



RECEIVED
NORTON TOWN CLERK
2023 APR 19 AM 8:38

NORTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF August 30, 2022

The Planning Board Meeting of August 30, 2022 was called to order at the Norton Public Library via Hybrid means over ZOOM at 7:15 p.m. by Mr. Timothy Griffin, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Allen Bouley, Mrs. Laura Parker, Mr. Bill Marr, Mr. Eric Norris, and Mr. Wayne Graf. Also, in attendance was Administrative Assistant Bryan Carmichael.

Mr. Griffin explains how hybrid meetings work and how they will affect this meeting. Zoom is down at this meeting and no one can enter the meeting space over Zoom.

General Business

Mr. Griffin states he had contacted the Town's IT coordinator about the Zoom problem from the last meeting and they said the meetings should be fine now. Mr. Griffin states that he will talk with them again as the Zoom room is still not allowing access.

Bills & Warrants – The reimbursements approved from the last meeting and the Verizon bill are submitted to the Planning Board.

ANR ENDORSEMENT-(16192) 394 Old Colony Road Applicant/Owner: Ronald Haskell

Mr. Tyler LaFreniere from Risser Engineering is here to represent the owner Mr. Haskell. The purpose of the plan is to combine the lots on Decal Drive into 394 Old Colony Road and remove the paper street Decal Drive. This would lead to more projects on the property that are currently not possible with the current lot lines.

Mr. Griffin asks if that is because the lot is multi-zoned. Mr. LaFreniere states it is because the setbacks off of lot lines. Mr. Griffin states that the lot is zoned Industrial and Commercial. Mr. Griffin asks what is Mr. LaFreniere looking to do with the delineation. Mr. LaFreniere states that the delineation does not need to change as that will not affect the project. Mr. Griffin asks if the zones would remain and the lots would be split. Mr. LaFreniere states that is correct.

Mrs. Parker states that the site looks like an existing subdivision and asks when the subdivision was done. Mr. LaFreniere states it was done 30 to 40 years ago. Mrs. Parker asks if it was after 1955. Mr. LaFreniere states that it is after 1955. Mrs. Parker asks if Mr. LaFreniere is removing Decal Drive. Mr. LaFreniere states that is correct. Mrs. Parker asks for the Board to open to page 31 & 32 of the ANR handbook which talks about approving ANR lots with subdivision ways. If the approved way was not built and there was no performance guarantee in place and the

applicant does not look like they are entitled to an ANR endorsement and that they would need to go for a special permit. Mr. Griffin asks if it is to remove the paper street. Mrs. Parker states she believes it is. Mrs. Parker asks if Decal Drive was approved by the Town. Mr. LaFreniere states he believes it was. Mrs. Parker states she is interpreting the handbook as it is not allowing for ANR endorsement. Mr. Griffin asks which law Mrs. Parker is looking at. Mrs. Parker states it is in the ANR handbook under the Mass General Law Chapter 41 Subsection 81U and 81W. Mrs. Parker states there seems to be some instances of precedence to this in the ANR handbook and is unsure if this is being interpreted correctly. Mrs. Parker states that they are modifying an existing subdivision and if there is any change to the number, size of the lots on a previously approved subdivision. Mr. Griffin states that it is under the assumption that the project was a subdivision when filed. Mrs. Parker states that is the reason why she asked if it was a subdivision and if done after 1955 then it would've been under the subdivision control law.

Mr. Griffin asks Mr. Carmichael if this was discussed during the department meeting when discussing the project on whether this being a subdivision would impact the ANR. Mr. Carmichael states that the discussion with the Conservation and Building Commissioners didn't bring this up and recommended to the applicant that they start with an ANR before going forward with the rest of their application. Mr. Griffin asks Mrs. Parker if she is reading the General Law as they are not entitled to an ANR not that the Planning Board could not grant one. Mrs. Parker reads that the court decided that a plan is not entitled to an ANR endorsement unless the previous approved subdivision way that is shown on the ANR plan has been built or there is a performance guarantee assuring that the way will be built. Mr. Griffin states it sounds fairly definitive. Mrs. Parker agrees.

Mr. Griffin asks to confirm when the application came in. Mr. Carmichael states it was the 23rd of August. Mr. Griffin asks if there are objections to continuing the ANR to the next meeting and got the opinion of Town Counsel. Mr. LaFreniere states that it is okay with him.

Mrs. Parker states that there are a few other questions she has that may not be answered this meeting. Mrs. Parker states that there is an open special permit on the property for the property and doesn't know how that is addressed. Mr. Griffin states that the property is one of the lots that is being combined into. Mrs. Parker states that the building and the lots being combined have a different owner and asks how that will be addressed, if a letter of intent is needed. Mr. Griffin states that the two properties are differently listed and if the applicant owns or has interest in all the lots. Mr. LaFreniere states that the owner Mr. Ron Haskell is the only member of the Norton Rams LLC. Mr. Griffin states that the contents of the existing special permit that is in process wouldn't necessarily change it would just change the delineation of the lot and the size of the description of the lot. Mrs. Parker states that there was parking that seems to have been assigned to them that may be coming from other areas. Mr. Griffin states he doesn't think it was coming from other areas it was going all over the building, contained on the one lot. They met all the requirements and they had worked with the other tenants which was discussed during the special permit process. Mr. Griffin states he doesn't see that impacting the special permit other than making it difficult to pull the files for later use. Mrs. Parker asks if it means there is nothing stopping the special permit from moving forward. Mr. Griffin states that the corollary would be if someone in Norton decided to rename a road all the process in planning was in play then that is the similar kind of description change to a lot. Mrs. Parker states if they are getting rid of

Decal Drive then the whole lot would become 394 Old Colony Road. Mr. LaFreniere states it would. Mr. Griffin states that the size of the lot or parcel ID number would change. Mrs. Parker asks if this would prevent the applicant from moving forward with their project. Mr. Griffin states he wouldn't think it would affect it. Mr. Griffin states that they will contact Town Counsel on the questions Mrs. Parker is asking and asks Mrs. Parker to send the questions over to Mr. Carmichael. Mr. Griffin asks if the Board is okay with continuing the ANR to the next meeting, September 20th.

Mr. Bouley motions to continue the ANR to September 20, 2022 and is seconded by Mr. Norris. The Planning Board Vote All in Favor of the continuance.

Public Hearing

SP 13540 & 13479: 196 Mansfield Avenue. Request to reimburse the remaining balance from the peer review.

There is no one present to speak on it and the Planning Board doesn't make a motion on it.

SP 12737: 280 South Washington Street. Owner ESA P Properties LLC. Applicant Carroll Advertising LLC. Application for a Special Permit for the construction of a 75' foot tall by 48' feet wide digital billboard. Continued from March 22, 2022, April 5, 2022, May 24, 2022, June 21, 2022, and July 26, 2022. Applicant is seeking a continuance to October 25, 2022.

Mr. Griffin asks Mr. Carmichael when next they will be able to presleptent or come to an agreement. Mr. Carmichael states they have said they will be getting to an agreement soon. Mr. Griffin states that he would like to have them come before the Planning Board soon so it can be discussed how the Board would like to proceed or if they would like to withdraw.

Mr. Bouley motions to continue the Public Hearing to October 25, 2022 and is seconded by Mrs. Parker. The Planning Board Vote in Favor of continuing the Public Hearing.

DEF 13932 & SP 14704: 0, 126, 128 & 154 Pine Street and 0 Wood Road. Owner/Applicant: Norton Land Company, LLC. Application for the creation of 44 lots into a residential cluster subdivision. Continued from May 10, 2022, May 24, 2022, June 21, 2022, June 28, 2022, and July 26, 2022. Applicant is seeking a continuance to September 20, 2022.

Mr. Bouley motions to continue the application to September 20, 2022 and is seconded by Mrs. Parker. The Planning Board Vote All in Favor of continuing the application to September 20, 2022.

SPR 15808: 0 Hill Street. Applicant: Kessler Machine and Fabricating. Owner: Norton Development Inc. Application for a 9,900 square foot machine and fabricating building. Continued from August 16, 2022.

Mr. Michael Dryden, the senior project manager with Allen Engineering is present to speak on the application as a representative of the applicant Mr. Joe Kessler of Kessler Machine and Fabricating. The initial filed plans dated July 11th is slightly different from the plans that will be shown. The Conservation Commission had let Mr. Dryden know that there was a portion of the stormwater management that needed to be moved outside the vernal pool buffer zone to a ground pool. They took the same program and made a slight modification to it; the plans were sent to the Planning Board. If needed Mr. Dryden will compare the plans from the older plans to the most recent if needed. Mr. Griffin asks Mr. Dryden to point out the difference when it shows up in the updated plans. Mr. Dryden states that he will.

Mr. Dryden shows that the map is at the scale of 1-inch equals 30 feet and the site is 0 Hill Street, it is known on the ANR subdivision as lot 3B which was part of a larger lot to the north. The lot is not reflected as separate yet on the Assessor's map. The site is a 3.7-acre portion of the lot that was a part of the ANR. The lot is located entirely within the Industrial district. To the east of the site is the Commerce Park and the closest use is the Ryder Rental Company, to the North is vacant wooded land and further north is the solar field. To the south there is little Industrial use but includes the wastewater treatment plant and to the west is residentially zoned property. There are some residential dwellings along Hill Street with the nearest homes at the end of the project site with vacant wooded land directly across from the project. There are wetland resource areas on the site which is in front of the Conservation Commission. There is isolated land subject to flooding, there is vegetated wetland, bordering vegetative wetland, and vernal pools on site. They'll be able to nestle the project in between all those environmental constraints. The stormwater system is also being peer reviewed through the Conservation Commission. The layout materials plan is straightforward, its overall disturbance is about one acre which means a little more than a quarter of the site is being developed with the rest of the site remaining wooded. The development project is just under 10,000 square feet to avoid the special permit process of 10,000 square feet or greater. This project is proposed in phases the initial phase is 7,400 square feet and the second phase is 2,500 square feet. Phase two may never be built but the applicant wants to make sure that is captured and covered in the programming documents as they have the ability to build up to 10,000 square feet. Mr. Griffin states he is not the first to build a building at 9,900 square feet. Mr. Dryden states that the access to the property is two curb cuts. There are thirteen parking spaces being proposed and required for this use around the building. What is being proposed is eleven spaces along the front which are associated with phase one and then phase two will have two more spaces in the back. Utilities are water which is readily available to the site, power is readily available, and while a municipal sewer connection is not available being proposed is an on-site sewage disposal plan. It is a small system that uses a very low intensity use in terms of super generation. There has been a comprehensive soil testing program not only for DEP Stormwater management requirements but for the sewage disposal system and have gotten favorable results for soil conditions with sands and gravel on the site which is conducive to on-site sewage disposal. What is trying to be done is minimize the amount of impact on the site as they are under an acre of impact which avoids the stormwater impact study and avoids the NPDES process in stormwater pollution prevention plan to keep this project compact and the impacts as minimum as possible. The tree line is close to the development and in between the two curb cuts they are maintaining a significant wooden buffer there and is thickly vegetated in most areas and they are trying to screen the building by maintaining that vegetative buffer. The project is designed in accordance with applicable

standards of Mass DEP. On the original plan there is an open detention basin being proposed as well as a subsurface detention and infiltration system. Upon submittal of the plan, they received an early notification from the Conservation Commission which helped in getting the plan getting updated. The basin was within the 100 foot no build zone of a vernal pool which was not allowed under storm water management standard three. The new plan has two subsurface basins which will shift everything slightly take the open basin and put it underground and reduce the program. A little bit of the impervious area was removed from the project as well. That allowed all the stormwater BMPs a minimum of 100 feet from the certified vernal pool and still meet the standards for peak flow mitigation. Mr. Dryden states that the distance from the vernal pool is the only change, the building footprint, the circulation, the curb cuts, the amount of parking spaces remain the same.

Mr. Bouley asks if the application has been seen by the Fire Department. Mr. Dryden states that he doesn't think the fire department commented on the online permit unless it happened recently. Mr. Bouley states that Mr. Dryden will probably have to contact the Fire Department and adds that he can put turning templates on the site. Mr. Bouley states the turn looks tight and that it would be good to confirm with the Fire Department. Mr. Griffin asks Mr. Carmichael to email the Fire Department to know their opinion on the project. Mr. Bouley asks if an Operations and Maintenance plan was included. Mr. Dryden states it was included in the stormwater management calculations and that has been reviewed by the peer review consultant. Mr. Bouley asks if there is a landscaping plan beyond the tree planting in the front of the property. Mr. Dryden states he did include landscaping in the event the applicant was inclined to plant additional trees but the goal was to minimize clearing and maintain that buffer in the front. Mr. Bouley states the buffer is going to be a talking point and adds that he didn't see any additional notes the limit of the tree cutting and the dimensions. Mr. Dryden states he can add dimensions in the notes. Mr. Bouley states that if there is any room on the entry or exit way on either side or if Mr. Dryden would like to do a separate page for a landscaping plan. Mr. Dryden states that they will keep existing vegetation. Mr. Bouley asks if there will be any description or cut sheet on the signs. Mr. Dryden states that there are no proposed signs on the property. Mr. Griffin points out the note on the plan about a sign. Mr. Dryden explains that that is an existing sign and restates that there are no proposed signs on the plan. Mr. Bouley asks if all the lighting is going to be all off the building. Mr. Dryden states that the lights are all wall packs and the specs are provided on the layout materials plan page four of six of the plan set. The lights will be 14-foot mounting height full cut off and the applicant is trying to reduce the amount of light as they know residential areas are nearby. All lighting will be mounted on the building no separate light poles.

Mr. Marr states he understands the building is being shifted over to the south because of the vernal pool buffer zone for construction. Mr. Marr states on the non-updated plans that to the south side of the pavement is abutting the 100-foot buffer of the vernal pool. Mr. Marr asks how much of the pavement will be left to get to all the bay doors around the building as the buffer is hit on the back and the north and what is the size of the vehicles that will be on the property. Mr. Dryden states the design is with two curb cuts into the front and they will use the forklifts to bring material in so there will be no formal loading into the back if they need to move smaller product via pickup trucks. There is 24 feet of pavement clear from the back of the building. Mr. Marr states that when the building is moved towards the south the pavement was already

abutting the buffer zone on the south side of, the building. Mr. Griffin asks if Mr. Marr is talking about the top right corner on the map. Mr. Marr confirms that it is and asks if there is enough room to go around without going into the 100-foot buffer zone into the vernal pools. Mr. Dryden states that the shift was made because stormwater practices can't be within 100 feet but work can be done within 100 feet. There are no stormwater BMPs on the site which was the purpose of the shift. There is nothing that precludes the applicant from doing work in the 100-foot buffer and it would just impact having to do storm water management. Mr. Marr states it is something that the Conservation Commission would look into. Mr. Griffin states that you can't have Stormwater Management near water resources. Mr. Dryden states that you cannot have a stormwater BMP including a discharge point from a subsurface detention infiltration system within 100-feet.

Mr. Griffin asks why does the applicant want to be in Norton. Mr. Dryden states the applicant wants to set up at the site because of its location, the proximity to Interstate 495, and had looked at several other properties before choosing Norton. Other reasons for choosing the property were that it was zoned industrial and it was a by right use that wouldn't require a special permit. It does have some environmental constraints to deal with the Conservation Commission and comply with all the local requirements as well. Mr. Griffin states that the proximity to residential from the industrial zone and asks if the applicant has asked for any indication to the hours of operation for the business and if the applicant would be open to specific hours of construction. Mr. Dryden states the hours of construction is a reasonable request however doesn't know the hours of operation and will ask his client. Mr. Griffin asks if there are thirteen parking spots required and planned for the whole plan. Mr. Dryden states that the whole project would need the thirteen spots but with just phase one it will be eleven so there will be less disturbance if there will be a phase two to meet the required parking spaces.

Abutters are recognized. Mr. James Carter, of Norwood the owner of 0 Hill Street which is across from the proposed development. Mr. Carter states he owns 6.2 acres including a pond with houses surrounding the property. Mr. Carter states he plans on putting more homes in the area and is worried about the traffic, lighting, noise, which all might be disturbing to residents with trucks coming and going on the property. Mr. Carter states he surveyed the residents on Hill Street as to the types of concerns they have such as the narrowness of Hill Street and the safety of pedestrians who want to walk Hill Street. Limitations on the road because it is narrow include not being able to have sidewalks, no lighting to increase visibility, and no drainage system. Mr. Carter states that the Norton Industrial Park should be utilized and the property should be trying to get an entrance from Commerce Way and get an agreement from the Ryder Truck company and extend the parking lot area to reach 0 Hill Street. Having them go through Commerce Way wouldn't alter the utilities on Hill Street. The lights will shine into the houses of the neighbors. Mr. Carter states he feels like this is not conducive to the residential / industrial use area. Mr. Carter had gotten five petitions of twelve signatures signed from residents of Crane Street and Pine Street and sent them over to the Town Manager. Another concern is the distance between the two openings of the property and the buffer zone of the Industrial and Residential properties as when he purchased the property, he thought it was 200 feet and since then it has been reduced to 30 feet. Mr. Carter states that the applicant has at minimum 30 feet of steel, six by six plates of steel that will be cut up and will fabricate different projects. The current project is large and Mr. Carter states he doesn't feel it fits in the neighborhood.

Mr. Richard Conley of 61 Hill Street asks if the trucks are going to be left on the property idle overnight. Mr. Conley states that the streets aren't wide enough for the trucks being proposed and that they would have to use both lanes to make it down the street. Mr. Griffin states that a standard condition is the hours of operation. Mr. Conley asks if the materials will be stored inside. Mr. Griffin states that one of the site conditions is to not allow outdoor storage. Mr. Conley asks where they will store chemicals and dispose of them. Mr. Griffin states dumping is prohibited in the area. Mr. Conley asks if there is a leak and is there an area of protection from potentially run-offs into vernal pools. Mr. Griffin states he will ask the applicant as they do not have the documentation on spill control and their procedures for them. Mr. Conley asks if a traffic study will be done. Mr. Griffin states he doesn't believe a traffic study is required for the scope of the project being shown. Mr. Griffin states that if they are looking to add 11 parking spaces, an empty space, and two potential parking spaces then it will generate 11 trips at 8:30 in the morning and 11 trips at 5 in the afternoon. Mr. Conley asks if there will be a semi-truck at night. Mr. Griffin restates that he will ask the applicant what the hours of operation will be. Mr. Conley asks how much room is there between the parking spaces and the building. Mr. Griffin states that there is 30 feet between the parking spaces and the building. Mr. Conley states that he doesn't think a commercial business should be there as it doesn't fit the neighborhood and the traffic going down the street is fast. Mr. Griffin states that the property is zoned industrial. Mr. Conley agrees it is a good spot for an industrial building and asks if they move the building over will they have to re-perk the site with new test pits. Mr. Griffin states that they are in the Stormwater report which is being peer reviewed. Mr. Conley states that the Conservation Commission waived the Stormwater report and the Species study on the property.

Mr. Griffin asks Mr. Dryden if there are any notes on how they will handle disposing chemicals on the property and ask to have Mr. Dryden clarify about the Stormwater report. Mr. Dryden states that the site is sand and gravels and that was its own testing program and then moved the BMPs so they were just outside the testing so because of the sand and gravel there are no expectations for any type of change and there is no waiver being asked to the Conservation Commission about Stormwater only to defer it to construction so that there won't have to mobilize equipment twice and because of the soils there will not be any change to the groundwater levels. It isn't being waived it is being asked to be done in confirmatory testing prior to construction. There will be nothing stored outside of the building and the entire operation will be conducted inside the building including fabrication and assembly. The materials and chemicals will have to be handled and disposed of in full compliance with all applicable regulations with nothing dumped on the site. The Conservation Commission had asked the same question and are concerned about the resource areas and the same answer was given to them as the Planning Board.

Ms. Acquinetta Woods of 55 Hill Street states she has lived at her property for almost thirty years and states that what is being put there does not belong. Ms. Woods states she has difficulty getting out of her driveway because of the amount of traffic and states that there are trucks that go down the street and take up the whole street. Ms. Woods states that a one time there were supposed to be signs stating no trucks entering Hill Street and feels that having this business would add to the trucks that would be going down Hill Street.

Mrs. Amy Conley of 61 Hill Street states she agrees with the other residents and states she has only lived there for a short time and is shocked at the amount of traffic that goes down Hill Street. Hill Street is a narrow-wooded street and is surprised to know that some heavy trucks do go down and will have to drive slowly to avoid some of the sharp corners. There are a few bicyclists that use the road to go to the back of the walking path and people walking to look at the wildlife. Mrs. Conley states that her house was built in 1790 and that the zone had been existing as residential for all of that time. Mrs. Conley states that while she understands the zone is industrial, she feels that a structure across from residential property isn't appropriate. Mrs. Conley states that the noise pollution would surround the neighborhood and that even if the applicant will meet the Conservation Commission's standards for approval, it still doesn't mean that some of the environment is being destroyed around the area. Mrs. Conley pulls out the Master Plan and states that one of the goals is to preserve existing open spaces and acquire new open space to permanently protect them and improve open spaces including the Norton Reservoir, the bike path, as well as the aquifers and water resources from harmful pollution and developments. Mrs. Conley states she understands that the Conservation Commission has their piece and even if the applicant is meeting all the requirements, it doesn't mean they aren't destroying the environment right across from where she is. Mrs. Conley states that the Conservation Commission waived the Wildlife impact survey and that a commercial business would destroy the wildlife when it comes in.

Mr. Bob Geldard of 51 Hill Street lived at the property for 25 years back when Hill Street was a dirt road. Since then, traffic has increased. Trucks have to take up large portions of the road and cars facing them have to pull off to let them through and you can see where trucks tires have gone. The trucks are damaging the roads. For the 30-foot area in the front how can a semi-truck get in and out, will it be a one-way driveway and if it is which side is the entry way. As it could impact the amount of traffic going through Hill Street as most of the traffic down Hill Street is from the Industrial Park. Despite trucks being told not to go down Hill Street they have been doing so. For Conservation reasons there are multiple vernal pools out on the property and a cranberry bog out on the property. With how much of wetlands on the property, the possibility of flooding is something Mr. Geldard is worried about. How will a septic system go in even if it is a soil made of sand and gravel. If there was a storm there is a water shutoff across the street from the proposed site that forms a large puddle that is constantly there. Noise pollution is being made with the police shooting range which scares Mr. Geldard's dog and is concerned that his dog will be more frightened by the noise this development will bring.

Mr. Griffin asks Mr. Dryden about truck turning radius and lighting. For truck turning, the plan is to have the trucks pull in parallel to the building and pull out the opposite way. Mr. Dryden states that trucks can function either way and can put turning templates on the plans which should be an easy addition. Mr. Griffin asks if the lights in the plan are intended to keep light pollution down. Mr. Dryden states that is correct and that on sheet 3 there is a lighting specification that are 14 feet tall mounted LED lights designed to cast light on the immediate pavement close to the building to avoid shining light onto the neighbor's property. Mr. Griffin asks to confirm that the lights will only be on the building. Mr. Dryden states that is true and that they are just over the doors. Mr. Griffin asks if there is any light in the front parking area. Mr. Dryden states that there isn't but typically there would be lights at the driveways for safety purposes but they are not on the plan.

Mr. Marr states that the proposed buffer strip tree line in the front the goal is to leave the native trees there in place to create a buffer and asks since abutters were bringing up light pollution are the existing tree deciduous and lose their leaves during the winter months. Mr. Dryden states that it is mostly deciduous. Mr. Marr states that for half a year there will be no tree buffer other than the trunks. Mr. Dryden states that there will be some but sees Mr. Marr's point. Mr. Dryden states he understands the concerns of the neighbors' residential dwellings and Mr. Dryden and his client want to work toward a design that is low impact, only impacting one acre of a four-acre lot and the rest will remain as wooded property. There are two curb cuts and Mr. Dryden states he will screen the building to the best of his ability and the rest of the site will remain undeveloped. Mr. Dryden states he will also get confirmed hours of operation from his client for the next meeting.

Mr. Bouley states he would like to know how often the applicant gets deliveries prior to the next meeting. Mr. Dryden states that is fine. Mr. Griffin states that Mr. Dryden is going to the Conservation Commission, and asks in terms of timing when is the best time to continue to and have the information asked for. Mr. Griffin states that the next meeting would be the 20th of September and then September 27th. Mr. Dryden states he would prefer the September 20th meeting and Mr. Dryden states they are meeting the Conservation Commission on the 12th of September.

Mr. Carter states that in regards to the egress entrance would it be possible to talk to FEMA to get an inspection done to see if it can go through Commerce Way so people won't have to go down Hill Street. Mr. Carter states that when the state took over the property there was a 200-foot distance from residential properties and that there is a plan that shows the buffer all along Hill Street. Since the plan there have been solar panels which upset the tenants of the condo apartments as it devalued their apartments. Mr. Carter states it is unthinkable to have residential and industrial as close as it is and that the 200 feet buffer would help if it was still the buffer in use. Mr. Griffin states that the applicant had looked at other locations and chose Norton and that this is an as of right use on the property and the Applicant has made their choice as to what they want to do. Mr. Dryden states that they had looked at the possibility to extend the roadway from Commerce Way it already is a development with a cul-de-sac at the end of it which would have to be an extension through a private development which is not possible. To extend the cost of extending a roadway for a small program it's just cost prohibitive, it isn't possible with the types of premiums it can't be absorbed by a small project like this.

Motion to continue the public hearing to the September 20th meeting is made by Mr. Bouley and seconded by Mr. Norris. The Planning Board all vote in favor of continuing the hearing to September 20th.

SP 15966 & SPR 15640: 120 Mansfield Avenue. Owner: Town of Norton. Applicant: VHB Inc. Application for the construction of the Norton Senior Center.

Mr. Scott Lindgren a civil engineer for the Applicant VHB who was hired by the Town of Norton to help construct the Norton Senior Center. Also present is Mr. Michael Viveiros from DBVW Architects. There were going to be more people who worked on the project attending but

there is a problem with the Zoom call. Mr. Lindgren shows a PowerPoint presentation and starts it off by showing a rendering of the Senior Center on Mansfield Avenue. The property is located at 160 and 120 Mansfield Avenue, it is a seven-acre property that is abutting a residential neighborhood and on the other is a commercial property as well as bordering the Norton Reservoir. The property was an existing residential home which is still present on the site and did have an open garage and an outbuilding and it has three curb cuts along Mansfield Avenue that access the current residence with a loop driveway and a small outbuilding driveway to the left onto Reservoir currently has a wetlands bank and has an isolated wetlands associated with the property. It is not a vernal pool that designates as such located around the bank of the Norton Reservoir. That has a 25-foot buffer from the Norton Conservation Commission which is also labeled on the plan along with the 100 foot buffer zone to the wetlands. The Senior Center project was in front of the Conservation Commission the week before for a Notice of Intent and a Stormwater management and the Conservation elements involved and has had their meeting continued to September to answer some of the questions as well as go over the plan with the Planning Board to make sure there was a comprehensive plan for both boards. An aerial of present conditions was shown to show how the site looks like currently. The proposed conditions show the rendering from the first page and the parking lot design for the Senior Center. The proposed Senior Center would be at the same location as the house is currently. The Senior Center is just under 11900 square feet. There are two entrance ways located off of Mansfield Avenue. They're in proximity of the existing curb cut though there will be slight modifications to provide some spatial away from the commercially zoned and had a little bit in between the existing driveway to the garage and to the residence. Both of those are a two-way egress to the property and they supply access to the parking areas and into the loading areas. The senior center has noted on the plan has 59 parking spaces broken into three parts with 42, 13, and 4 spaced sections around the senior center. It will be a one-directional driveway to allow for a smoother flow around the facility but also to provide some one-way access to a convenience that the senior center is going to provide which has to do with their food bank and providing what they do now at the Town Hall at the Senior Center. This will be done with a drive-up delivery when someone needs some assistance in food that they'll be able to drive in off of Mansfield Avenue out and around the one way and out from the point where there is the food pantry. Among the 13 parking spaces there is a handicap accessible parking space located in the front of the building with six spaces and a few normal standard parking spaces. Then the 4 parking spaces to the right of the parking area which are envisioned as employee parking as they are adjacent to the loading area. Circulation around the front of the senior center where most of the activity is for drop-offs and pickups for the senior center. Also, if there are any van or activities that might utilize transport there is a center island and a circulation where there is a drop-off at the Senior Center to drop off and let them go back into the Senior Center parking area. Loading is associated with the Senior Center which is all focuses on the right side of the senior center where there is a loading area to allow for drop-off and pick up of goods, trash, and refuse. Trash and refuse have a dumpster in the back of the building. There may be some deliveries to the food pantry and the site has accommodated the need for a delivery truck for food delivery on the left side of the building. There will be some electric vehicle parking stations and, in the future, may add electric vehicle charging stations that are located in the front of the facility and one off to the road to the left. The next slide had a drawn rendering over the pre-existing map to show the buffer zones and the conditions of the property. There is not much activity in the back of the property other than creating storm water management within that area there is a small area of parking just to the top

of the 42-space parking lot that would be in the buffer zone. There will not be much clearing on the property with about 2.83 acres of work on the seven-acre lot with a few mature trees around the lawn area and the project limits are about 2.8 acres with a little impact to the trees top the upper right of the Senior Center in the construction of the storm water system and there will be trees removed in front of the house and in the rear but the majority of the tree line along the reservoir will remain intact. The property is zoned Village Commercial which is a by-right use in the zone but the Special Permit is for a drive through facility which is separate from the Senior Center and requires a Special Permit. There is also a parking variance being asked by the Zoning Board as the use doesn't have enough parking required with the 59 proposed spaces and are not clear with how many spaces are needed for the type of use. Public Assembly use has a requirement for one space per two people to house 328 people and some office space would require about 169 parking spaces. The number of trips per day and the activities are much less than the parking spaces that are provided in consultation with the town and the Permeant Building Committee to discuss how many spaces should be considered.

Mr. Griffin asks if the General Assembly parking is used mainly for houses of worship in packed seats. Mr. Lindgren states that is true and it is for meeting spaces as such the one currently is use as well and is determined by the amount of people that can come into the room which would be needed for a Town Meeting Space or a Council Chamber space and will probably have to talk about this again when the Town Hall has to be reviewed. The utilities are the next slide of the plan. Stormwater is still under review from the Conservation Commission to make sure they are complying to the State and local regulations for the property for an infiltration basin, rain garden systems, and a swale for pre-treatment. This would not only comply with all the standards of Stormwater Management regulations where they are providing greater than 80 treatment and also phosphorus removal requirements and they are also receiving more than three times the amount of water on an annual basis with this system. There has been a lot of soil testing with sands and gravels a lot of opportunity to recharge storm water into the aquifer and not have it mainly discharge over land to the water resources of the Norton Reservoir and the wetlands so it is a good way of filtering and cleaning that would give a good system of stormwater management. The next slide talks about the septic system. The Senior Center will be on septic as there is no public sewer on Mansfield Avenue. What is being proposed is a septic system leach field that is located in the rear of the senior center. The plans have been submitted to the Board of Health but have not had a hearing with them yet. This project will be looking to be in compliance with Title Five, the state code, and they have been coordinating with the Board of Health agent. The design needs to meet certain standards, this is a pressure dosing system to provide a quality of treatment of the septic affluent from the senior center. There is some septic tank and a grease chamber to control the wastewater to the system. Water services are provided directly off of Mansfield Avenue with a two-inch domestic service and a six-inch Fire Protection Service for the sprinkling for the Senior Center. There is an existing hydrant along Mansfield Avenue that is going to be relocated just adjacent to the new driveway and are proposing to put in a new hydrant close to the building to meet the requirements of the fire code and coordination with the fire department about having it within 100 feet of the fire department connection to the building. There will be an internal site hydrant. The electric, telephone, and gas services are all still coming from Mansfield Avenue to the service area which has the proposed transformer for the electrical service generator and also a gas meter. This is all to the right rear of the property away from the Senior Center facility. There had been a traffic study done for the senior center. There

were certain intersections that were done for the study. The analysis periods were looked at for the weekdays traffic counts during the peak hours in the morning and evening. The counts were done in May 2022. The crash history of Mansfield Avenue and the intersections crash rate averages. They will be going to apply for the curb cut permits from the MassDOT which will be done after the approval from the Norton Boards. The ITA trip generation was used for information for senior centers but there is no back data on this senior center. So, data was used from other senior centers to help come up with the Norton Senior Center trip generation and added 42 new trips during peak hours to determine the estimated trip generation for the new senior center. The traffic operations would operate at a D or better under the existing and build conditions. The construction is not projected to have a significant impact to the roadway system. The traffic study information will be reviewed by the Mass DOT. The front of the architecture is shown through a rendering. The front doorway is shown for the pickup/drop off site and there is a rain garden and some trees. The back elevation rendering shows the rear of the property as you're extending out to the rear where the septic system was with the lawn area with a patio with an entryway back into the senior center. Landscape improvements have been made strategically by the landscape engineer both on the residential area and the commercial area but to also add some native tree selections and some general tree placements are being provided at the exterior of the patio and the arrival for the seniors coming into the facility. The sight lines are good and the trees are ones that could be used for all seasons. Planters are placed around the Plaza area for pedestrian safety. This ends the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Griffin asks to talk about the traffic flow and asks why is the drive through loop going in the opposite direction so when drivers enter on the right side of the driveway they continue on the right side of the area and around and back out rather than crossing paths at the driveway. Mr. Lindgren states that it is not noted on the plans in terms of signage, stock control, and safety measures but it was discussed in length about drive-throughs and what the activity is about the nature of it and normal drive-throughs are usually on the driver's side. That is where the deposits were going and if it were to go counterclockwise it would be on the right side. Mr. Marr adds that the seniors who go for the food pantry pickups go on their own which is why they need to get access. Mr. Lindgren states that the opposite side you can notice the front entry as being a one-way counterclockwise and the reason for that is it is mainly for a drop-off and handicapped accessibility for vans and such which are normally on the passenger side so the driveway to the drop off in the front of the entryway is counterclockwise for that purpose. Mr. Griffin asks the distance from the roadway towards where the left-hand curve proceeds back into the parking area and how many cars could go in before they went into the street where the crossover point would be. Mr. Lindgren states that the point is about 110 feet from the building which is about 85 feet. Mr. Griffin asks if that would be six cars. Mr. Lindgren states it might be more than six depending on where they are going. Mr. Griffin asks if it would be two cars before they would be sticking out into Mansfield Avenue. Mr. Lindgren states that it would probably be five cars if they wanted to take a left turn through the drive through section. In terms of coming cars during the peak hours and how many people are leaving there is a secondary egress to the right side. There is the opportunity to see if traffic is stacking up and gives them the chance to go over to the other curb to leave the property. In general Mr. Lindgren thinks the circulation works for the volume that will be on the site and can have some measurements done for the intersection to show the amount of people. Mr. Griffin states he figured it had been evaluated but not had not thought for the driver's side door.

Mr. Griffin asks about the part of the property next to the commercial property where the four parking spaces are and if there is any intent to connect the parking to the adjacent lot and how does it look topographically between the two properties. Mr. Lindgren states that there is a grade that doesn't have a drop off so there is no wall and is not envisioned to connect. Currently now there is an existing fence that is there and the thought is the screen and fence approach as part of the project so there will be a barrier. Mr. Viveiros states that there is a retaining wall along the edge of the property. The only connection would be a pedestrian connection around that part of the driveway to allow seniors access other there. Mr. Lindgren states he will look to see if there is a potential grading problem but there will not be a connection.

Mr. Marr asks if this has been reviewed by the Fire Department yet. Mr. Marr explains the reason he asks is because he doesn't see how the current plan wouldn't require an access point from the back. Mr. Marr continues stating that if the Fire Department needs a means of egress, then all the parking spaces in the back could be eliminated so the trucks could circle around which might make even fewer parking spaces for the ZBA to consider. Mr. Lindgren states they have gone in front of the Fire Department and have reviewed the plan and have talked about the issue with them. Mr. Lindgren states that there can be some serviceable area in the back and have noted that the Fire Department could get to the patio if needed and are in discussion for what the final treatment will be. Mr. Marr states usually it is a wide road. Mr. Lindgren states that this is being talked with the Building Department and Fire Department on what is needed and knows that there will be another discussion on the topic in terms of access.

Mr. Bouley asks if they are going to use the sub service traction mats that would be planted in the grass. Mr. Lindgren states yes, that will be a part of the plan in the back or some other type of treatment under the soil that way an ambulance or fire truck can get up there without sinking into the mud. Mr. Viveiros states that they will work with the Fire Department to meet the requirements. Mr. Marr adds that there will be seniors with walkers where some parts of the center wouldn't be walkable and having more pavement would let them travel more places around the center. Mr. Lindgren states that they want to make sure that the regulations from the Fire Department are met and will merge the needs of the Fire Department and the senior center. Mr. Marr states he worked with senior centers and oversaw their expansion of assisted living and has experience in the wants of seniors which is why he asked.

Mrs. Parker states she would like to discuss the traffic study in relation to the food pantry and noticed the model for the senior center was South Hadley for the potential traffic study. Mrs. Parker asks how many parking spaces does South Hadley's Senior Center have. Mr. Lindgren states it is a question he may not be able to answer this meeting because the Traffic Engineer, Mr. Matt Keeley is not present. Mrs. Parker asks if the food pantry is run out of the senior center in South Hadley and has the Cupboard of Kindness been consulted in this configuration. The reason this is being asked is because Cupboard of Kindness has pick-ups twice a month. The number of people receiving assistance from the Cupboard of Kindness is going to exceed 42 and Mrs. Parker asks if the parking assessment is off if Cupboard of Kindness is going to keep the schedule. Mr. Lindgren states he will get back to the board with that question. Mr. Griffin states he doesn't know how many people would be picking up at once and if the information would be available to share or be shared with. Mr. Griffin states if there is a certain volume expected at a

certain time. Mr. Viveiros states that it should be fine as it is already at the Senior Center. Mrs. Parker states the Cupboard of Kindness is set up at the Town Hall. Mr. Viveiros states that the drive through is more for people picking up meals during the day. Mr. Lindgren states they also met with part of the food pantry group as part of the design. Mrs. Parker states that they may stagger the pickup so it is less taxing on the area and thinks it should be added to the traffic assessment as it is twice a month. Mr. Griffin states that the proposed use of the food pantry is currently at another location. Mr. Viveiros states the drive-up window is for more daily prepared meals not related to the Cupboard of Kindness as it isn't meant to be giving out large amounts of food and this service is more related to the Senior Center. Mrs. Parker states she is considered from what she heard from the Permanent Building Committee since they are tabling the kitchen facilities at this site. Mr. Viveiros states that there will be no table in the kitchen facilities and there are some components of the kitchen that they would like to have that they are trying to find a way for them to get. The concerns have to do more with the capacity and size but there will be a functioning kitchen. Mrs. Parker asks to confirm that the drive through window will not be doing the Cupboard of Kindness food assistance for people involved in that program. Mr. Viveiros states he doesn't know of the Cupboard of Kindness program and restates that the drive through facility is for daily pre-made meals. Mr. Viveiros states that the Cupboard of Kindness program wasn't initially a part of the process and that it was double doors with a porch on the end so that things could be stacked and handed off to people as they came in and not intended to serve a food pantry function. Mr. Viveiros states that he understands it is moving over to the senior center and that it got busy during the pandemic at the Town Hall. Mrs. Parker states it is a widely used. Mr. Viveiros states that they will go and collect bags of groceries. Mrs. Parker states that the Cupboard of Kindness was going to be in the small section to the left. Mr. Viveiros states that there is a section for them in that area but they will not be using the drive through window which is for the pre-made meals. Mr. Griffin states that they are working on both aspects of the project and the simplest thing would be to confirm where the Cupboard of Kindness operation will be operating out of regardless of which building it is to make sure the peak traffic flows are accurate for if they do have Cupboard of Kindness there. Mr. Lindgren states he can confirm that and bring the data back. Mr. Griffin states that the traffic engineer should know the trip generation it might have added from the Cupboard of Kindness.

Mr. Marr states during the pandemic the existing Senior Center was making phone calls to people 65 and older that they could pick up donated food and is unsure if it will continue with the new site with the drive through service. Mr. Viveiros states it sounds like the grab and go which is what the drive through will be used for mainly but can check to confirm. Mr. Marr states that if that isn't a part of the driveway then it may add more cars to the Senior Center.

Mr. Griffin asks when Mr. Lindgren can come back to the board with the asked for information. Mr. Lindgren states that they will be appearing before the ZBA in September and can make it to the next available meeting to get there because of the Zoning Board and the Conservation Commission and can get the information quickly for the next meeting.

Mrs. Parker asks to make sure that the arborvitae and hosta plantings in the landscape plan are deer resistant and potentially rabbit resistant. Mr. Lindgren states that he will contact the landscape engineer about the plants.

Mr. Viveiros states that he would prefer the continuance be the earliest meeting and states a member of the permeant building committee would've attended if the Zoom meeting was working.

Mr. Griffin asks if there are any comments from anyone attending the meeting and asks Mr. Peter Wiggins of 157 Mansfield Avenue if he has any comments. Mr. Wiggins states that he does not have any comments.

Mr. Bouley motions to continue the public hearing to the September 20th meeting and seconded by Mr. Norris. The Planning Board vote in favor of continuing the application to September 20th.

Other Business

Mr. Griffin states that there are members of the public present that want to talk to the Planning Board. Mr. Robert Keating of 182 Dean Street comes up to the podium and states he wants to talk about 0 Dean Street. Mr. Keating explains that there is a concern about a real estate sign at 186 Dean Street which is next to another house and it is a property with 30 acres on it. Anyone can sell acres but the Berkshire Hathaway site is inviting developers to the raw land which Mr. Keating states is a narrow street that Norton will not let a school bus go down. Mr. Keating asks if 186 Dean Street is the entrance way for the property as then it would be would be a street going off of a narrow street close to an intersection.

Mr. Griffin asks if this is the same 0 Dean Street that was seen earlier in the year that withdrew. Mr. Keating states it isn't and the property he is asking about is further down the street. Mr. Keating shows the realtor page and shows it at the intersection from Old Dean and Dean Street and is not very far from the high-tension wires. Mr. Bouley asks if it is between the high-tension wires and Hodges. Mr. Keating states it is. Mr. Keating asks for advice from the Planning Board on how to proceed. Mr. Griffin asks to confirm that it is 186 Old Dean Street. Mr. Keating confirms it is and the property is officially named 0 Dean Street. Mr. Griffin states that the property is zoned residential and if they wanted to see what could potentially go on the property then they could look in the zoning bylaw for residential-80 and see what is allowed by right and if it requires a special permit it would come before the Planning Board. Mr. Keating states that there doesn't seem to be enough frontage to have anything there. Mr. Griffin states that the developer would have to find a way to get enough frontage to do the project. Mr. Griffin states that the required amount of frontage for each zone will be in the bylaw along with any building requirements for the zone. Mr. Keating asks what the process would be to keep up to date on it. Mr. Griffin states that he recommends they speak with the realtor who is selling the property to know why they are selling and if they know what the future of the property is.

General Business

Mr. Bouley states that the reimbursement was skipped on the agenda. Mr. Griffin asks Mr. Carmichael which site that is. Mr. Carmichael states 196 Mansfield is the site with the flex warehouse and recently had a modification done on it. Mr. Bouley asks if they finished their

project. Mr. Carmichael states that he can't confirm that it is and will ask Mr. Robert Sullivan for the next meeting.

Adjournment

The motion to adjourn the August 30, 2022 meeting was done by Mr. Bouley and seconded by Mrs. Parker. The Planning Board vote in Favor of adjourning the meeting at 9:35 pm.

Minutes prepared and submitted by Bryan Carmichael, Department of Planning and Economic Development Administrative Assistant.

Minutes Approved on: 9/13/23

Signature

_____