

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
February 13, 2024

7:00pm

Remote Meeting

Members Present: Scott Carlson, Otto Lies, Frank Doyle, Brynn Zawada, James Parker

Others Present: David George, Town Planner, Sam Malafronte, Solli Engineering, Danny Hannoush, DDMNS Realty, Doug Andrysick, Mike George, Wingspan, Amy Allen and Alexis Vallejos, Green International, Mike Stokes, Matt Devlin, Edmond Benoit, Mary Jude Pigsley, Bob Pollitt, John Woodsmall, Director, DPW

S Carlson called the meeting to order at 7:01pm

1. ANR: 1A. 1116 Wachusett Street; 1B. 404 and 410 Elmwood Avenue.

Doug Andrysick on behalf of Mr. Goodhile who owns 1116 Wachusett Street. The request is to join former lot 2 parcel 1 of 7600 sq feet and parcel 10-A to be one undivided property.

S Carlson asked if there is access to the back lot. D Andrysick answered yes but not from Manning Road. Board members looked at the plot plan. B Zawada asked for the specific area to be joined to be outlined. D Andrysick explained this request to join is to receive one tax bill from the town; both plots are zoned the same way.

Motion made by O Lies, seconded by S Carlson, TO ENDORSE THE A&R FOR 1116 WACHUSETT STREET. APPROVED 5-0-0.

M George from Wingspan to request boundary change at 404 and 410 Elmwood Avenue. Would like to swap 70 square feet from 404 Elmwood to 410 Elmwood to stay within zoning guidelines. A&R was submitted in 2021.

Board members examined the plots to analyze where the boundary change is located. S Carlson asked how wide the lot is where the change may take place but M George did not have a figure. A figure for the narrowest point of the plot due to the change was requested by the Board from Wingspan since the plan has changed since its initial approval.

Motion made by F Doyle, seconded by S Carlson FOR CONTINUANCE OF A&R FOR 404 AND 410 ELMWOOD AVENUE TO THE FEBRUARY 27TH MEETING. Approved 5-0-0.

2. 788 Main Street (Continued Hearing from 11/14/23, 12/12/23, and 1/9/24, 1/23/24— 7:00 PM): Special Permit with Site Plan Review for Restaurant, including associated drive through lane.

S Malafronte from Solli Engineering addressed the questions from previous meetings:

- Revised peak hour traffic volumes and analysis were provided and reviewed
- Proposed storage length is expected to accommodate the queues at the drive -thru
- Proposed site plan layout and entry/exit can accommodate the proper truck turning movements
- Green's peer review comments are resolved

- Accessible parking spaces cannot be moved closer to the entrance due to the grading not being sufficient for ramp curbing and the slope is greater than 2%

Board member comments:

- J Parker asked if the model presented is an acceptable one for this type of establishment; A Vasquez from Green International explained the peer review is used to make sure the applicant is within safety standards which it is
- F Doyle asked if in the traffic analysis there is a backup of vehicles entering or exiting onto Main Street? A Allen explained that there is no backup, that volumes entering are not an issue and exiting will not back up at all
- S Malafronte asked A Allen in her professional opinion of the analysis of the site plan, if it represents a detriment to Main Street in Town of Holden. A Allen stated that exiting is only part that may have a delay but it will not affect nearby streets adversely.
- O Lies asked once the Main Street lines are drawn with the left turn lane in the middle will the enter and exit no longer be a problem; A Allen said it will be easier to enter and exit the site, and improves it
- O Lies asked S Malafronte his thoughts on the exit/enter plan; S Malafronte agrees with Green International's findings and stated, for the record, that the Main Street project is not related to this applicant's request, yet peer review was based on its data. S Carlson asked for clarification. S Malafronte explained the applicant will use new data from the MDOT's lane configuration information for spring 2024 which is not part of this application.

S Malafronte reviewed the timeline and summarized the special permit findings of the site including capacity, dimensional regulations, parking, and landscaping/lighting. The traffic impact study reviewed Holden DPW's response that this "development will not represent a significant increase to the existing traffic volumes on Main Street". Revisions of the grading and drainage plan were highlighted, an impermeable geomembrane liner has been added to the east side of the underground water system plan to help prevent any contamination or flowing of groundwater horizontally rather than downward.

S Carlson asked about conservation issues; S Malafronte attended the Conservation Commission meeting which was continued since the Commission had stormwater questions as well. The liner detailed previously was added due to a request by a member of the Conservation Commission.

The meeting was opened to the public. Discussion of guidelines for responses to be concise and to the point. A 3 minute response cap will be followed.

Public Comment

Mary Jude Pigsley, 215 Newell Road commented that the totality of circumstances is lacking in this model as real world traffic conditions are already bad. MJ Pigsley asked that if the site is approved it should be conditional on a traffic analysis post construction with no left turn on Main Street. An analysis of real world comprehensive peak level analysis of the suicide lane with a left out of the site simultaneously as a green light for the left at Industrial should be looked at.

S Carlson in response explained the Planning Board has no control over MDOT plans. The left turn lane is the recommendation of the state, not the town.

Matt Devlin – 42 Sherwood Hill Drive requested minutes of the previous meetings be posted. M Devlin detailed his concerns about storm water discharge to groundwater. Updated plans show 8 underground chambers rather than five next to a contaminated site with potential for cross contamination and PFAS. M Devlin stated no soil or water samples have been taken nor studied and questioned the addition of the liner previously discussed. M Devlin voiced concern over storm water discharge onto other people's property as well as traffic concerns since no analysis of in store service during the site's proposed 17 hour open hours period was done. No queue for instore or commercial deliveries were analyzed.

S Malafrente response:

- applicant did perform phase 2 examination which did not find any contamination on site
- infiltration changes required by state and are in compliance
- existing analysis of discharge to rear property would be reduced in each direction by proposed conditions

M Devlin responded with concerns over discharge to someone else's property; S Carlson clarified it is an improvement over existing conditions and the system is within code and state regulations.

Mike Stokes, 11 Canterbury Lane commented that queue theory allows for many ways to study queue and the most information gained is best. If MDOT has to be involved with queue and traffic make sure we have data for traffic queue. M Stokes commented a post traffic queue analysis of the drive through with population changes and traffic changes would be advisable.

Bob Pollitt, 41 Sherwood Hill Drive questioned if any analysis accounted for traffic exiting Speedway and whether the changes being made by MDOT include analysis of the site's proposed traffic. Traffic on Sherwood Hill is bad since it is already a cut through. A Allen stated that changing Main Street from 4 to 2 lanes is a traffic calming intent but can't speak to MDOT reasoning. Volume of traffic from Speedway was analyzed but no analysis of Sherwood Hill Drive was done; the two study intersections were the site and Industrial Drive. B Pollitt suggested there would be more volume of traffic exiting Speedway to the right with a suicide lane; the real life scenario is dangerous since the flow may not work.

S Malafrente stated that in previous meetings the maximum exit of the driveway queue left or right was identified as 2 vehicles during peak hours and the peer review said it didn't impact traffic negatively.

Brian Diehl, 17 Laurel Hill Road questioned the left hand turn into site when cars will be turning into the Bagel Inn store fronts sharing the same section of the suicide lane and wondered how can this conflict be mitigated if using the same lane in both directions.

S Malafrente stated that during peak hours vehicles will be taking a right into the Bagel Inn store front but the suicide lane concept is not that of the applicant but the MDOT. The applicant

followed the guidelines of MDOT by submitting an access permit including the layout of the site driveway.

Alexis Vallejos, 1104 Main Street suggested the reality is more than what it looks like on paper and that an increase in business every hour of every day will increase flow of traffic.

S Carlson reiterated that the MDOT road project is moving forward.

Mike Stokes, 11 Canterbury Lane asked who owns execution of the traffic analysis combined with queue analysis.

S Malafrotne provided the traffic impact study and the queue analysis memorandum in January to the Planning Board in response to F Doyle's request. Peer review comments were taken into account and other sites were analyzed for comparison. This is published on the town website.

John Woodsmall, Director of Public Works explained that the MDOT resurfacing project is going forward. Eversource is replacing pipes to be ready for spring work on Main Street. The original analysis by the Town is supported by the peer review; all factors are analyzed and as the gatekeepers of the project all of these questions are considered. J Woodsmall commented the analysis was done correctly, it conforms with standards in the industry and the applicant has done what they can do. The storm water drainage is normal in practice, flowing toward stream to the north; the site is only required to infiltrate a certain amount; engineering staff have looked at drainage and have no concerns with it and the installation of the impermeable barrier will only help things on the site.

S Malafrotne will be submitting a land disturbance permit; J Woodsmall stated MDOT doesn't collaborate but will be looking at the site again and stated that the traffic on Main Street is due to more than one site.

Mary Jude Pigsley, 215 Newell Road commented that at least one of the five comparable properties used for queue analysis has only a right hand turn and another site is not adequate for comparison. MJ Pigsley asked if Phase 2 analysis can be posted online. D George confirmed it is up to the applicant if the phase 2 analysis is posted, it is not required.

Edmond Benoit was visible online but multiple attempts to reach him for comment were unsuccessful.

D George stated if the Board is satisfied it has received all information necessary to make a decision there is no need for a continuance. Board discussed if any conditions should be put on the project.

The Main Street repaving project will be done (estimated by June 2024) by the time the site opens if approved J Parker asked if the Board members believe they have enough information to make a decision.

B Zawada commented that the traffic conditions on Main Street aren't based on one business;

F Doyle stated the challenges of taking a left on Main Street are not due to one coffee shop and the applicant has been compliant and underwent a rigorous review.

J Woodsmall suggested examining post development conditions one year after the store opening and if any issued directly related to the site are identified, the developer can suggest fixes for that; language will be redefined by the the time the decision is drafted

O Lies thanked participants who joined these meetings to discuss 788 Main Street; many letters were received against the project and reiterated the Planning Board reviews the site and traffic - Board has no jurisdiction on number of coffee shops in town.

Motion made by O Lies, seconded by B Zawada to CLOSE THE HEARING. APPROVED 5-0-0.

S Malafronte agrees to post construction monitoring within one year of site occupancy; with the Town Planner the applicant will monitor site over full 7 full day am and pm peak periods.

Motion made by B Zawada, seconded by S Carlson to VOTE ON 788 MAIN STREET AT THE NEXT MEETING. APPROVED 5-0-0.

3. Jefferson Village Center Zoning: discussion and update.

D George met with the Economic Development Committee (EDC); the Committee is in support of the proposal. Outreach will be done to the parcel owners and other interested stakeholders. It will be on the future EDC agenda.

4. Minutes: January 23, 2024.

Motion made by O Lies, seconded by J Parker TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 23, 2024 MEETING MINUTES. APPROVED 5-0.

D George commented that for the February 27th meeting Sunshine Ridge and Westminster Place have requests for extensions which will be on the agenda.

Adjourn Meeting.

Motion made O Lies, seconded by S Carlson TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. APPROVED 5-0.

Next Meeting: **February 27, 2024**