

## ***PLANNING BOARD***

***TOWN OF GREENFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS***  
***14 Court Square, Greenfield, MA 01301***

***413-772-1548***  
***413-772-1309 (fax)***



### **GREENFIELD PLANNING BOARD**

#### **Minutes of March 17, 2011**

#### **Planning/Veteran's Office, 114 Main Street**

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. with the following members:

**PRESENT:** Roxann Wedegartner, Chair; Linda Smith, Vice-chair; Mary Newton, Clerk; Clayton Sibley; James Allen; and Alternate Joshua Parker

Also present were Mayor William Martin; Eric Twarog, Director of Planning and Development; GCTV; Greenfield Recorder; and members of the public.

#### Approval of Minutes

**MOTION:** Moved by Sibley, seconded by Smith and voted 5:0 to approve the meeting minutes from February 22, 2011.

Wedegartner announced that the meeting will end around 10:00 p.m. and announced that the meeting is being recorded and asked if anyone else was recording the meeting. GCTV responded yes.

#### Action Items

a. Planning Board Recommendation on the Acceptance of a Public Way – Solar Way.

Twarog stated that the Board had completely released the covenant for Solar Way back in October of 2010. He also stated that the DPW had inspected the road at that time and had no issues with the release of the covenant and has no issues with accepting Solar Way as a public way. The Board discussed the request and took the following action:

**MOTION:** Moved by Smith, seconded by Newton, and voted 5-0 to forward a positive recommendation to the Town Council for the acceptance of Solar Way as a public way.

b. (Continued from February 17, 2011) – Board Deliberation on Application of Greenfield Investor's Property Development, LLC, Proposed 135,000 square foot retail store off French King Highway (Tax Map R04, Lot 44; Tax Map R05, Lot 23)

The following project proponents were present: Tim Sullivan of Goulston & Storrs; Michael Dupree of VHB and Donna MacNicol of MacNicol & Tombs. Wedegartner re-capped where the Board is currently in its deliberation on this project by stating that the Board left off at #3 under Building Placement and Design of the Corridor Overlay District Design Guidelines. Wedegartner stated that May 5, 2011 is the last regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting for the Board to make a decision on this project as the 90-day review period ends May 9, 2011. If the Board does not make a decision by that date, then the project would be constructively approved unless both parties agree to an extension of that date. Wedegartner asked the Board not to review every word of the guidelines but instead to state issues relevant to the overall section in question. Tim Sullivan stated that what would work best for them is for the Board to complete the list of issues/comments on each section after which the proponents will address all comments in a comprehensive manner as many of the comments are interrelated.

Building Placement and Design - #3 (Page 3, Corridor Design Guidelines)

Smith asked why the access around the building isn't one-way. Mr. Dupree stated that it is intended to be a two-way as there is no access around the entire building except for emergency access. Newton inquired whether Gill Road could be utilized for emergency access if the front access way were somehow blocked by use of a crash gate or other mechanism. Mr. Dupree responded that Gill Road could be adapted to accommodate emergency vehicles. Mr. Sullivan stated that they will look into this. Newton expressed concern over the lack of lighting on Gill Road. Mr. Sullivan stated that there will be lighting for pedestrians on site but that off site is private property.

Building Placement and Design - #4 (Pages 3-4, Corridor Design Guidelines)

Mr. Sullivan stated that they would like some more guidance on specific design elements of the project. Newton questioned the front façade canopy and its purpose and also inquired about cover for those using the bus stop on site. She asked if an outdoor vestibule area could be provided. Mr. Sullivan responded that there is a vestibule area in the building at the front entrance area. Board discussed submitted floor plan. Mr. Sullivan stated that the submitted floor plan is for illustrative purposes and is likely to change due to particular tenant needs. Mr. Sullivan stated that they will take all comments on design and provide a general style that the future tenant will need to adhere to but that final tenant-based design will need to be given by the Planning Board. Newton asked if a covered area could be provided closer to the bus stop. Wedegartner stated that the covered canopy area could be extended all the way to the entrance area. Mr. Sullivan stated that they will look into different options for this. Smith inquired on foundation plantings. Mr. Dupree reviewed the revised plan set with the Board showing the foundation plantings. Smith asked that the Board review each letter under #4 in detail and reviewed the overall goals of the Corridor Design Guidelines with the Board. Smith stated that the scale of the project needs to be discussed at this time. She stated that based on letter a under #4, the scale of the current proposal does not meet this guideline and that the size of the store needs to be reduced to meet this guideline. She stated that she likes Mayor Martin's proposal for a size of less than 100,000 square feet and David Singer's proposal for a size of 80,000 square feet with potential for future expansion. Wedegartner stated that she agrees that size is a big ticket item for consideration and that the Board should consider this at the April 7, 2011 Planning Board meeting when it considers other major issue such as traffic mitigation. Wedegartner stated that the Town's ordinances and regulations do not provide guidance on size for particular uses. She stated that the Town's regulations could be amended in the future to address this. Mr. Sullivan responded on the issue of scale by stating that they have met every criterion of the guidelines and have not asked for any waivers or other relief. Mr. Sullivan stated that for the Greenfield project, neither 80,000 nor 100,000 square feet in size would work as a single-tenant store. Smith asked why 92,000 square feet works in Northampton but would not work in Greenfield. Mr. Sullivan responded that there are many factors involved such as site development costs. Mr. Sullivan also stated that any size under 130,000 square feet may result in a multiple-tenant development which would increase traffic impacts as opposed to a single-tenant development. Mr. Sullivan stated that he will have to confer with his client to determine the threshold of size for a single-tenant vs. a multiple-tenant scenario. Newton stated that too small of a store would also be an issue as is the case for BJ's and Home Depot as expressed by residents. Allen stated that in Hinsdale, NH the Wal-Mart there has expanded to a mega-store. He stated that in order to avoid a similar situation in Greenfield, the size issue needs to be resolved so that the project is done right the first time. Mayor Martin stated that reducing the size of the store would reduce traffic impacts and thereby reduce the cost of mitigation. Mr. Sullivan responded that mitigation costs would not change by reducing the size of the store. Wedegartner stated that the project proponents have heard the concerns on design and will go back to the drawing board to address them. Newton asked for a to-scale dimensioned layout of the building. Mr. Sullivan responded yes they will provide that. Smith expressed concerns about 4b, 4d, 4e, and 4g. Wedegartner directed the project proponents to provide specific details on building materials when they come back with a redesign. Wedegartner stated that the re-design must be submitted to the Board prior to the second meeting in April. Sibley stated that the Board needs to come to a consensus on design within itself prior to directing the applicant to re-design it. Wedegartner responded that the Board has already given direction to the applicant for the re-design. Newton inquired if "hardy plank" could be used on the front elevation because the Board doesn't like the proposed scored concrete. Smith expressed concerns about #7, 8, and 9 under "Building Placement and Design". Mr. Dupree stated that they will provide two perspectives, one from the access drive and one from Route 2 adjacent to the building. Smith asked for a roof-top plan. Newton inquired about solar panels on the roof-top. Mr. Sullivan responded

that they could not commit to specific green standards such as solar panels on the roof due to a lack of a tenant and their construction based needs. Smith asked if the roof-top plan for the North Adams Wal-Mart project could be provided to the Board as it is also a Ceruzzi project. Mr. Sullivan responded that they will look into it.

#### Site Landscaping Items 1-11

Smith inquired about seating areas and if any have been shown. Mr. Sullivan responded that they could show this but that it would be likely to change based on final tenant based design approval by the Planning Board. Newton asked about tree plantings and suggested that Nancy Hazard's letter on this should be followed to ensure that the planted trees survive. Smith stated that she would like to see more trees planted in the parking areas. Wedegartner inquired about tree plantings in the parking area over the underground infiltration field. Mr. Dupree responded that it would not be desirable to plant trees over an underground infiltration field.

#### Parking, Circulation and Pedestrian Access

Newton asked for the total number of proposed parking spaces. Mr. Dupree responded 560 after eliminating the 28 spaces near the northern sidewalk. The Board discussed the recommendation of the Department of Planning and Development of a maximum ratio of 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area which would be 540 parking spaces. Allen inquired about snow storage areas. Mr. Dupree reviewed proposed snow storage areas with the Board. Newton inquired on the estimated number of truck trips per day. Mr. Dupree responded that he doesn't have the answer but will check with their traffic engineer. The Board continued to discuss parking ratios. The Board reached consensus on a ratio of 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area. Newton inquired on the potential for banking parking. Mr. Sullivan responded that this would not work for this site. Smith inquired on sidewalks along French King Highway as opposed to utilizing Gill Road. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the two alternatives with the Board, the first being providing a sidewalk along their property line along French King Highway; the second alternative utilizing portions of Gill Road and King Road. The Board continued discussion of the two alternatives as well as emergency access to the site.

#### Lighting

Mr. Dupree reviewed lighting with the Board. Pole height has been reduced from the original proposal to 24 feet in height. Gooseneck lighting will be used for decorative lighting along the front of the building. MRW fixtures will be used for security lighting on the sides and rear of the building. KSF2 fixtures will be used on the light poles in the parking areas. Bollard lighting will be utilized for pedestrian lighting for the walkway. Cylinder lighting will be used for accent lighting along the front of the building. Sibley inquired on required foot candles for safety purposes. Mr. Dupree responded that all of the proposed lighting fixtures meet the Town's requirements. Sibley suggested that as the poles are installed, to put in wiring at the same time for security cameras. Mr. Sullivan responded that they would expect as a condition of approval, the Police Chief would have to approve their security plan. Wedegartner summarized for the proponents that the Board would like the following: 1) further discussion on size, 2) a refined design in two meetings, 3) different options for lighting in two meetings, and 4) an estimate of daily truck traffic.

Wedegartner announced that the next Planning Board meeting will be held on April 7, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. at the Department of Planning and Development at 114 Main Street.

#### Adjournment

**MOTION: Moved by Newton, seconded by Sibley, and voted 5:0 to adjourn the meeting at 10:11 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Eric Twarog, AICP  
Director of Planning and Development