

## PLANNING BOARD

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

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



### GREENFIELD PLANNING BOARD Minutes of April 21, 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; and James Allen

**ABSENT:** Alternate Joshua Parker

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

#### Approval of Minutes

**MOTION:** Moved by Sibley, seconded by Newton and voted 4-1 (Smith voted no) to approve the meeting minutes from April 7, 2011 as amended.

Wedegartner announced that the meeting is being recorded and asked if anyone else was recording the meeting. GCTV and WHAI responded yes.

#### Public Hearing

- a. **7:00 PM:** Application of Wedgewood Gardens, Inc. for property located at 220 Silver Street which is located in the Urban Residential (RA) Zoning District, for a special permit pursuant to Sections 200-6.11(D) and 200-8.3 of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow a common driveway to serve three (3) residential lots.

Wedegartner opened the public hearing at 7:27 PM and read the public hearing notice. Wedegartner reviewed with the audience the rules/procedures for a public hearing. Terry Kimball reviewed the proposed common driveway plan with the Board. Sibley asked who will own the driveway and who will maintain it. Mr. Kimball responded that he owns the driveway and that maintenance responsibility will fall on the residents using the common driveway. Allen inquired about the existing garage. Mr. Kimball stated that the existing garage will be moved as shown on the plan. Newton inquired why so much parking is being provided for the proposed number of dwelling units. Mr. Kimball stated that the paved areas for parking also includes room for vehicles to turn around and for snow storage. He also stated that in terms of cost effectiveness, the less pavement the better so he has provided what he believes to be safe and convenient. Allen inquired if there was any other use proposed for "Lot C". Mr. Kimball responded that the lot can only accommodate one home. Newton expressed concerns about the "commercial feel" of the proposed driveway within a residential area. Board discussed the configuration of the proposed common driveway. Allen inquired on whether the homes will be rented or sold. Mr. Kimball responded that they will be rented. Sibley stated that given the number of proposed units and potential visitors, the proposed parking areas could be full which would mean that vehicles would have to be parked on the grass.

Wedegartner opened the public hearing up for public comment. No public comments.

The Board continued to discuss the proposed number and configuration of the parking spaces. Newton stated that she would like to see a re-design of the parking area to include more green space and more uniform configuration. Wedegartner mentioned the following two options relative to this application: 1) require a re-design and continue the public hearing to another day and time, or 2) close the public hearing and rely on Mr. Kimball's say so on the re-design request. Mr. Kimball stated that he will abide by the Planning Board's request for a reduction in size rather than coming back on another day. The Board continued to discuss the possibilities for a re-design to reduce the overall area of the parking. Newton again stated that she would like to see a re-design. Mr. Kimball inquired if this could be done through a condition(s).

**MOTION: Moved by Sibley, seconded by Newton, and voted 5-0 to close the public hearing at 7:58 PM.**

### **Board Deliberation – 220 Silver Street**

Sibley inquired about trash pickup. Mr. Kimball stated that trash pickup is on Barr Avenue.

**MOTION: Moved by Newton, seconded by Sibley, and voted 5-0 to approve the application of Wedgewood Gardens, Inc. for property located at 220 Silver Street which is located in the Urban Residential (RA) Zoning District, for a special permit pursuant to Sections 200-6.11(D) and 200-8.3 of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow a common driveway to serve three (3) residential lots with the following conditions:**

- 1) The applicant shall provide a green space of 12' x 8' in the Lot C parking area; and**
- 2) The parking width for Lot B be increased from 18 feet to 24 feet in width.**

### Action Items

- a. (Continued from March 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 explained to the Board that Tim Sullivan will present on the new design elements of the project and if time allows the Board will begin its review of the draft decision prepared by the Department of Planning and Development. If there is not enough time, the Board can use the May 5<sup>th</sup> meeting to complete this review. Mr. Sullivan reviewed with the Board the requests made to date on the design of the project to include the following: materials used, perspectives, moving plantings, and the reduction of parking spaces to 540. Mr. Sullivan requested that the identification of the specific parking spaces to be eliminated be done once a tenant is identified and final design is submitted to the Planning Board. Wedegartner clarified that the project proponents agree to the reduction of parking spaces to 540, but that the specific parking spaces to be eliminated be done by the future tenant. Mr. Sullivan concurred. Mr. Sullivan passed out a handout to the board and reviewed the new design features with the Board (handout dated April 21, 2011 is hereby made a part of these meeting minutes). Newton inquired on the material used for the top of the columns at the store's primary entrance. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the materials used and confirmed that the top material is metal. Board discussed column brick height. Mr. Sullivan suggested that this design detail could be finalized once a tenant is identified. Board discussed various options for column design. Mr. Sullivan continued to review the new design elements. Smith inquired if the landscaping features on the perspectives conform to the site plan. Mr. Sullivan responded yes. Newton inquired if the proposed windows are real windows. Mr. Sullivan responded yes. Wedegartner inquired about the windows on the French King Highway side of the building. Mr. Sullivan stated that the exact placement of the windows will be a tenant based decision subject to the Board's final approval. Smith inquired on the white portions shown on the building elevations. Mr. Sullivan responded that the white sections are different sides of the building to differentiate the different elevations. Sibley concurred with Newton about the material used for the top of the columns at the canopy entrance and stated

that a better design could be done. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the materials board with the Board. Mr. Sullivan stated that the final materials and coloring to be used will be a tenant based decision subject to the Board's final approval. Newton inquired on whether the project proponents could provide additional material examples for the Board to review. Mr. Sullivan again stated that the final materials and coloring to be used will be a tenant based decision subject to the Board's final approval. Newton inquired on the materials to be used for the flat roof. Mr. Sullivan responded that the roof will be made of a rubber membrane material. Newton asked about the potential for solar panels on the roof. Mr. Sullivan stated that they cannot commit to this sustainable design feature as it would be a tenant based decision. Newton stated that she would like to see the roof designed so that it is compatible for solar panel installation. Mr. Dupree stated that without an identified tenant at this time, having such a requirement could limit the pool of potential tenants. Allen inquired on typical lease length agreements for such retail stores. Mr. Sullivan responded typically a 10-year lease agreement with options to extend. Mayor Martin asked for clarification on final approval of the tenant based design. Wedegartner confirmed that the final approval on design will be done by the Planning Board. Mr. Sullivan handed out a roof plan as requested by the board as well as a perspective from French King Highway showing the view of the roof. Board discussed this perspective. Newton inquired on a maintenance plan for the plantings. Mr. Sullivan responded that there is a maintenance plan that has been submitted to the Board. Smith inquired on what aspects of the project will need to come back before the Planning board once a tenant is identified. Mr. Sullivan responded final tenant based design and sustainable design features. Mr. Sullivan stated that if the Board prepares a list of desirable sustainable design features, that they would take this list to a future tenant for consideration. Board discussed preparing such a list. Smith inquired on the Stretch Code requirements. Donna MacNicol explained that the method of meeting the Stretch Code (20% above current energy code) can be done multiple ways but has to be met by law. Wedegartner inquired on the new lighting features. The Board had no concerns. Wedegartner announced a 5 minute break.

Wedegartner reviewed the process of making a motion and the required elements within a motion with the Board and audience. The Board began the process of reviewing the draft findings of fact. Smith inquired if the Board can revisit specific findings at the next meeting. Wedegartner responded yes. Wedegartner asked the Board if they had any specific questions or issues with the draft findings of fact. Smith stated that the proposed traffic mitigation package is not enough and moved to triple the amount after excluding the \$880,000 for the site access signal and driveway improvements, to \$382,500 to be held in escrow for five (5) years after which time all unused funds would be returned to the applicant. Mayor Martin seconded the motion. Wedegartner asked Smith for clarification on how this number was determined. Smith clarified that she tripled the proposed traffic mitigation package minus the cost of the site access improvements and sidewalk costs ( $\$127,500 \times 3 = \$382,000$ ). Wedegartner stated that the proposed traffic mitigation numbers in the summary table were not pulled out of a hat but were determined after considerable consultation between the Board's peer reviewer BETA Group, VHB, the Town Engineer, and the Department of Planning and Development. Newton stated that she agrees with Smith on increasing traffic mitigation amounts but not tripling them and not for a period of 5 years in escrow. She stated that any traffic issue will become apparent sooner rather than later and if the time is too long, impacts from new development may not be factored in. Newton highlighted the issue of fluctuating petroleum costs and how that may impact today's traffic mitigation numbers. The Board discussed this issue. Smith stated that the Level of Service (LOS) at the High Street/Maple Street intersection goes from a Level C to a Level D and asked if this meets the special permit/Major Development Review requirements. Wedegartner responded that it does because the overall LOS should be at C or better. Donna MacNicol stated that the only mitigation appropriate for this intersection is their proposed safety measure. Smith expressed concerns that the LOS falls below C on several of the legs of intersections in the study area. Board discussed this issue. Mayor Martin stated that he asked Kien Ho of BETA Group and Larry Petrin, Town Engineer, to determine the cost of the 4 traffic calming options for Wildwood Avenue. He stated that 3 of the 4 options fall within the amount allocated for Wildwood Avenue with the exception being the dead-end option so that additional money is needed for Wildwood Avenue. Board discussion moved to the topic of pedestrian/bicycle access to the site from Loomis and King Roads. Mayor Martin asked for clarification on the \$19,000 for design and who would design the sidewalk. Mr. Sullivan stated that the project proponents would design the sidewalk and provide the Town with \$79,000 for construction of the sidewalk. Mayor Martin asked the project proponents about

any philanthropic contributions to the Town of Greenfield. Wedegartner stated that this request is not appropriate. Board discuss alternative for pedestrian/bicycle access to the site. Allen stated that he lives about 150 feet away from Maple Street which is why he is so concerned about safety at the intersection of High Street/Maple Street. Allen suggested that the Board prohibit commercial trucking on Maple Street. Wedegartner questioned whether this could legally be done unless it is based on truck tonnage. Allen stated that they could specify the tonnage. Board discussed this issue. Mayor Martin stated that based on a conversation with Larry Petrin, it is his belief that the Town cannot restrict commercial truck traffic on Maple Street. Smith re-stated her motion which was seconded by Mayor Martin. The Board discussed the MDR rules and regulations relative to LOS. Mayor Martin asked for a friendly amendment to lower the amount to \$75,000 and to reduce the time period from 5 to 2 years in escrow after construction. Smith agreed. Board continued to discuss this issue. Smith requested that the motion be tabled to the next meeting. Board discussed this request. Board took the following vote on the friendly amendment: 2-3 (Sibley, Allen, and Wedegartner voted against). The friendly amendment motion failed. Twarog offered a compromise solution of a fifteen percent (15%) contingency fee on \$273,000 of the traffic mitigation package which is \$40,950 or \$41,000 rounded up. Sibley offered this as a friendly amendment to the original motion, seconded by Newton, and voted 4-1 (Allen voted against) subject to the Director of the Department of Public Works approval for the use and release of these funds. The friendly amendment passed. The Board voted on the original motion as amended 4-1 (Allen voted against). Motion passed.

Wedegartner announced that the next Planning Board meeting will be held on May 5, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. at the Department of Planning and Development at 114 Main Street.

Adjournment

**MOTION: Moved by Sibley, seconded by Newton, and voted 5:0 to adjourn the meeting at 10:52 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Eric Twarog, AICP  
Director of Planning and Development