

Maynard Planning Board – Meeting and Public Hearing
January 28, 2020 - 7 p.m.
195 Main Street, Soup Campbell Room

Board Members Present: Greg Tuzzolo – Chair, Bill Cranshaw, Chris Arsenault, Jim Coleman,

Others Present: Bill Nemser – Town Planner; Wayne Amico – Town Engineer; James MacDonald – MacDonald Development; Jacque MacDonald – MacDonald Development

Called to Order at 7:05 p.m. by Greg Tuzzolo

Approval of Minutes

Bill Cranshaw made a motion to approve the Minutes dated 06.25.19, which was seconded by Chris Arsenault.

The Board voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Bill Cranshaw made a motion to approve the Minutes dated 01.14.20, which was seconded by Greg Tuzzolo.

The Board voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Public Hearing – 115 Main Street (Continued from 12.10.19)

Jacque MacDonald reminded everyone of the phased approach that MacDonald Development plans to utilize with regard to the hearings for the site at 115 Main Street. She stated that during the previous meeting, MacDonald Development discussed traffic and pedestrian circulation and parking. This meeting will be focused on the site plan and engineering. The next meeting will be focused on the promenade, architectural elevations, and affordable housing. The following meeting will be focused on conservation and repair of the retaining wall that's located along the river on the site. The topic of the following meeting will be the development agreement and proposed changes to striping of the municipal parking lot.

The applicant stated that MacDonald Development has been working for months with VHB to address all of their concerns. They feel that they have adequately addressed most of the civil engineering concerns but indicated that there is quite a bit of work still left to do on the conservation aspect of the proposal. That work is on-going and will be discussed as noted in the phased approach referenced above.

Wayne Amico agreed that VHB has been working with the applicant and that they have met several times. VHB has reviewed at least two sets of revised plans. Though there have been some tweaks, the overall site layout has not had any significant changes. All of the civil engineering issues have been

resolved. VHB is awaiting a re-submittal of the storm water report. The other areas of concern will be addressed in future hearings per relevant topic.

The applicant reviewed the most recent waiver requests, which includes the following six items:

1. Number of units for density bonus: proposal is for 813 square feet per unit vs. 1500 square feet which equates to 26 units instead of 14.
2. Proposal for 32 parking spaces (including 26 residential, 2 handicap, and 4 retail/flex spaces) vs. the required 39 spaces (1.5 per unit)
3. Five proposed parking spaces are within the 10-foot setback. (They abut the municipal parking lot, not residential property.)
4. Standard scale of plans is 1:10. A couple pages in the applicant's plan set show a scale of 1:20.
5. Professional engineer stamp: the applicant had Foresite Engineering prepare a survey for this project (as well as their 42 Summer Street project).
6. Curb radius requirement is 25 feet for the parking lot entrance. The applicant's plans for the property entrance show one side as 8 feet 2 inches and the other side as 4 feet 2 inches. There's an additional internal curb in the parking garage adjacent to space six. The requirement for that curb is a 10-foot radius; the applicant is asking for a radius of 6 feet 6 inches.

Greg Tuzzolo asked if a turning study was done for VHB's review. Wayne Amico stated that he has no issues with the radii as proposed and that they are fairly typical for this type of property. Jacque MacDonald stated that she had met with several members of the VHB team and came up with a revised one-way parking lot layout as a result of those discussions. The applicant stated that the VHB engineers felt that there was no study needed for the parking garage as there is plenty of turning space available with the revised layout.

Jim Coleman asked for Wayne Amico's feedback on all of the requested waivers. Wayne Amico stated that the first waiver request is outside of his focus area and is up to the Planning Board to determine. However, he has no issue with the five other waivers as requested.

Jacque MacDonald reviewed the changes that were made to the parking layout. All of the parking spaces are now the typical 9x18.5 feet. The previous waiver request to have some smaller parking spaces has been removed from the waiver list. One parking space was removed from the garage and a bike rack area was added. The size of the mechanical room was decreased and a second bike rack was added in front of the garage. The previous plan for two parking lots has been eliminated. There is now just one external lot being proposed (in addition to the parking garage). The parking lot is now being proposed as one way. There are now two areas for snow storage being proposed. The previous proposal was to lift and carry out the snow.

Wayne Amico stated that VHB feels the revised layout is an improvement over the previous proposal. Bill Cranshaw expressed concern about the width of the parking garage entrance, and he asked if there will be mirrors installed to improve visibility for drivers. James MacDonald stated that he has three other buildings in Maynard and each has an 18-foot garage entrance but that he is willing to put mirrors in if the Board requires it. The Board also discussed widening the entrance of the garage to 20 feet. The applicant is willing to do that as well. Greg Tuzzolo suggested that a counterclockwise flow of traffic might help. Wayne Amico agreed and the applicant is amenable to making that change.

Bill Cranshaw expressed concern about parking spaces 30, 31, 32, and 16 on the plan. He stated that if the vehicle overhangs space 30 by a little bit or if there is a snow pile in front of the vehicle, it would impede the ability of someone to exit the building. The applicant stated that there will be a fence around the perimeter of the parking area but it has not yet been designed. There was a discussion about the challenges of all four of those parking spaces. Wayne Amico stated that he feels the promenade could be decreased by a few feet in order to make more room in the parking area without compromising too much of the promenade as it is already designed to be approximately 15-20 feet wide. Another suggestion Wayne Amico offered was for the Board to consider 30 parking spaces instead of 32 to allow for better circulation. Greg Tuzzolo asked if the door to the building could swing open the other way and if the door to the stairs could be shifted. There was also a discussion about angling some of the parking spaces. The applicant said all of those changes could be made.

The Board discussed the general concept of the proposed fence and provided feedback that the fence should not be opaque or create any security concerns. The applicant stated that the intent was to comply with the design guidelines calling for the parking area to be screened. Bill Cranshaw pointed out that the fence on the south end next to the building needs to be able to stop cars near the doors of the building. Chris Arsenault suggested that the applicant can consider bollards as well. The Board agreed that the applicant should consider no fencing along the back of the building.

There was a question about whether or not the parking lot would be curbed. The applicant stated that it will not be as there is currently a plan to have fencing installed. The current proposal calls for the pavement of the parking lot and the brick of the promenade to be at the same level with a fence separating the two. Because the property is within the flood plain, the applicant is limited in terms of adding material. Greg Tuzzolo suggested maybe cutting down into the site to making the parking lot lower than the promenade. Wayne Amico pointed out that there has to be some safety feature preventing cars from going from the parking area into the promenade or river. The applicant stated that bollards can be added to the plan. Greg Tuzzolo stated that his preference would be to have a curb separating the parking area from the promenade. Wayne Amico suggested a six-inch wide vertical curb between the parking lot and the promenade with some type of fence behind it and a gap every five to ten feet so there are no flood plain issues.

The applicant described the dumpster set-up would be in a fully-enclosed "shed" (just like their other properties in town). There will be trash on one side and recycling on the other with a side door that residents can access the shed. The company that the applicant uses to collect the trash and recycling will pull up to the dumpster with a front-load truck, unlock the front doors of the shed, remove the trash and recycling, lock the doors, and back out of the parking area.

Bill Cranshaw asked the applicant to describe the plans for the bike storage areas. He reminded the applicant that there are standards for bike parking that should be followed. There was a discussion about the appropriate number of bike storage spaces that should be available. Greg Tuzzolo stated that 50% of the number of units – or 13 spaces -- would be a good target at a minimum. He asked the applicant to show the bike storage plans very clearly in upcoming hearings and to be mindful that residents should not have to get past other bikes to get to their own. The Board encouraged the applicant to consider hanging rack storage options. Bill Nemser also mentioned the option of bike lockers that could potentially be installed in spaces 31 and 32.

Bill Cranshaw asked the applicant what the plans are for a crosswalk to the other side of Main Street.

The applicant stated that they feel that the promenade will draw pedestrians away from the CVS parking lot and closer to the river, which is near the existing crosswalk to the mill side of Main Street. The applicant did have extensive discussions with VHB regarding the topic of a crosswalk. Wayne Amico stated that VHB feels the most reasonable approach is to leave the existing crosswalk where it is and provide adequate pedestrian crossing signs. The applicant stated that they will be adding the recommended signage. Wayne Amico suggested that the applicant get a written statement from the VHB engineers to provide to the Board indicating that the proposed plan of keeping the existing crosswalk and adding signage was what VHB ultimately recommended.

Greg Tuzzolo asked for public comment.

Sarah Ambrose of Tremont Street asked if there could be an exit added from the property through the municipal lot. By doing so, there would be some parking spaces lost in the municipal lot.

Sarah Lanigan of Roosevelt Street asked if the parking is intended for the residents and businesses. The applicant stated that is correct. Sarah Lanigan stated that she feels there is too much emphasis being placed on cars going in and out of parking spaces when the traffic for the property will be isolated to residents and people utilizing the businesses on site.

Wayne Amico reminded everyone of the discussion at the previous hearing regarding the original CVS plan that required a no-left turn sign on Main Street preventing cars from entering the CVS parking lot via a left turn. He stated that a sign will be put in place as originally intended.

A resident of Apple Ridge asked why the proposed fence along the walkway can't be a green border (e.g. hedges). Greg Tuzzolo stated he would be open to that. Chris Arsenault stated that it would need to comply with safety considerations. The resident also asked if there could be any consideration given to a landscape design plan for the top of the retaining wall rather than a physical barrier to the river. The applicant stated that they are working to create a balance between design features, safety features, and requirements of the EPA, the Conservation Commission, and other relevant groups.

Kathy Kendra of 14 Euclid Avenue pointed out that hedges would not prevent a car from traveling beyond the parking area and into the promenade/river area.

Natalie Robert of 48 Summer Street asked if there would be a way to have an opening in the wall (e.g. a post instead of a wall) at the entrance of the parking garage to allow for more visibility of traffic coming and going at the entrance/exit. The applicant stated they will give that some consideration.

Bill Cranshaw asked if all utilities will be underground. The applicant stated that the intent is to have all utilities underground. They are working with the various utility companies.

Greg Tuzzolo asked about storm water management on the site. VHB needs to review the storm water management plan being proposed by the applicant based on the revised parking lot layout. The applicant's engineer explained that, there will be no water from the site going into the river and that it will all go into a catch basin and leaching field as indicated in the proposal. (He also pointed out that water from the municipal lot flows into the river but that is outside the control of the applicant as it is not part of their property. The applicant is proposing an 18-inch stone wall along the property line.) The applicant explained that currently all water on the site is dumping into the river with no catch basin or

filter mechanism and that the proposed plan would be a significant improvement over the existing conditions. Greg Tuzzolo expressed concern about ice build-up along the promenade. The applicant stated that the promenade will be made of pervious material. Greg Tuzzolo asked that the applicant consider the idea of a linear trench drain between the asphalt and the brick.

There was a discussion about the Local Initiative Program (LIP) and the timeline of that application process as it relates to the Planning Board discussion of the proposal. It was agreed that the applicant will need to get more information on that process outside of the current meeting.

The Board, Wayne Amico, and the applicant discussed the upcoming topics to be addressed as follows: parking, traffic/circulation, drainage, storm water, design, landscape, and promenade. The final agenda of the next hearing date will be subject to the information that has been submitted two weeks prior to the meeting.

Greg Tuzzolo made a motion to continue the Public Hearing for 115 Main Street to March 10, 2020, which was seconded by Jim Coleman.

The Board voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Town Planner Update

Bill Nemser stated that there have been a number of construction-hour violations at Maynard Crossing/129 Parker Street. There have been questions about the enforcement process for those violations. He explained that Planning Board decisions are enforced by the Building Commissioner, who can impose fines of up to \$300 per day per violation instance. Any infraction that occurs outside of normal business hours for the Building Commissioner will be documented by the police and presented to the Building Commissioner for enforcement. There was a violation that occurred on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day and there was a fine imposed. The Building Commissioner is currently researching other options available for enforcement through the Building Code. Bill Nemser stated that the Building Commissioner does have the authority to suspend the project if the developer is not in compliance with the agreements of the permit(s) as issued by the Planning Board.

Bill Cranshaw suggested that if the developer is aware of a violation, receives a fine, and yet continues to operate in violation, their permit should be revoked. Chris Arsenault agreed. Wayne Amico recommended that the Board have the Building Commissioner attend a meeting to understand the Board's position on the process.

Trish Saunders of Dettling Road pointed out that the MLK Day violation was the third documented violation on a federal holiday. She stated that there have also been instances of construction occurring in the evening hours as well.

Greg Tuzzolo asked if violations can be a consideration in future modification decisions. Bill Nemser stated that it can be.

Chris Arsenault suggested that the Board asks the developer to come before the Board to discuss the violations and the process moving forward. Bill Nemser agreed to invite the developer and the Building Commissioner to the next Board meeting.

Bill Nemser stated that he will be drafting a letter for the Board's review related to DPW's analysis of the water capacity in Maynard and how it impacts the decisions of the Planning Board moving forward. Justin DeMarco would use the letter in his discussions with the Board of Selectmen.

There will be a review of the Master Plan status on March 10, 2010 at 6:30.

Wayne Amico stated that he has informed the applicant of the coffee shop multiple times that they are required to meet with DPW to discuss the water and sewer needs for the project and they have yet to do that. The Board agreed that they can close the hearing if the applicant comes unprepared with the requirements for the hearing.

Greg Tuzzolo made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Chris Arsenault.

The Board voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Adjourned at 9:50 p.m.