

**Maynard Planning Board – Meeting and Public Hearing  
December 10, 2019 - 7 p.m.  
195 Main Street, Room 101**

---

**Board Members Present:** Greg Tuzzolo – Chair, Andrew D’Amour – Vice Chair, Bill Cranshaw, Chris Arsenault, Jim Coleman, Mike Uttley (Alternate)

**Others Present:** Bill Nemser – Town Planner; Wayne Amico – Town Engineer; Ron Muller – Principal at Ron Muller & Associates; Kirsten Braun – Traffic Engineer from Ron Muller & Associates; Patrick Dunford – Traffic Engineer from VHB

---

**Called to Order** at 7:00 p.m. by Greg Tuzzolo

**Public Hearing – 115 Main Street (Continued from 11.12.19)**

Greg Tuzzolo reopened the Public Hearing for 115 Main Street, which was continued from November 12, 2019.

Greg Tuzzolo explained that the topics of tonight’s hearing will be traffic, pedestrian circulation, and parking. He stated that the Board has received the supporting materials and has reviewed them accordingly. He further pointed out that, although there is a site plan, including landscaping, contained within the application materials, it has not undergone a peer review or design review. So the plan will be utilized merely to support the conversation regarding traffic, pedestrian circulation, and parking. The next hearing will be focused on the details of the site plan.

Candace Ho and Melissa MacDonald were in attendance representing MacDonald Development as Jimmy MacDonald was unable to attend due to an accident.

Ron Muller of Ron Muller & Associates stated that the traffic study demonstrated that the project will not a big generator of traffic. The proposed project will include 26 apartments and 1800 square feet of retail. The study shows that there will be approximately 15-25 peak-hour trips (total traffic entering and exiting during one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon). The study assumes traffic will flow through the municipal lot access onto Summer Street rather than thru the CVS parking lot. Ron Muller went on to discuss the parking area, which is proposed to be 31 spaces for the apartments and 4 spaces for the retail businesses, which falls short of the zoning requirement for 39 spaces. He explained that MacDonald Development has done studies at ten other sites they have around Maynard and concluded that 24 parking spaces would suffice for the proposed 26 units. Ron Muller’s team also reviewed national standards for apartment developments and determined that the proposed project would require 29 parking spaces based on national standards.

With regard to pedestrian circulation, Ron Muller presented a graph to illustrate what it would look like. Under the proposed conditions, the curb cut on Main Street will be closed. There will be a pedestrian connection/”promenade” that will connect the sidewalk along Main Street with the Assabet River Rail

Trail (ARRT). The only vehicular access to the site will be at the rear of the site via the municipal parking lot. The proposal also includes installing pedestrian warning signs at both sides of the crosswalk to facilitate pedestrian access from the other side of Main Street through the site and onto the ARRT.

In response to concerns about traffic using the CVS parking lot to exit onto Main Street, Ron Muller stated that the proposal includes installing a “No Right Turn” sign in the rear section of the site as people are leaving the municipal parking lot area and heading toward Summer Street to prevent cars from turning into the CVS parking lot area. Ron Muller also stated that James MacDonald has agreed to include a statement in the lease agreement for tenants of the building that the CVS parking lot is not to be used as a cut-through to Main Street. According to Ron Muller, VHB concurs with the results of the traffic study; however VHB did recommend that the “No Right Turn” sign be shown on the site plan; that the stop sign/line be added on the driveway exit at a more appropriate location as recommended by VHB ; that the applicant include an engineering plan of how the municipal parking lot would be re-striped; and that the applicant evaluate the sight distance at the site exit (which has been done but not yet submitted). The results of the sight-distance evaluation show 80 feet at 15mph.

Wayne Amico confirmed that they did receive a formal traffic impact study from the applicant’s engineer. VHB summarized their comments in a memo dated November 11, 2019, which was submitted to the Planning Board (PB). Subsequent to that first memo, graphics were sent to VHB for review, resulting in another memo from VHB dated December 2, 2019. Wayne Amico stated that he does agree with the comments made by the applicant’s engineer but asked Pat Dunford to provide additional comments.

Pat Dunford stated that he does agree with the findings of the traffic study that was conducted by the applicant’s engineer. VHB conducted two separate reviews. Pat Dunford feels that the applicant’s engineer looked at an appropriate area for the study and that the site would be a low-traffic generator. He does not anticipate any notable off-site impacts, and he doesn’t foresee anything that would require mitigation. The study did note that traffic on Summer Street generally travels at around 33mph whereas the posted speed limit is 20-25mph. (He pointed out that those results were outside of the scope of the purpose of the study but thought it worth mentioning.) Though he feels that the proposal of adding the “No Right Turn” sign and the verbiage in the lease is a good idea, he does not feel that it will significantly impact the behavior of individuals. Pat Dunford feels that the promenade is a much better use of the land with regard to pedestrian usage. VHB did offer a few minor suggestions related to pedestrian and bike safety.

Pat Dunford pointed out that most of the comments from VHB were related to the site plan, as it is very tight in some areas with compact parking spaces, which can be further complicated in a parking garage with columns, etc. He referred to it as an “inherent inefficiency” and questioned why the site couldn’t be widened a bit to accommodate standard parking aisles and spaces, perhaps at the cost of a few feet from the promenade. In addition to outstanding questions about sight lines, VHB also has questions about how, for example, an Uber pickup would occur, where moving vans would park to load/unload residents, trash pick-up, FedEx deliveries, etc.

Greg Tuzzolo asked the Board if they had any questions and reiterated that the three focus areas of the discussion for the current hearing are traffic, pedestrian circulation, and parking. Bill Cranshaw asked about the intersection of Main Street and Walnut Street. He pointed out that there is quite a bit of pedestrian activity in that area and wondered whether the crosswalk should only be on one side or both

sides of Walnut Street as pedestrians are crossing from Main Street. There is currently only one crosswalk on Main Street on the river side. Wayne Amico stated that he would not recommend moving the existing crosswalk but that the Board could recommend that the applicant add another one on the opposite side of Walnut Street. Jim Coleman also recommended including a blinking warning light for pedestrian crossings.

Bill Cranshaw suggested that the front of the building have a drop-off/delivery area as part of the plan. Wayne Amico stated that there has been some discussion about re-engineering the space near the entrance to the municipal lot, where the dumpster is currently proposed, to provide an alternate dumpster configuration and some empty space for a potential pick-up/delivery area. VHB has provided that feedback to Jacque MacDonald, who has been working with her site engineer, but there has been no revised plan submitted as of yet.

Bill Cranshaw asked what the legal rights are in terms of preventing people from using the CVS parking lot as a cut-through. He questioned whether the Town or CVS could prevent people from doing so. Wayne Amico stated that he believes the Town could block access to the CVS parking lot from the municipal lot but encouraged Bill Nemser to research it in further detail to see if there is anything specifically stated in the documents from the CVS site plan approval. Bill Cranshaw believes that it's worth evaluating the impact of closing off the access or making a one-way traffic flow.

Chris Arsenault asked if there is a speed limit posted in the municipal parking area. A meeting attendee stated that there was one near the Summer Street intersection. Wayne Amico stated that he was not aware of any speed limit signs in the parking lot. He did point out that there are several parallel parking spaces along the rail trail, which slows traffic down because the space to get through is narrower.

Jim Coleman asked if a speed bump would slow traffic down and suggested that it might be a consideration for the municipal parking lot. Andrew D'Amour suggested that the brick crosswalks at the Main Street and Nason Street intersection would be a good location for speed bumps. Bill Cranshaw stated that that intersection is designed the way it is because it's the route for emergency vehicles. Wayne Amico reminded the Board that a requirement of the 10-12 Nason Street project is to add pedestrian warning signs at that crossing area.

Bill Cranshaw asked Bill Nemser if the proposed "No Right Turn" sign would be enforceable. Both Bill Nemser and Wayne Amico stated that they believe it would be enforceable because it would be located on Town property and that a ticket could be issued if people are in violation of the sign.

Chris Arsenault stated that he does not feel that the discussion has addressed the "awkwardness" of the circulation. Ron Muller pointed out that much of the current issue is related to pedestrians utilizing the CVS parking lot to access Main Street and that the proposed promenade would address that issue directly. Jim Coleman suggested inviting CVS to be a part of future conversations related to people using their parking lot as a cut-through. Bill Nemser stated that, during the meeting, he found the information in the PB decision for CVS. In reading through the information, it was discovered that it states, "Vehicular traffic turning movements will be limited to right-turn only movements into and out of the Main Street entrance..."

Tim Hess questioned why movement through the CVS parking lot is considered bad. Some of the Board Members stated that it's too small of a space for so much vehicular and pedestrian movement. Wayne

Amico pointed out that the CVS was give a variance for their parking spaces, which are smaller than the required width.

Wayne Amico stated that he had met with the applicant and discussed the two graphics related to pedestrian circulation. He feels that the applicant gave the topic good thought to how everything would work for general pedestrians using the promenade, retail patrons, tenants of the building, etc.

Greg Tuzzolo questioned whether the proposed connection between the promenade and the rail trail would meet ADA requirements. Wayne Amico stated that that is undecided but pointed out that it does need to be ADA compliant. That will be part of the pending revised plan.

Greg Tuzzolo asked the applicant to explain where a delivery person would bring a package and if it would be brought to the resident's door or if there would be a mail room, etc. The applicant stated that deliveries would typically occur in the mailroom/mailbox area, although sometimes deliveries will happen at a resident's door. There will be a space near the dumpster where delivery vehicles will be able to park to bring packages inside. The front entrance will be for retail only. Greg Tuzzolo questioned whether there should be loading zone in the front. Wayne Amico expressed concerns about having a dedicated loading zone at the front of the building (on Main Street). Greg Tuzzolo asked if there should be a "No Loading Zone" sign at that location. Wayne Amico said it can be proposed for this project. There was some question as to how wide the sidewalk is in front of the property and whether or not there would be space for a pull-off area. Greg Tuzzolo suggested that, if there is space for street parking for the retail businesses, it should be considered.

Resident Margaret Ann Miles of 58 Summer St suggested that emergency vehicles would have trouble accessing the building if there are cars parked in front of it.

Natalie Robert of 48 Summer Street stated that if the intersection at Walnut Street is complicated, then a loading zone and/or parking spaces should not be added, further complicating that intersection.

Bill Cranshaw asked for more clarification of what the promenade is intended to be (e.g. a destination, a bike dismount area, etc.). Greg Tuzzolo reminded the Board and attendees that there still needs to be a design review completed.

Kathleen Kendra of 14 Euclid Ave pointed out that the outside parking spaces require drivers to go under the building to get to them.

There was a discussion about discrepancies in the number of parking spaces noted in the plans versus what is required. (The report indicates 35 whereas the plan indicates 37.) The Board agreed that there should be four spaces dedicated to the retail portion of the project. Andrew D'Amour stated that, although the placement of those spaces makes the most sense in terms of the site plan, people who are patrons of the businesses on the property will likely have trouble finding those parking spaces due to their location. With regard to resident parking, VHB's recommendation is that there be one space dedicated per unit, as is done at the applicant's other residential properties in town. The applicant noted that it is part of the lease agreement.

Andrew D'Amour stated that he believes the plan as proposed makes everything too tight in terms of parking aisles, parking spaces, and vehicle navigation through the property, even given the reduction in

required spaces. Bill Cranshaw pointed out that the number of proposed units on the property makes it more challenging than if the project was scaled down to accommodate a by-right usage. Bill Nemser reminded everyone that the spirit of the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) is to promote fewer automobiles and parking in the area.

Andrew D'Amour asked about the revised DOD requirement of 50% retail usage. Bill Nemser said this particular project would not be governed by the revised requirements because it was initiated prior to the changes taking place.

Tim Hess pointed out that there are plenty of public parking spaces in town and that other businesses in downtown don't have any dedicated parking. Chris Arsenault asked the applicant what they envision in terms of a business that will be there. The applicant does not have a specific type of business in mind but feels that the space is flexible to accommodate a wide range of possible businesses. Greg Tuzzolo asked for the applicant's opinion of the dedicated retail parking. They are complying with the requirement to have it but do not feel it is necessary. Greg Tuzzolo suggested that the specific location of the retail parking spaces might be decided at a later time when it's more clear what type of business will be located in that space. Bill Cranshaw stated that he thinks the interior garage space would be better for the retail spaces. Chris Arsenault agreed.

Bill Cranshaw asked for an update on the unit mix. Ron Muller referred to the traffic study and stated that the numbers they used in their study were as follows: 4 studios, sixteen one-bedroom units, and 6 two-bedroom units. There was a general discussion about the appropriate number of parking spaces required for the residential part of the building.

Kathleen Kendra asked about visitor parking and parking for postal employees. Greg Tuzzolo asked if the municipal lot could be used for guest parking. Wayne Amico stated that he does not know if overnight parking is enforced in that lot.

The Board discussed requiring 32 parking spaces: 26 residential, four retail, and two handicap spaces. Greg Tuzzolo pointed out that there have been ongoing discussions for months related to the issues with the proposed parking area of the building and that there haven't been any real changes. He feels that it is still too tight according to the plan. He encouraged the applicant to explore ways to open it up more.

Bill Cranshaw asked if there is bike parking planned for residents. There is nothing other than a bike rack on the promenade in the current plan.

Greg Tuzzolo asked the applicant to clarify on the plan (for future conversations) what portion of the project is intended for public use versus just for residents and where the boundary line lies.

Bill Cranshaw asked for clarification of how the easement would work. Greg Tuzzolo agreed that there are many questions related to ownership, maintenance, etc. as part of the development agreement that will need to be considered in future conversations. Wayne Amico stated what his recommendation would be: that the applicant should retain ownership of the land they have at the site; that they be required to maintain whatever they build for the promenade; and that the town should have rights to use the promenade.

*Greg Tuzzolo made a motion to continue the Public Hearing for 115 Main Street to January 28, 2020, which was seconded by Andrew D'Amour.*

***The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.***

*Greg Tuzzolo made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Andrew D'Amour.*

***The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.***

**Adjourned** at 9:01 p.m.