

## Town of Groveland

# Economic Development Planning & Conservation Department Planning Board

183 Main Street Groveland, MA 01834 Brad Ligols, Chair Walter Sorenson, Vice-Chair John Stokes III Chris Goodwin DJ McNulty Jason Naves, Associate

Board/Committee Name:

PLANNING BOARD

Date:

TUESDAY, October 30, 2023

Time of Meeting:

7:00 PM

Location:

Town Hall, 183 Main Street

Groveland, MA 01834

#### **APPROVED 3-19-2024**

Present: Brad Ligols, DJ McNulty, Jason Naves, Walter F. Sorenson Jr.,

Absent: John Stokes III, Chris Goodwin

Staff Present: Annie Schindler (Town Planner & Conservation Agent)

<u>Public Present</u>: Steve Glowacki (912 Salem Street *representative*), William Bryan III (912 Salem Street *owner*), Mark Abare (912 Salem St *applicant*), Craig & Kathy Weaver (25 Cannon Hill Ave), Peter

Ellison (TEC), Jameson & Kelly Pelkey (6 Homestead Ln)

Note: Minutes are not a transcript; see the recorded meeting for verbatim information.

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, "An Act Relative to Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency", extended by the Governor on March 30, 2023, which extended permission for boards and commissions to conduct remote meetings, the Planning Board conducted this meeting in a hybrid format.

**MOTION**: Sorenson motions to open the meeting. McNulty seconds the motion. Voted all in favor, the motion passes.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**NEW 912 SALEM STREET**: In accordance with General Laws, Chapter 40A, as amended, Groveland Zoning Bylaw Section 13, and Groveland Stormwater Bylaw and Regulations, the Board will hear the application made by Mark A Abare, for the premises located at 912 Salem St Map 41 Lot 095, in the Industrial (I), Residential 1 (R1), and Residential 2 (R2) Zoning Districts, and owned by William T Bryan III, for a Site Plan Approval and Stormwater Management and Land Disturbance Permit. The application is for the construction of a contractor's yard and associated site work for the project. Ligols: *Reads the above notice*.

Glowacki: I'm Steve Glowacki, representative for the project with RJ O'Connell. We started with the Zoning Board and have since also applied for a permit with the Conservation Commission. We have also begun the process of peer review with TEC. The overall site is 22.3-acres with a residential home and associated structures. For this application, the entirety of the development will be close to the street, this was done to avoid turtle habitat while also meeting the needs of the applicant. Access to the site is currently provided by a driveway on Salem Street. The property is in three districts, but what we are proposing to be developed will be fully in the Industrial Zone. There is a 22,000 sq ft building with parking on both sides, with garage doors on both sides. It will be built to spec with no tenants when built. Stormwater for the site will generally be collected on the north side of the parcel, which will be sent to a stormwater basin. We will be making one pond a subsurface system. For the south side it will be collected through catch basins, etc. and will be sent to a basin on the west side of the site. It will mitigate, treat, and

clean the water before discharging. We did do some soil test pits on the site. We are compliant with Zoning. The modified plan shows a smaller building and it moved towards the south side of the lot, this was done after conversations with the Conservation Commission. We also clarified where the trash would be with an enclosure and gate.

Sorenson: So, it is a very large building on a very large parcel. Is this mostly treed right now?

Glowacki: The area around the existing buildings is clear, and we will be pushing out the tree line a bit more.

Sorenson: How many acres are you clearing?

<u>Glowacki</u>: I'm not sure off the top of my head. The back portion will be cleared out to the edge of the basin. A lot of that area is scrub. We are trying to maintain as many trees as possible. We will be filling in the back as the front portion of the lot is higher than the back. We will have some retention walls.

Ligols: Are you doing a chemical catch basin?

<u>Glowacki</u>: No, we will have the hoods, sumps, particle separators, and then we will discharge them into the basins. We have provided our calculations, and based on those we think they meet all the requirements.

Ligols: Depending on the use I don't know how TEC feels about the catch basins.

Glowacki: I see, you're worried about what businesses could be stored in the building.

Sorenson: This proposed tree line, is this proposed or existing?

<u>Glowacki</u>: The intent of the grading is to pull the tree line back, and we also have a robust landscaping plan. We are using larger trees around the border of the parking area; we don't want to fully screen the front so there is visibility from the road.

Sorenson: Those are being brought in by treescape?

<u>Glowacki</u>: We're bringing in trees that would be able to mature. The proposed tree line shown will be the remnants of the existing tree line of the site.

Ligols: Is this a phased project?

Glowacki: This is not a phased project. There are hurdles we would need to address to do that, wetland crossing, turtle habitat, for example. This project is outside of the turtle habitat. We have no further plans at this site, at this time. In terms of utilities, we will be pulling gas and water from Salem Street. We know we will have to coordinate with the Electric Department. We will have a septic system as well; its location is based on several setbacks. From a parking perspective, we looked at the ITE modeling and how many spaces would typically be used. We're showing a requirement of 36 spaces based on floor area and use.

Sorenson: Do you have an architectural plan yet?

<u>Glowacki</u>: No not yet, but we have provided some photos of what we are looking to do. A floor plan would just show a vacant building as we have no tenants yet.

Sorenson: How many fire hydrants?

Ligols: That's going to go to the Chief.

Glowacki: There is currently one in front.

<u>Ligols</u>: Depending on the use, the catch basin in a hood going to be okay? We have a lot of wetlands in the back. In Zoning a couple of comments were that we would like to see a wider lane into the site, some kind of a circle for turning for fire trucks and larger trucks.

<u>Glowacki</u>: We have compiled some turning exhibits for fire trucks, trash trucks, and box trucks. A tractor trailer should be fine if we widen the entrance. Additionally, we showed that a box truck could swing through the roll up doors that are on both sides, so they could theoretically get through the last two.

Ligols: That would mean that the last unit would not be rented.

<u>Glowacki</u>: No, we were more so showing this as the last unit will be the most difficult to get in and out of but they have this option got getting in and out.

Sorenson: You need to make access to the back of the building for fire.

<u>Glowacki</u>: One of the challenges with that is working with the Conservation Commission and they stipulate that parking must be outside of the buffer zone, so we would be impacting that a bit more. The challenge is the pavement in that area.

<u>Ligols</u>: Mike Dempsey is going to have to see the interest for public safety. It doesn't need to be paved.

Sorenson: Hammerheads don't work, from experience.

Glowacki: Sure, we can look into that.

Ellison: I'm Peter Ellison, with TEC the peer reviewer for the Planning Board. We had a good meeting with RJ O'Connell. To answer the previous question about stormwater, they were able to meet the treatment requirement through the parcel separators. I don't see how they would have a problem meeting that. Glowacki – have you shifted the location of the parking with the new plan to be outside of the 100-foot buffer?

<u>Glowacki</u>: Yes, that's correct. The goal was to shift everything out of the buffer zone. And the turning plan.

<u>Ellison</u>: Yes, that makes sense. One thing to take note of is that for uses like this, tenants sometimes like to store things outside. My recommendation is to only allow materials to be stored inside or to have designated outdoor storage areas.

Sorenson: Will vehicles be parked inside?

Glowacki: It depends, we're building it based on spec so we don't know who will be going in there.

Ligols: It's a heavily traveled road as well. For delivery there are some challenges there.

Sorenson: There's a signal going in there too. What triggered the lights going in there?

Ellison: It is one of the most dangerous intersections in the State according to the data.

<u>Glowacki</u>: To that point, we also supplied a traffic assessment of the property, primary focused on the sight line distance and the number of proposed uses. It's challenging because you're on the inside of the curve but based on the speed of the road they saw no issues. And Vanesse also reached out to the Town to get the information on the signal to take that into account.

Ligols: On the entrance of 24-feet, does that makes sense for TEC?

<u>Ellison</u>: It can work with 24 feet, especially if the applicant isn't anticipating any full-size tractor trailers going in there.

<u>Glowacki</u>: We don't have any objection to widening it. We were just trying to make it more palatable for the neighborhood.

<u>Naves</u>: In terms of the 50-foot setbacks, in terms of pulling the building further away from the wetlands and giving some relief with that frontage?

Planner: That would require a variance through the Zoning Board.

Glowacki: Yes, we are pinched in by various aspects on this site.

Ligols: So, no floor drains of any type?

<u>Glowacki</u>: No, it would be a slab foundation. For the ZBA we had submitted a list of prohibitions, fertilizer plants, car graveyards, etc. for the Aquifer Protection Zone. The building designed wouldn't lend itself to much modification either.

Sorenson: What about people who wash their trucks inside? Where would their water go?

Abare: We aren't going to have internal car washes there.

Sorenson: But you have to prepare for that regardless.

<u>Ligols</u>: Ellison what do you think about drains?

Ellison: It would be under the building code.

Glowacki: I don't want to speak for Abare, but I assume there will be businesses that are not allowed to lease in the building.

Abare: There's a lot of "what ifs" right now so we just don't know. If we put drains in the floor, aren't we promoting that people like change their oil in there? I don't want that kind of business.

Discussion regarding business that could have floor drains and what that would mean for future planning for the site, etc.

Glowacki: We can talk to the team to try to prepare for all eventualities.

**MOTION**: Sorenson motions to continue the hearing to November 28<sup>th</sup>. Naves seconded the motion. Voted all in favor, the motion passes.

# **HOMESTEAD LANE**: 30-foot no cut zone issue along Cannon Hill Ave.

<u>K Weaver</u>: I live at 25 Cannon Hill Ave. I'm here for your help. Years ago, a development went up behind us, known as Homestead Lane. There were 5-6 houses that went up and there was supposed to be a 30-foot buffer zone between that property and ours. It seems like the neighbors are not keeping up with that. They are constantly in the buffer zone, constantly cutting trees, and there is nothing we can do about it. They do it on the weekend. We called the police and there is nothing they can do. We don't want any neighbor problems. We are trying to preserve the 30 feet. It is lot 6.

Sorenson: There was a 30-foot no cut, no clear, walking only, absolutely nothing zone. We have had violations before. I see that here the concern is that there are some dead trees. Normally if you want to take something down you must replant two trees. I understand the concern with dead limbs at the top.

J. Pelkey (6 Homestead Ln): We've had a couple of them fall, some on the house, deck area.

K. Pelkey (6 Homestead Ln): They are tall thin trees that are hitting the home. We have two kids, and we don't want them falling on them. We want to retain privacy and the area. We are not back there clearing things. We did last year and now we know we shouldn't have. That is why we are here now to get proper approval. We are just concerned about safety.

Ligols: If they come in with an arborist and a safety issue I don't see the problem.

Sorenson: Then they would still have to plant.

McNulty: It doesn't say in the bylaw that if they cut down a tree that they have to plan two more.

J. Pelkey: The bylaws say if there is a dead tree you can take it down.

<u>Planner:</u> You are referring to the covenant, not the bylaw. It doesn't specifically note in the covenant who is enforcement is, so I had our Building Inspector go and take a look. The Planning Board is the entity that allows for the removal.

K. Weaver: There are not enough trees back there.

K. Pelkey: Since we moved in, we haven't taken anything out back.

J. Pelkey: We've planted stuff since we've moved in.

McNulty: Part of Sam's comment is that they didn't know before and they are going through the proper process. He also notes that he can't tell where they were originally cut, which makes me think it wasn't very impactful.

<u>Sorenson</u>: I would like to go take a look at this so I can see what's going on. I want to see it from both sides. I want to keep that buffer zone there.

<u>K. Weaver</u>: There is no buffer zone left. There are trees but there used to be a wall but then the big stone wall was built. I can see through Homestead.

J. Pelkey: We aren't looking to take everything out.

McNulty: It doesn't seem like you have a problem with your neighbor, you just want to make sure that the buffer remains intact.

<u>K. Weaver</u>: I want to rebuild it. I've looked into pricing trees. I was hoping to ask you guys tonight because we were promised trees in 2017.

Ligols: Who promised that?

<u>K. Weaver</u>: The Board. The builder came in and asked to be released of his bond and the Board said only if you plant the trees you promised and he said yeah and there was no trees.

Ligols: You can't ask these homeowners to do that.

K. Weaver: I'm not. I'm just trying to rebuild nature. Would the Board be willing to help us to plant trees?

Ligols: We don't have a budget to plant trees.

Sorenson: I will be in touch to schedule a site visit.

MOTION: Ligols makes a motion that Wally goes out and does a site walk. K. Weaver interrupts the

motion.

<u>K. Weaver</u>: So, what does that accomplish? Sorenson: I want to see what it looks like.

K. Weaver: And then what?

Ligols: And then we will come back with some kind of solution.

Sorenson: And I want to look into some things.

Ligols: So, the motion would be that Wally, or any other board member go take a look at it to come up

with some kind of solution. K. Weaver: To rebuild it?

Ligols: I'm only one of a five-member board. The Pelkey's should contact an arborist to confirm that the

trees are dead.

**MOTION**: McNulty seconds the above motion. Voted all in favor, the motion passes.

#### 929 - 931 SALEM STREET: Review of vault storage plans.

<u>Planner</u>: TEC is in the process of working on it. They only received authorization to start a couple of days ago.

Ellison: Yes, it will take two weeks.

<u>Ligols</u>: Do they have schedules on piping and hardware, or is it just the vault? We were supposed to hear updates on this every 3-6 months and we haven't. Do we have a timeline on when they want to start? <u>Planner</u>: Before the winter freeze. I included the special permit from this in your meeting packet and it notes that the Board will be provided with them for review so that is why it is on the agenda.

#### Ligols recuses himself.

**MOTION**: McNulty makes a motion to promote Wally to chair. Naves seconds the motion. Voted all in favor, the motion passes. *No Ligols*.

## 15 NELSON STREET/GROVELAND SELF STORAGE: Bond reduction request.

Ellison: The only item we had outstanding what that there is a portion of Nelson Street that was supposed to be paved per the original plans from the entrance to the facility to Salem Street. The hydrant was placed in a different location than originally planned, but I think that was squared away with the Water Department. There's an open trench on the side of the road that I assume is there to finalize anything with the waterline before it is backfilled. So, if you close up those two items it comes up to about \$14,000. We know of the 40B project on Sewell St so we assume Nelson St will be dug up in the near future, so there is an argument whether it should be paved right now.

Sorenson: Well Nelson Street is a private way.

<u>Planner</u>: The Town Clerk has recently showed me a document she found that notes that it is a public was. I can get more information on that.

Ligols: The former Road Commissioner confirmed that it is a Private/Accepted Road.

Sorenson: So, the bond reduction is to \$14,000.

<u>Ligols</u>: When we came back and talked about Nelson Street, there is a dovetail at the end of the street, coming down it's pretty bad. So, we decided to bring water in through 833 Salem Street. There's a repair needed on the trench. It had passed the first test and hopefully will pass the second test tomorrow. The problem is the neighbors because they encroached on the right of way. We said we were going to put the

hydrant in so we don't have to touch Nelson St, so we don't have to put it back the way it was supposed to be. Once the hydrant is in, I would like it to be fully reduced. The existing facility will be basically complete, we are working on the as built now which will be submitted when the whole project is finished. Sorenson: Do you want to just wait until you have the hydrant in to fully reduce it?

<u>Ligols</u>: We can do it all at once.

**833 SALEM STREET**: Construction update, request to reduce frequency of construction monitoring, and bond reduction request.

McNulty: The other part of this is to reduce the site inspections.

Ligols: Yes, I'm looking for every other week or when there is a rain event over .5 inches.

McNulty: Is this something we normally do?

Sorenson: Yes, based on stabilization.

<u>Ligols</u>: Foundations are going in now, the top of everything has been graded for the most part, the pond is in. The retention wall is in. The slab is all graded and will be formed and poured this week. The site is a bowl, there is nothing leaving the site, it's pretty stable. All of the stormwater features are in.

Ellison: There is a \$50,000 bond for stabilization. When we were there last Thursday the site was still an active construction zone, it was graded and compacted, but it is not fully stabilized. Is the intent to get it down this fall?

Ligols: The intention is to get binder down.

Ellison: Based on the current areas that are not stabilized, we recommend reducing the bond from \$50,000 to \$40,000. But it sounds to me like over the next week or two there will be more stabilized. It would be a higher percentage reduction if you wait. For the site inspections, I would recommend reducing it, it don't see it as a high-risk site.

McNulty: Then it makes sense to hold off on the bond reduction.

Ligols: I'm fine with that.

**MOTION**: McNulty makes a motion to reduce the frequency of the construction monitoring to bi-weekly from peer reviews. Naves seconds the motion. Voted all in favor, the motion passes. *No Ligols*.

Ligols returns to the board, Sorenson remains as acting chair.

MINUTES: Approval of the June 6, 2023, and June 20, 2023, meeting minutes.

Planner: Apologies the agenda should only have read the June 6, 2023, meeting minutes.

**MOTION**: Sorenson motions to approve the June 6, 2023, meeting minutes. McNulty seconds the motion. Voted all in favor, the motion passes unanimously.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**: Appoint a Planning Board member to the Economic Development Committee.

**MOTION**: Naves motions to nominate DJ for the Economic Development Committee. Ligols seconds the motion. Voted all in favor, the motion passes unanimously.

#### TOWN PLANNER UPDATE

Planner: At the last meeting the Comprehensive Master Plan was approved, and Inness and Associates submitted it to the MMA for their Comprehensive Master Plan awards. Billis Way has submitted their as built and TEC has done their first review. The taxes on the two parcels that are to be donated to the Town have been paid for. 895 Salem St, they have submitted their as built and TEC has done their first round of comments, they should be able to be on the next meeting for as built acceptance and bond reduction. Lastly, the Katie Lane/106 King Street is going well.

# OTHER ITEMS NOT REASONABLE ANTICIPATED AT TIME OF POSTING

None.

**NEXT MEETING** November 28, 2023

# **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION**: Sorenson motions to adjourn. McNulty seconds the motion. Voted all in favor, the motion passes unanimously.