

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Mr. Robert Cantoreggi, Chair.

Members present: Robert Cantoreggi, Chair
George Yered, Clerk
James McKay
Richard Nichols
Nicole Riley
Carlo Molinari, Associate

Melissa Recos, BETA Group

Members Absent:

Also present: Scott Fuzy, 15 Stony Brook Dr.
Wayne Klocko, Permanent Building Comm. Chair
Kerri Barrett, 34-36 Exchange St.
Daniel Merrikin, Merrikin Engineering
Scott Miccile, Toll Brothers, 134 Flanders Rd., Westboro
Atty. Edward Cannon, Doherty, Ciechanowski, Dugan & Cannon
Erin Fredette, McMahon Associates
Austin Turner, Bohler Engineering
Shawn Nuckolls, Toll Brothers
Robert Hubbell, Orchard Street

**NEW POLICE STATION SPECIAL PERMIT
AS-BUILT PLAN APPROVAL REQUEST
PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE**

Mr. Wayne Klocko presented the as-built plan for the new police station at 1003 Main Street. The Planning Board reviewed the plan.

On a motion made by Mr. Cantoreggi, seconded by Ms. Riley, it was voted unanimously (6-0) to approve and accept the plan entitled, "Site As-Built, 1003 Main Street, Millis, Massachusetts," dated July 29, 2016, last revised October 26, 2016, prepared by Guerriere & Halnon, Inc., 55 West Central Street, Franklin, MA, and stamped by Robert E. Constantine, II.

The Board expressed their appreciation to Mr. Klocko for the wonderful work done by the Permanent Building Committee.

**SPECIAL PER. APP. WITH SITE PLAN APPROVAL, PUBLIC HEAR., CONT.
MCEOD – 34-36 EXCHANGE ST.
DANIEL MERRIKIN, MERRIKIN ENGINEERING**

The public hearing was opened at 7:59 p.m. with notice being read by Mr. Yered, Clerk.

The proposed project is to construct a second story to the existing building to provide five new two-bedroom apartments. Mr. Merrikin presented the revised plans with the latest

revision date of October 27, 2016. Mr. Merrikin summarized the substantive issues. It is proposed to eliminate the driveway entrance on the north side and widen the other entrance. According to Mr. Merrikin, the Fire Chief preferred what was proposed for the driveway and “was good with it.” This change allows for thirty-two parking spaces on-site and street parking in front subject to DPW approval. Mr. Merrikin stated that there would then be forty-nine on-site parking spots total for both 32-34 Exchange Street and 34-36 Exchange Street. According to Mr. Merrikin, “we think there is adequate parking.”

Mr. Merrikin provided information on the 2016 and 2009 Variances granted by the Zoning board of Appeals for the site. He stated that the variances for parking “should still stand” as they “run with the land and pertain to existing parking facilities.”

Another issue was regarding improvements to the stormwater management. The applicant proposes installation of a French Drain. There is a swale on the next-door property and the applicant “can do an amendment for privately maintained Stormwater Management.” He said they are working to model it after Centennial Place to “integrate the aesthetics.” Mr. Merrikin stated that notes have been added to the plan and they have “marked off” fire lanes and signage has been proposed. A short section of fencing has been added.

Ms. Recos of BETA Group, the Board’s consulting engineer, stated that she met with Mr. Merrikin and he was able to address many concerns raised in the review letter, dated August 22, 2016. She summarized her review letter dated October 31, 2016. She stated that BETA will defer to the Board regarding the six criteria for the Board to consider when making their decision (page 8 of BETA’s letter, attached).

Open Space was discussed. Mr. Merrikin said that the applicant is “not looking for a density bonus.” According to Mr. Merrikin, the applicant is amenable to park benches, a couple of trees, etc.

There are no detailed construction drawings at this time, Mr. Merrikin stated. No operating hour restrictions have been proposed for the commercial uses. The dumpster pickup can be during business hours if the Board wishes to make such a notation in the decision, he said. Parking locations can be marked by signage on the fence, he said, and they can look into possible curb stones as well. Mr. Merrikin said that no pole mounted lighting is proposed; only lighting on the buildings.

There were no further questions or comments.

On a motion made by Mr. Cantoreggi, seconded by Mr. McKay, it was voted unanimously (6-0) at 8:00 p.m. to close the public hearing. Deliberation and vote will be scheduled on the December 6, 2016 agenda.

SPECIAL PERMIT MODIFICATION, PUBLIC HEARING, CONT., SENIOR RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (SRCDD) GLEN ELLEN COUNTRY CLUB - 84 ORCHARD STREET TOLL BROTHERS

The public hearing continuation was opened at 8:01 p.m. with notice being read by Mr. Yered, Clerk.

Atty. Cannon summarized the main issues raised during the last hearing on October 11, 2016. A response letter from Bohler Engineering, dated November 1, 2016, was submitted to the Board for review.

Atty. Cannon requested that the Board consider extending the lapse period of the Special Permit should the modification be approved. He requested that “the Board include in its decision that the date on which the Special Permit will lapse, both as originally granted and as modified, shall be January 1, 2020.” He said that this is due to the extensive permitting process; Definitive Plan stage, Zoning, Conservation Commission. The extension would allow time for this permitting to be done, he said.

Mr. Cantoreggi referenced an email from Ilana Quirk, Town Counsel, dated October 31, 2016. According to the email, the Board can only extend the date up to an additional two years from the date of any new special permit decision. In Atty. Quirk’s opinion, “if a new special permit were granted during November 2016, a new expiration deadline could be granted that would increase the expiration deadline from January 6, 2018 to November 2018.” Atty. Cannon stated that he believed the Board has the discretion to extend the date “if good cause is shown” to do so. He will follow up with Town Counsel on this issue.

Ms. Erin Fredette of McMahon Associates discussed the traffic study. She stated that she had discussion with Mr. Greg Lucas of BETA Group, the Board’s consulting engineers. She stated that two items were covered in more detail: Trip Generation and Traffic Volume Data. A letter from Mr. Lucas, dated October 31, 2016 was reviewed. Ms. Fredette said that the study was consistent with industry standards and there is an “associated reduction in traffic” due, in part, to the decrease in the number of units. “ITE versus Local Data comparisons would both result in a decrease of traffic,” she said. Locations where data was collected was discussed. “Holliston was not looked at,” Ms. Fredette stated. Traffic during construction was discussed. Ms. Recos stated that she had discussions with Mr. Lucas regarding the traffic and that traffic from construction workers would not be more than the “full build-out.” She said that standard conditions are in place and included in the decision to alleviate construction concerns. Mr. Nuckolls stated that “construction staging will always be on the site.” Ms. Riley stated that, in her opinion, it is “not appropriate to try varying analysis for the traffic study,” as in all fairness to the applicant, it is “a **modification** to the existing Special Permit” and the traffic analysis has already been done and reviewed sufficiently.

Mr. Austin Turner of Bohler Engineering discussed the “general landscaping features” on the plans. He said that more detail would be provided in the Definitive Plan stage of development. He summarized the “Landscape Plan Summary” comments on Bohler’s letter, dated November 1, 2016. The modified development proposal, he said, is less dense and “as a whole, more contiguous Open Space” is available. Mr. Turner stated that they would be having “a lot of conversations with the gas company” regarding the easement running through the property. Ms. Recos suggested that the applicant provide “Phasing Plans” for the three phases of construction.

Mr. Turner stated that the public trail amenity would propose a gravel parking area for approximately 10-20 vehicles. This parking area would be “outside the development; on the perimeter.” The existing cart paths will be used, he said. According to Mr. Turner, the Condominium Association will be responsible for maintaining the open space of the former golf course so it does not become overgrown.

Mr. McKay noted that the application proposes a “looping system” for water where the prior application did not. Mr. Cantoreggi asked if the applicant had given any thought to Town sewer. Mr. Nuckolls of Toll Brothers stated that they would be willing to discuss this issue with the Town.

Mr. Robert Hubbell of Orchard Street expressed some concerns and stated that, in his opinion, the modification application is “not consistent with the Special Permit that was issued.” Keeping the 9-hole golf course “is a major point and is mentioned in the first paragraph” of the original decision, he stated. It “changes the neighborhood setting.”

Mr. Cantoreggi stated that an unsigned letter, addressed to him, was received and appeared to contain a “press release” of some sort. Nothing was dated or signed, however, to validate the information, he said. Atty. Cannon stated that he spoke to Atty. John Mostyn who represented the prior applicant. “It appeared to be an early stage press release as the project took shape,” he said. The project evolved over time and “the intent was if it was going to be a course, it would be private.” No such document was received as part of the record for the initial application. Mr. McKay stated that he was involved in the early meetings with the previous Town Administrator when the project was being discussed; before any permitting process began. No such document was submitted during the Planning Board’s public hearing process, he said. Ms. Riley stated that the golf course being public or private is “not relevant” and what the Board needs to determine is whether the “prior Special Permit required or only allowed the golf course.” Mr. Nichols stated that whether it is a golf course or not, it is still Open Space; however it is “too much of a change in my mind.” Mr. Nuckolls stated that in their opinion, the golf course was “allowed and not required.”

There was no further discussion.

On a motion made by Mr. McKay, seconded by Ms. Riley, it was voted unanimously (6-0) at 9:04 p.m. to close the public hearing. Deliberation and vote will be scheduled on the December 6, 2016 agenda.

OTHER BUSINESS:

MINUTES

On a motion made by Mr. McKay, seconded by Ms. Riley, it was unanimously voted to approve the regular session minutes from October 11, 2016, as written.

On a motion made by Mr. McKay, seconded by Mr. Nichols, it was unanimously voted to approve the executive session minutes from October 11, 2016, as written.

ADJOURN

There being no further discussion and on a motion made by Mr. Cantoreggi, seconded by Ms. Riley and voted unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Scheduled Planning Board Meetings: December 6, 2016
January 10, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

Camille Standley
Administrative Assistant