign, the developer responded that the different types of lighting were discussed, the problem with up lighting is during snow it gets covered and throws light up to the night sky, down lighting there is an issue with there being enough lighting throughout the sign, internal illumination allows for even lighting in the sign and will have to be discussed since it is not allowed without special permit. Halo lighting was described and was used at the Mill and Main project, problem with halo lighting is with logos. Brent Mathison asked how far back from Parker Street the main pylon sign would be; the sign will be approximately 25 ft from the edge of pavement. It was asked how the way finding signs were lit; the signs are backlit.

Chair Cahill opened the public hearing to comments from the public regarding signs.

Mr. Cranshaw asked for clarification on what can change after town meeting as far as sign location, lighting and size. Attorney Witten stated the pylon sign cannot be changed after approval at Town Meeting by the Planning Board, changes would have to go back to Town Meeting, the Planning Board can revise the internal signs as long as it is not a substantial change. Town Planner Bill Nemser stated the developer should add a sheet to the plan that includes all the specifics of the pylon sign, the developer agreed. Mr. Estabrook commented on the pylon sign having 18 tenant panels and the ability of being able to read all of them while driving by. Another resident commented that the signs along Parker Street have to be as softly lit as possible, it would be preferred that those tenants have a tenant panel and sign on the internal side. Mr. Galey stated again that the size of the sign should be based on the community and the neighborhood. Chair Cahill commented that dimmers were required on lighting on previous signs that faced residential areas and this could be a lighting option on the pylon sign. The Planning Board will have discretion on signage details during site plan approval for all except the pylon sign. It was discussed whether the concept plan and the signage would be two separate Town Meeting approvals. Attorney Witten stated it can be done as two separate votes.

Chair Cahill asked the Board for comments to the developer on the pylon sign. Brent stated that the size seems to be an issue with the residents, illumination should be done with dimmers during specific hours, would be more inclined to support if the sign were smaller. William commented he would like to see exactly where at the entry the sign will be, hard to gage if size needs to be decreased. Greg would like to see the location as well, wants to see consistent coloring, concerned about the overall scale of the sign, smaller signage can work, they are not competing against other shopping areas. Chair Cahill agrees with all the above comments. Andrew concurs with the comments, need to see renderings and all the details of lighting. The Board is in agreement that they are against internal illumination. Samantha stated she likes that it is setback from the street, would like to see detail, agrees with other comments on lighting, have the coloring be cohesive, would like to see size reduced, she also commended the applicant on eliminating the other signs along Parker Street.

Chair Cahill asked Town Engineer Wayne Amico to comment on the changes that have been made to the plans, the pedestrian way, roundabout and North entrance. Wayne stated he has reviewed the plans and has issued a letter dated May 9. Most of the traffic comments have been addressed. Pat Dunford traffic engineer from VHB gave an overview, placement of the roundabout, signal, holiday season conditions. During holiday season there may be additional traffic controls with police details due to extra traffic. The roundabout location has been shifted back which is preferable, North entry will be a right turn in. Chair Cahill asked for Board questions on the traffic changes. Greg asked about the southwest retail area and the senior living facility, there seems to be a lot of traffic activity in that area, the developer stated they can look at modifying that area. Greg also commented on the retaining wall aesthetics. Chair Cahill asked about the connection between the high school parking lot and the southwest corner, would like to see a paved passageway, the area is going to be used and it would be helpful if there is a pedestrian connection for safety. Wayne commented that some of the crossings should be worked out during the site plan process, he also agrees with Greg's comment on the southwest intersection could be reworked for better flow.

Chair Cahill opened the hearing for public comments.

Trish Saunders referred to conditions listed in the 2009 agreement about noise, delivery times need to be sensitive to the abutting neighbors. She presented the 2009 documents that listed site plan conditions. Trish Saunders asked again about stormwater management and asked if the Planning Board was aware of what Conservation Commissions comments were on how far west the project goes on the property. The developer stated there were three areas that the Conservation Commission was concerned with, the parking area was moved out of the 100 ft buffer zone, the second area was behind the independent living facility the stormwater area was changed, the third area was by pad B building did some enhanced wetland improvement, they are meeting again with Conservation on May 17. Greg asked if the stormwater calculations have been done as shown on the plan, Wayne commented that the areas shown seem reasonable, but stormwater analysis has not been done, which is not done until site plan review, the basin shapes may change. A question was asked if the Planning Board was confident that traffic issues and the traffic impact analysis, Attorney Witten referenced section 9.3.7 which addresses on and offsite traffic mitigation. The traffic engineer stated that traffic analysis numbers are similar to the 2013 plan and additional intersections have been requested. A letter has been submitted addressing traffic number for the proposed project and the number have decreased from the 2013 analysis. A resident asked about connectivity to other public areas for the apartment buildings, also the question of snow removal was asked, Chair Cahill stated the snow removal question should be addressed by Conservation.

Chair Cahill stated that Jared from Fisheries and Wildlife was present, Jared commented that he will be at the next Conservation meeting, the developer has made some amendments to the turtle nesting area which is their biggest concern, happy to see the extension of the turtle barrier would like to see addition of nesting habitat to the southwestern corner of the site.

Chair Cahill stated they will now discuss buffers and landscape. Samantha asked how the landscape area buffering the abutters would be maintained, she also asked about hours for the loading zones. Bill Nemser stated the buffers will need to be adjusted during the site plan approval, the 2009 approval had some conditions for loading times and buffers, the developers continue to work with abutters to address concerns and will be covered during the site plan approval. A question was asked about what trees would be removed along Parker Street. It was recommended to change the wording on fencing to

say privacy fencing instead of being type specific. A resident asked about decibel levels of the trucks entering and that vinyl fencing will not control the levels, also at Field Street the site line onto Parker Street needs to be looked at, a tree needs to be removed.

Chair Cahill stated there are still a few issues that need to be addressed before the Planning Board making a recommendation on these plans for Town Meeting. The developer will revise the plans based on the comments tonight, most of the changes will be to the signage plan. Chair Cahill thanked the developer for listening to the community and Board concerns. The hearing will be continued to June 1<sup>st</sup>. ***A motion was made by Bernie Cahill to continue the hearing for 129 Parker Street concept plan and signage plan to June 1, 2016 at 7 p.m. at the Maynard Town Hall, room to be determined, seconded by Andrew D'Amour. The Board voted 5 to 0 in favor of the motion.***

Waltham Street:

Bill Nemser stated that Wayne was asked by one of the owners if they can put up a white vinyl fence, Wayne showed a sketch of the proposed fence. Wayne suggested that the post and rail be replaced and be allowed to install as proposed, there are no site distance issues. This project was subject to design review, the question came up as to whether this requires an amendment to the design review approval, Bill Nemser stated he sent the question to Town counsel but has not received a response.

***A motion was made by Bernie Cahill to adjourn, seconded by Samantha Paull.***

***Meeting adjourned at 10:09 p.m.***