

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
October 10, 2017

7:18PM

Memorial Hall

Members Present: John Michalak, Otto Lies, Tina Stratis, William Ritter, Jeff Head

Members Not Present: Scott Carlson, Rob Ricker

Others Present: Pam Harding, Director of Planning
Liz Fotos, Town Recorder

J. Michalak called the meeting to order at 7:18PM

**PUBLIC HEARING DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION-TORREY LANE- CUL DE SAC 4 LOTS –
BOYLSTON, CP LLC Continued from September 24, 2017**

J. Michalak stated that this was a continuation from September 24, 2017. He stated that before they began he wanted to let the applicant know that the Board only had four members present and they would need a unanimous vote in order to receive approval. He asked if they wished to proceed or if they wanted to request an extension.

John Grenier, Boylston, CP LLC asked for a moment to get in touch with his client.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS RECOMMENDATIONS

Variance- 377 Bailey Road- Paul and Kathleen Belair// Relief from front yard setback requirements

P. Harding stated that they applicant was asking for relief of the frontyard setback for a detached garage.

J. Michalak asked if there was any issues with how close it was

P. Harding stated that DPW had comments about the u-shaped driveway; the applicant was not allowed two curb cuts.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by O. Lies, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTE TO MAKE NO RECOMMENDATION 377 BAILEY ROAD/ PAUL AND KATHLEEN BELAIR/ RELIEF OF THE FRONTYARD SETBACK FOR A DETACHED GARARGE BECAUSE THERE WAS LIMITED PLANNING SIGNIFICANCE.

Variance- 103 General Hobbs Road- Stuart Cain and Kristine Yont// Relief from sideyard setback requirements

P. Harding stated that the applicant was seeking relief from the sideyard requirements for construction of a pool pavilion. She stated the hearing was on October 19, 2017 for the ZBA.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by O. Lies, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO MAKE NO RECOMMENDATION TO 103 GENERAL HOBBS ROAD, RELIEF FROM SIDEYARD SETBACK REQUIREMENTS AS THERE WAS LIMITED PLANNING SIGNIFICANCE.

MEETING MINUTES

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by T. Stratis, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 8, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS CORRECTED.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by O. Lies, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED.

PUBLIC HEARING DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION-TORREY LANE- CUL DE SAC 4 LOTS – BOYLSTON, CP LLC Continued from September 24, 2017- cont.

J. Grenier stated that the applicant wished to continue the matter to the October 24, 2017 Planning Board Meeting.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by T. Stratis, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO GRANT THE DEVELOPERS WRITTEN REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PUBLIC HEARING// DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION, TORREY LANE CUL DE SAC 4 LOTS TO OCTOBER 24, 2017 AT 7:00PM AND A TIME PERIOD TO FILE THE DECISION TO NOVEMBER 3, 2017.

CMRPC DLTA- JEFFERSON VILLAGE ZONING PROJECT

Jeff Bagg, Project Manager and Ronak Moradi, Planning Assistant were present at the meeting.

J. Bagg stated that he was before the Board in July and that he thinks they are about half way through with the analysis and that it was a good time to give the Board an update and ask some final questions for guidance. He stated that he thinks that by early December they will have a final packet.

J. Bagg handed out a packet for the Board and presented a slideshow.

J. Bagg stated that they pulled the boundary back from the study and that they were looking at the existing zoning versus what potential options would make sense in the area. He stated that the village zoning has some good qualities and could potentially make it more flexible for development.

J. Bagg stated that they had been inventorying the area and working on design guidelines. He stated what they were trying to accomplish with this project was to provide the Planning Board with an area analysis that can give them some recommendations for zoning changes moving forward. He stated that he believes the timing of this work could work with the Town's Master Plan effort. He stated that often in the Master Plan this work is done so they will have a jump start on it for this area and it could serve as a reference for the Master Plan.

J. Bagg showed the Board an existing land use map and stated that they wanted to work on creating a new map and a conceptual proposed map. He stated that The Jefferson Mill itself was important and was multi/mixed use and it could be constraining however with a special permit it may be able to spur

development of other parcels in the area. He stated that they did not focus too much on that parcel because they wanted to make sure zoning was in place first.

J. Bagg stated that one parcel he wanted to focus on was the pizza place (Pizza 17). He stated that location may be redeveloped in the future. He stated the unique part of this area was the pond water in the back that restricted them. He stated what they would want to look at was keeping some configuration of the parking in place and restriping. He showed the Board a picture of what he was speaking about.

J. Bagg stated that what they were trying to do was to start to look at the existing bylaw that may or may not allow for redevelopment of parcels and try to identify where there could be potential issues with the village bylaw.

J. Bagg stated the other thing that the Village Bylaw encourages is to try to build to a certain line. He stated they also look at parking and try to redevelop with parking pushed to the side or rear of a building.

J. Bagg stated that he had a question with the current bylaw. He stated that the village district had a separate section in the bylaw that he imagined was created to incorporate the mill. He asked if they were able to get an individual parcel proposed for development.

P. Harding stated that there was a complex formula used in the bylaw.

J. Bagg replied he had seen it.

P. Harding stated that she believes it was created for that project and that there was no set area requirement.

J. Bagg stated that when looking at the zoning map it appeared that the Village Area was only applied to one section of town.

J. Michalak replied that was true and that was what they wanted to expand on.

J. Bagg stated that the formula made it difficult to apply to a smaller parcel and that there seemed to be a need to change the commercial district or to create a sub district.

J. Michalak stated that he thought that attempt was to come up with a new description of the Village Zone with the goal was future development of retail stores on the bottom and residence on the top and have that village feel. He stated that there could be shops and the whole area would encompass the village feel and in the end a new zone would be created. He stated that they wanted from him (CMRPC) assistance on revitalizing the area the way the Board envisioned it.

J. Bagg stated that a new district where both village and commercial were would be the cleanest option moving forward. He stated the Village District required more research and was complex how it stood and would be difficult to apply to smaller parcels

J. Michalak stated that Erik Smith (Form CMRPC Planning Rep) had shown the Board samples from other communities and that was how the Board had envisioned the change moving forward.

P. Harding stated that deleting and replacing was probably how they would move forward.

J. Michalak asked if they should try to work with what they currently had in the bylaw.

W. Ritter stated they could keep the stuff that works and give some flexibility where necessary. He asked P. Harding why the commercial district when so far up High Street.

P. Harding replied she was not sure and that was one of her questions.

J. Bagg stated that the first two properties up, an excavation company and the Jefferson Service Area would be the two sensitive property owners. He stated they may lose automotive use in that area in a village system so the business owners may be concerned about those changes.

J. Michalak replied that he would assume they would be grandfathered in.

J. Bagg stated that what they wanted to do was to help not only the Board but community members envision what they were taking about. He asked the Board if they felt as though the pizza place and the parcel to the left that looked like apartments was a good place to study in more detail. He stated he wanted to focus on those and get more detailed plans for them.

J. Michalak stated that he felt that those two parcels were critical to the area and would need to be transformed to make it have the village feel. He asked about parking.

J. Bagg stated that he wanted to look at the building to the left of it as well. He stated they wanted to look at design elements to give the town the tools to have in place for when these places do change in the future.

T. Stratis asked about handicap accessibility.

J. Bagg replied that it would be the parking spot closest to the building.

W. Ritter stated that he thinks that they would need to consider all those buildings and the lack of parking in addition to Eagle Lake behind them. He stated they would require some specific redevelopment and that it could make a new building there difficult based on those limitations.

J. Bagg stated that in the second paragraph it said that the Planning Board via Special Permit could modify the layout dimensions. He stated that he always checks for that flexibility because that was key to a lot of that redevelopment and making sure the building placement was correct. He stated they need the flexibility but they also need the criteria.

J. Bagg stated that when the Board was speaking they said retail space and then apartments on top; he asked if they were envisioning a three story building options. He stated the bylaw has caps on all height limitations.

P. Harding replied it was 30-35ft.

J. Bagg stated that was something they could look about as well in order to give developers some flexibility. He stated 10ft each floor and then a little extra would fit into the 35FT.

J. Michalak asked what the rest of the Board was envisioning. He stated he was imagining more of a downtown feel with commercial and then apartments on top and green with sidewalks and landscaping to buffer.

P. Harding stated that one of the things that had changed a lot since they began speaking about this part of town was the Eagle Lake situation. She stated that would have a big effect and right now they have permission to draw it down in May so it would eliminate about 75% of the lake.

J. Michalak asked what that would change.

W. Ritter stated that it was change the aesthetics for buildings on the lake.

P. Harding stated that property ownership and parcel area as well.

O. Lies stated that he agree with J. Michalak. He stated that the Board would like to see the future of what they were doing because he was not sure how much the current owners were willing to do. He stated that until there is movement on the mill he does not feel the area will get a boost. He stated he did not want people to get discouraged though because they were looking towards the future. O. Lies stated that he thinks if they use some of J. Michalak's comments they could get a pretty good bylaw and then hope that the mill moves forward and that creates interest and incentive for other businesses. He stated he thinks this should be fined tuned a little more and then move it forward. He stated that he was interested in seeing what people in the area think about the change.

J. Bagg stated that the section was challenging the way the road goes through and with the traffic patterns and speed. He stated that he thinks that the zoning is the right place to start to prepare future development.

J. Bagg stated that he wanted to pull examples from this vicinity to show people what could be possible.

O. Lies stated that there was also a lack of a crosswalk but it was a state road so there was nothing that they could do as a town. He stated that they would need to work on that but there was probably something that could be done in the short term to request that the state put in sidewalk and to do something to slow down traffic. He stated that was not something that would be part of the bylaw but it was something they needed to look at.

J. Bagg stated that was a challenge. He stated that he thought they would want to push zoning forward first and then get it in a report to the state to look at pedestrian access and crossing. He stated that it was currently a huge disconnect for those two sides of the street. He stated that MA DOT may not work quickly but if it was identified on a plan, this one and then the Master Plan it could help push it forward. He stated that it would need to be addressed in the future.

J. Bagg asked about the Harvest Grille. He stated that they have a good size parking in the back and things like that are valuable for overflow.

J. Bagg stated that to firm up expectations, the current grant will not get this matter to Town Meeting but he did want to put together a packet for a plan for the area and what the Board wanted to do. He stated that they wanted to take another step towards bringing the zoning change to Town Meeting. He asked if there would be a lot of resistance from the people or would this change typically be something that the Town would go along with.

W. Ritter replied it could go either way and was unpredictable.

J. Michalak suggested having some renderings but to make sure that everyone knew they did not intend to take down buildings.

P. Harding stated that the area right now was a very sensitive one with Eagle Lake and she thought anything surrounding it will be scrutinized.

J. Michalak asked if they were going to do anything to make it look nicer once the lake was drawn down or if they were not there yet on decisions.

P. Harding replied it was to repair the dam. She stated that they were told to come up with money for the repair or to remove the dam; both were costly so the simplest solution was to draw it down.

J. Michalak asked if they draw it down was it useable space.

J. Bagg stated that he thought that was one of the biggest challenges and that he would want to add this component into the report so that when the time was right they could build it into the Master Plan.

J. Bagg stated that he would provide the Board with material before their December meeting and then come in to speak with the Board again.

P. Harding stated that the December meeting was not scheduled yet.

The Board thanked them for coming out.

MISC

P. Harding provided the Board with a comprehensive set of revisions for Greenwood. She stated that Con Com approved it at their last meeting. She stated it was on for October 24, 2017.

J. Michalak asked where it stood.

P. Harding replied that sewer was a concern but that she did not want to discuss it until the 24th.

P. Harding stated that with regards to Recreational Marijuana, the Cannabis Control Commission updated its rules and regulations and if a town voted against recreational marijuana at the ballot then they could prohibit it from being located in their town by a vote at Town Meeting. She stated that if they wanted to they could prohibit it with a warrant article at Town Meeting.

J. Michalak asked who would make that recommendation.

P. Harding replied the ZBA.

W. Ritter asked if they could recommend an alternative to banning it completely and putting it in the industrial zoning area in case things fall through.

J. Michalak stated that he received an email regarding Planning Workshops.

P. Harding replied that she distributes them yearly via email and that they were CPTC Training Sessions, not through CMRPC.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by T. Stratis, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 10, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MEETING AT 8:21PM.

APPROVED: _____