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

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



GREENFIELD PLANNING BOARD Minutes of February 22, 2011 Greenfield Police Station, 321 High Street

The meeting was called to order at 7:11 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; Channel 22 News; and members of the public.

Approval of Minutes

MOTION: Moved by Sibley, seconded by Newton and voted 5:0 to approve the meeting minutes from

February 17, 2011.

Action Items

a. (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 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. Channel 22 News and GCTV responded yes. Wedegartner reviewed the Board's responsibilities in terms of its review of this project as well as the relevant documents that the Board will need to consider.

The Board continued its review of the projects compliance with the Corridor Overlay District Ordinance and Design Guidelines. Smith suggested that each section be read out loud in its entirety. The Board agreed. The Board reviewed Section 200-4.16, Corridor Overlay District, in its entirety. Mr. Sullivan responded to a question from Smith from the last meeting by stating that the site access road is currently not wide enough for a striped bicycle lane but suggested that Gill Road could be. The Board moved on to it s review of the Corridor Overlay District Design Guidelines. Wedegartner read the applicability section. Smith flagged Goal #3, Goal #4, Goal #6, and Goal #7 as items to be further discussed. Wedegartner read the design objectives section. Smith flagged Objectives # 2, #3, and #4 as items to be further discussed. Board began its discussion of the flagged items. Smith inquired on perspective view from Route 2A driving toward downtown in terms of the existing sandbank. Mr. Sullivan clarified that most of the existing sandbank will be utilized for the site access driveway. Smith inquired on the grade of the site access driveway. Mr. Dupree responded approximately 5%. Newton also inquired on the view from access driveway into the area of development. Mr. Sullivan responded that the exact view perspective being requested may not be possible in terms of accuracy but that they would look into this.

Goal #3 - Provide vegetated buffers and landscaping to soften the view of development

Smith stated that in winter, the site is easily viewable from Route 2A. Newton inquired if additional trees will be planted to minimize this by planting further up the slope. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that this area is town right-of-

way so the applicant would need town approval to plant such trees. Newton inquired on buffering/plantings along Route 2. Mr. Sullivan responded by clarifying that the Corridor Overlay District does not apply to Route 2. Mr. Sullivan also stated that the restored wetland #4 area will be visible from Route 2. Mayor Martin inquired whether a fence will be provided to prevent trash from blowing into the wetland areas. Mr. Dupree responded that a chain link fence has been provided for this purpose. A question on the proposed height of the fence was asked. Mr. Dupree that the height is four (4) feet but will confirm this. Wedegartner stated that she has counted all of the proposed landscaping planting and the totals are as follows: 2,292 total plantings; 350 plantings for restored wetland area; 818 plantings for buffer areas; and 1,021 plantings elsewhere on site.

Goal #4 - Achieve high quality building, site design and signage

Smith stated that she does not believe that this goal has been met and that more work needs to be done to meet this goal. Newton stated that the new design submitted in January is a step forward but not enough. Mayor Martin agreed. Wedegartner brought to the Board's attention the original submission of architectural design and compared that with the new design. Mr. Sullivan stated that without a tenant, they had limited capability to provide final details as the final design will be tenant based. Mr. Sullivan also stated that once a tenant is identified, the final design will have to be approved by the Board. Mr. Sullivan stated that their architect did look at building types throughout the community as well as the examples provided by the Board and others. Mr. Sullivan stated that they would be more than willing to consider specific suggestions/examples provided to them. Wedegartner suggested providing a different roof type in the area where the roof is curved. Smith inquired about additional windows on the building for employees. Board discussed more day lighting of the building in areas where it is feasible. The Board inquired on the depth of the proposed architectural details/breaks on the building design. Mr. Sullivan responded that he can't answer this question at this time but will find out for the Board. Newton inquired whether the proposed window at the entry way of the building will be a real window. Mr. Sullivan responded yes and that they will provide answers on the depth of architectural features and answer the question about additional day lighting of the building with more windows. The Board clarified that they would like to see real windows for day lighting. Board inquired whether the interior layout is to scale. Mr. Dupree responded that the scale is the same as the submitted site plan.

Goal #6 - Reduce the visual impact of the automobile.

Smith expressed concern about too many parking spaces. Board discussed snow storage areas. Parker inquired how the snow removal will take place. Mr. Dupree responded that the site has been designed accommodate snow removal to the designated areas. Mr. Sullivan stated that they determined their parking ratio based on ULI and ITE standards as well as experience on similar projects. Mr. Sullivan stated that he believes that the proposed parking is the minimum necessary to make this project safe and efficient. Wedegartner asked the project proponents to look into which 22 parking spaces to eliminate as recommended by the Department of Planning and Development. She strongly urged the project proponents to look into the elimination of the 22 parking spaces.

Goal #7 - Provide pedestrian access and amenities.

Wedegartner asked Mr. Sullivan to review these amenities with the Board which Mr. Sullivan did. Allen inquired whether lighting will be provided the pedestrian/bicycle lane. Mr. Sullivan responded that they do not propose to provide such lighting and that it would remain as it is today. Newton asked if the pedestrian/bicycle lane will allow for emergency vehicle access (crash gate, bollards, etc.). Mr. Dupree responded that they have talked to both the Police Chief and Deputy Fire Chief to work this out. Smith mentioned the Franklin County Bikeway and asked if the proposed pedestrian/bicycle lane could tie into this. It was pointed out that the Franklin County Bikeway ends at the intersection of Route2/Adams Road so it is not possible to tie into the existing system.

Wedegartner announced that the next Planning Board meeting will be held on March 17, 2011 at 7:00 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 ad | journ the meeting at 10:03 p | o.m. |
|---------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------|
| | | | | | |

Respectfully Submitted,

Eric Twarog, AICP Director of Planning and Development