

Approved: 8 / 17 / 2021

TOWN OF WINCHENDON

Planning Board



Signatures:

B. Gould
Les Goodrich
Opus West

Regular Meeting Minutes

July 20, 2021

Meeting held in Town Hall Auditorium

Members Present: Burton Gould; Art Amenta, Guy Corbosiero, Garrett Wante, Les Goodrich

Others Present: Alison Manugian, Brent Gleason, David Connor, Chris anderson, Wendell Orphe, Trevor Fletcher, Lionel Cloutier, Tiffany Newton, Camille Hart, Ben Olson, Jill Sackett, Danielle LaPointe, Jane LaPointe, Ryan Forsythe, Rick Lucier, Rick Ward, Suresh Bhatia, David Pollak, Julia Patten, Lisa Gauthier, Ken LaBrack, Chris Tompkins, Theresa Sazor

Chair Guy Corbosiero called the meeting to order at 6:35pm

Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance was lead by G. Corbosiero

The Chair offered an opportunity for announcements and public comments and none were forthcoming

B. Gould motioned to approved the minutes of May 18, 2021 as presented. A. Amenta seconded the motion and all voted aye.

L. Goodrich motioned to approve the minutes of June 15, 2021 as presented. G. Wante seconded the motion and all voted aye.

Public Hearing continuation – Site Plan application for site work and new business submitted by Mantis Management Group, LLC for a cannabis cultivation project located at 2 Juniper Street identified as Assessors' Map 5A3 Parcel 197

Chris Anderson of Hannigan Engineering and Wendell Orphe of Mantis Management were present to discuss the project.

- C. Anderson presented that the new plans and the plans for site plan review have been submitted and the DPW Director is in support of the drainage updates planned.
- Negotiations are ongoing with Walgreens' property owners regarding easement permissions
- A. Manugian summarized the items still outstanding or needing discussion:
 - The elevations of the building and the details of landscaping are still to be determined
 - Given the extent of the drainage work to be done a Performance Bond should be considered – the amount and details can be determined with the Planning Board or with the DPW in advance of a building permit being issued.
- B. Gould raised concerns about the project and the neighborhood. He feels the applicant should replace the drainage run through Pond St to the final outfall. He asked about the size of the pipe existing and expressed his opinion that the project team should have worked this out with the DPW already.
- A. Manugian stated that the DPW Director has no concerns about the project and she read his email to that effect.
- L. Goodrich noted that the loading dock and truck traffic will be at the front of the building and that access is off of Maple Street. He asked if this is a change from prior intent?

- C. Anderson indicated that this has always been the plan. Juniper Street will be updated with regrindings. Generally the trucks that will serve the operation are 30' or less.
- G. Corbosiero asked about hours of operation and typical deliveries.
- W. Orphe stated that they are working on the hours currently and expect to have work hours from 8am to 5pm. There will be no retail sales or public presence.

G. Wante motioned to close the public hearing. L. Goodrich seconded the motion and all voted aye.

The Board reviewed the conditions to be incorporated into any decisions granting permissions. All such conditions shall be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. If any substantive changes are proposed the applicant shall meet with the Planning Board to discuss and formal amendment may be needed:

- Performance Bond amount and format shall be finalized
- Final elevation and planting plans shall be submitted and approved by Agent
- Copies of Easements from abutters to be submitted
- Police Department shall review building and security plans and approve
- Typical Standard Conditions shall be included – add Cannabis Control Commission permissions to list of all required permits

G. Wante motioned to approve the Site Plan Submission, with conditions as outlined and standard conditions. A. Amenta seconded the motion and all presented voted aye via roll call vote.

Public Hearing continuation - Special Permit application seeking access to residential parcels other than through frontage submitted by Asher Construction for a project located on Weller Road identified as Assessors Map 5C3 Parcels 153, 222, 223, 224, & 225

Public Hearing - Site Plan application seeking permission to construct on residential parcels submitted by Asher Construction for a project located on Weller Road identified as Assessors Map 5C3 Parcels 153, 222, 223, 224, & 225

G. Corbosiero read the public hearing notice and both special permit continuation and site plan hearings were opened for discussion.

The applicant Ben Asher and Trevor Fletcher of Graz Engineering were present to discuss the project.

- T. Fletcher presented that there were washout or concerns in recent heavy rains
- He noted that the peer review letter has many items that are easily resolved and a few items to add
 - The project design doesn't currently mitigate for the 2, 10 and 100 year storms and guidance from the Planning Board is needed
 - The 80% TSS removal is typically required for commercial sites and there isn't room on this site to meet that standard.
- G. Corbosiero highlighted that this isn't a typical residential development given the steep hill, complexities and the changes following site clearing
- T. Fletcher clarified that the hardcopy plan provided at the meeting is the same as the previous submission.
- G. Corbosiero stated that the peer review has 6 pages of comments and asked how long it will take for the applicant to resolve these items in conjunction with the peer review engineer.
- A. Manugian opined that this work could be done in a meeting and that Board questions can be simultaneously addressed.
- B. Gould asked about the dark line labeled "D" at the bottom of the plan and what size this assumed drain line is.
- T. Fletcher stated that there is no connection planned to this drain line. Only a very small amount of runoff will go to the existing system in Weller Street.

- B. Gould opined that the site has no drainage – when he visited in May there was water 2” deep running down High St. He is concerned about the site sliding into High Street. He has yet to see a plan showing the wall related work on High Street. The current plans don’t have his support and are not fair to the abutters and Winchendon taxpayers.
- T. Fletcher stated that they feel the drainage is adequate but there is no added pressure in review.
- B. Gould opined that the applicant needs to return with a better design and drainage system.
- G. Corbosiero asked if the infiltration beds shown will capture all runoff.
- T. Fletcher stated that they are sized to capture most of the runoff – currently about 90% of the 10 year storm. The peer review highlights that more calculations are needed and discussion.
- G. Corbosiero asked about flow out onto Weller Street and the removal of the originally shown drainage channel.
- T. Fletcher stated that the stone drain west of the shared driveway will capture most of the runoff and that the swale on the other side will direct runoff to the infiltration areas. A channel drain could be added.
- G. Corbosiero indicated that this should be discussed with the peer review engineer.
- L. Goodrich stated that there are a lot of questions from peer review that are shared by board members and that need to be resolved.
- G. Corbosiero agreed and indicated he would like the typical list ultimately provided by the peer reviewer.
- L. Goodrich indicated disappointment that the applicant agreed to take down the remaining trees on High Street and that work has not been done.
- The applicant indicated that this task is on hold until all site work is approved.
- A. Amenta indicated concerns about the shared driveway – the property lines indicate that the driveway is owned by the three lower lots and the one uphill of the driveway.
- T. Fletcher indicated that this is true and that the responsibility for upkeep and controls will be on the three lower homes.
- L. Goodrich asked about the driveway width and ability of emergency and routine traffic to pass other vehicles.
- T. Fletcher indicated that the driveway is 17’ wide and that it’s not very long. Vehicles could pull off into yards if needed.
- G. Corbosiero asked about comments from the Fire Chief.
- A. Manugian indicated that there were no concerns expressed previously and that an additional review request will be made.
- G. Corbosiero indicated the next regular meeting is August 17th and the applicant indicated this is enough time to resolve the peer review questions.
- G. Corbosiero asked if there are members of the public here with comment on this project.
- Rosemarie Perry of 46 High Street indicated that she moved into her home late last fall and sees new cracks internally that are concerning. She has water in her basement and has discussed interior and external water issues with the abutter across from her home. Both feel this is partially due to the tree removals on this site. She has concerns about another tree falling and taking out the electricity as has happened in recent months. She asked where snow will be stored and how melt-water will be controlled. The exterior lighting on the recently sold second home shines into her bedroom and was on 24/7 for several weeks. This needs to be remedied for additional homes. She asked about overall erosion control plans and planned plantings to control erosion and runoff.
- A. Manugian indicated these questions will be incorporated in peer review discussions.

A Amenta motioned to continue the public hearing to August 17th 2021 at 6:35pm. L. Goodrich seconded the motion and all voted aye. B. Gould requested advance notice of any requested continuance to the September meeting.

Chair G. Corbosiero indicated a 5 minute recess with the meeting reconvening at 7:40pm.

Public Hearing – Site Plan application for approval to construct an amphitheater with parking and site work at Winchendon Community Park located on Ingleside Dr. identified as Winchendon Assessors' Map 5A3, Parcel 348

- G. Corbosiero read the hearing notice and opened the hearing
- A. Manugian summarized that this project hearing is open with the Conservation Commission for review and that it will be opened with the Zoning Board of Appeals tomorrow night.

David Pollak, Architect and Dave Lapointe, Engineer are here to discuss the project. They provided an overview and offered thanks to Robinson Broadhurst. The project summary included:

- Amphitheater with tiered seating for approx. 300
- Stage with cover and storage – including electrical service
- 50 space parking lot and overflow planned on the soccer field as has been done in the past
 - 123 spaces are required
- New sidewalk along Ingleside with lighting and then sidewalk proceeding to the stage area at a grade viable for wheelchair access and vehicles
- Site utility improvements include drainage and electrical – new 600A transformer then underground service
- Portable toilets planned for the amphitheater area
- The barn and garage will remain unaltered by this project
- The home will be demolished and trails retained.
- Security concerns for the park are much larger than simply for amphitheater events – no gates, securing etc proposed, barn has been an issue already and graffiti as well, a cell phone node and cameras are anticipated through town improvements not part of this project.
- A graphic shows the distances to nearby abutters and assertion that noise won't be an issue
- Streetlights will be compatible with others in town maintained by the DPW
- A Manugian indicated that there are a number of questions to be resolved
- B. Gould and L. Goodrich indicated that they are active with the Housing Authority, a listed abutter, but have no conflicts.
- G. Corbosiero stated he had served on the park committee over a year ago and has no conflict.
- B. Gould asked about a number of concerns:
 - What is the site size and what parcels are included – is it a 43 acre site or 52?
 - The intent stated is for no discharge of untreated stormwater, there is at least one stream currently and a lot of runoff through the area that doesn't appear to be addressed on the plans
- D. LaPointe responded that this statement is made in reference to the DEP stormwater management policy which speaks to the discharge from impervious areas, which are indeed treat here.
- D. LaPointe indicated that the wetland delineation was done by the previous Conservation Agent and a park volunteer and included wetlands impacted by the anticipated project. Another wetland located near the soccer field has been added from Mass GIS but was not field delineated.
- B. Gould indicated concern that the wetlands are not all shown and that the delineation wasn't professionally done. He indicated that there are items missing and that ultimately Whitney Pond is under Army Corp of Engineers review and control.
- D. Pollak stated that the wetlands delineated show the high water line and asked if there are other wetlands now shown. He's not sure he understands the concern.
- B. Gould stated that the wetland locations are the purview of the Conservation Commission. He is unhappy with the stormwater report and the basic information.
- D. LaPointe stated that the flagging was done in November of 2019 and survey in January of 2020
- G. Corbosiero asked for a summary of the parking area
- D. LaPointe summarized that they began with a traditional approach and open detention ponds. The Park Committee and Conservation Commission had concerns about the impacts and grading and the design was altered to use a pervious pavement system over infiltration hardscaping.
- A. Manugian updated that the DPW is not in support of the pervious paving, which requires frequent and specialized upkeep.

- D. LaPointe indicated that they will probably revise to a traditional pavement and drainage collection to underground infiltration units that outflow to the existing drainage area.
- A. Manugian suggested that a detailed Operations and Maintenance document with responsible parties would be helpful
- L. Goodrich asked about the grades and the proposed overflow to the north.
- D. LaPointe indicated that the parking lot is a high point currently and that the underground system will have sufficient slope to direct runoff
- L. Goodrich asked about trees and vegetation coming in from Maple Street in the walkway area.
- D. LaPointe stated that no new trees are proposed between the walkway and driveway, the existing swale will be retained and improved. Eight new trees (3 ½" caliper) will be planted between the walkway and the parking lot.
- G. Corbosiero asked about the driveway width and traffic patterns. The existing entry/exit will be retained and the driveway widths will match what is there now.
- A. Manugian asked about plans for additional parking should the soccer field be negatively impacted
- D. Pollak stated that the committee believes 50 spaces will be sufficient and that if additional parking is needed that will be addressed in the future.
- B. Gould asked about the need to get a curb cut from the State.
- D. LaPointe confirmed that a curb cut with expanded use will be applied for
- Brief discussion ensued about the starting point and source of the wetland/drainage run near the parking lot and other wetlands potentially not shown.
- A. Manugian stated that it would be helpful to see the entire parcel with all wetlands and to understand more of the long term plans for the Park
- G. Corbosiero confirmed that the Fire Chief has no concerns presently which is correct
- A. Manugian listed the last three questions she has and D. LaPointe responded:
 - A Cut and Fill analysis will be needed - Excess fill to go in cellar hold
 - Locations need to be understood for hydrants, call boxes and alarms
 - Is there a way to tell currently on-site which trees will be retained or removed - No
- B. Gould reiterated his concerns and indicated that while more work is needed this is a good effort

G. Corbosiero opened up to members of the public with concerns or comments/questions:

- Rick Lucier came up to comment as an abutter at 236 Maple Street
 - He attended a Conservation Commission meeting and spoke. He was asked to present comments and questions in writing which he has not.
 - The plans do not show a drainage pipe along the driveway or pipes from the soccer field.
 - There is a vernal pool in the area that isn't shown and outlets to Whitney Pond.
 - He asserted that a State Police detail may be needed for this section of Maple Street.
 - He has concerns about the impact of headlights into his home from the exit planned
 - He asked about the current field users when overflow parking is planned
 - He is concerned about an area near the barn where stumps and refuse were buried. How will this be addressed.
 - He can hear the commencement from the Winchendon School now and has noise concerns
 - He would like to understand the intent for tree removals and vegetation.
 - He doesn't want to see wildlife habitat destroyed.
 - He would like to see the project go to voters for final decisions as he feels there are other funding priorities
 - He believes that the proposed amphitheater will compete with the new brewery and gazebo for attendees.
- Ryan Forsythe of 181 Lakeshore Drive spoke:
 - He is strongly in favor of this project as a parent, community member and abutter. The project will use non-taxpayer resources to create a tremendous asset for the community.
 - B. Gould stated that there is a taxpayer expense in maintaining this project after construction and that the town has committed funds already.
 - R. Forsythe agreed and looks forward to supporting that ongoing maintenance spending.

- Tiffany Newton, Chair of the Park Programming Committee and a parent spoke to R. Lucier's concerns
 - She believes a rolling door will help control noise from the state
 - There are ongoing partnerships with other community groups and uses there is no conflict.

G. Corbosiero highlighted that the Planning Board is not to decide if this is a good or lacking project, but only to review in conjunction with the site plan regulations and bylaws.

- Jane Lapointe & Ken LaBrack of the Park Infrastructure Committee spoke
 - They look forward to the questions and discussion coming out of the Board's review – it's hard to tell what the tasks are for each Board
 - The amphitheater and parking lot only take up one acre – a plan to show the park is not a realistic expectation
 - Currently there are 38 letters of support that they have received, which were given to the Planning Agent.
 - Site Plan review seems to seem to envelop a lot more than she expected.
 - K. LaBrack clarified that the parcel is over 52 acres and the impact is only 1.2 acres
 - J. Lapointe asked audience members in support to raise their hands and a majority did so.
- G. Corbosiero stated that the smaller areas of direct impact will impact the larger site and elements
- A Manugian highlighted that the Planning Board, ZBA and Conservation all have areas of responsibility spelled out in local bylaws and regulations and in the State DEP rules
- B. Gould indicated he would like to see a peer review.
- G. Corbosiero indicated that he didn't see this as necessary and he asked A Manugian for her input; a general support of peer review any time the Board sees benefit.
- G. Wante indicated support for peer review stating that more information received sooner is always better.
- B. Gould motioned to require peer review from Tighe and Bond and to continue the hearing to August 17th at 6:40pm. A. Amenta seconded the motion and all voted aye following an opportunity for discussion.

B. Gould requested a 5 minute recess which was granted and took place.

The meeting resumed at 9:22pm and B. Gould motioned to adjourn. A. Amenta seconded the motion and all voted aye.

The meeting ended at 9:22pm