

PLANNING BOARD MEETING

Tuesday, June 27, 2023 at 6:00 PM

Town Hall - 41 South Main Street Randolph, MA 02368

MINUTES

Pursuant to the temporary provisions pertaining to the Open Meeting Law, public bodies may continue holding meetings remotely without a quorum of the public body physically present at a meeting location until March 31, 2025.

The public is invited to participate in the meeting via telephone or computer.

A. Call to Order - Roll Call

Called to order at 6:02pm by Chairman Plizga

PRESENT
Alexandra Alexopoulos
Tony Plizga
Nereyda Santos-Pina
Peter Taveira
Lou Sahlu

B. Chairperson Comments

C. Approval of Minutes

1. Minutes June 13, 2023

Motion made by Taveira, Seconded by Santos-Pina to approve the minutes of June 13, 2023.

Voting Yea: Alexopoulos, Santos-Pina, Taveira, Sahlu

Voting Abstaining: Plizga

D. Public Speaks

Ann Naughton of Meadow Lane noticed the meeting was not posted on the website. Planner Tyler said that it was legally posted in the Town Clerk's office on Friday, June 23, 2023. The website was corrected as soon as she became aware of it.

E. Public Hearings

1. Randolph Road - Site Plan and Design Review CONTINUED (6:15pm)

On the continuation of the hearing for the project at Randolph Road, Planner Tyler had Alex Escamilla introduce the project team: Benjamin Mueller, Mark Ford, Kevin DeMars, Robert Buckley, Luke Norton, and Gary McNaughton.

Planner Tyler provided a brief update. The hearing was opened at the last meeting which included a presentation by the project team and public comments and questions. The hearing was continued to this evening. Following the meeting, the Planning Board submitted questions in writing to the project team. Planner Tyler has been in contact with Fire Prevention as to the location of hydrants and a potential gate to deter truck traffic from accessing the portion of the property closest to residential abutters. The Board received some modifications to the plans. The project's hearing before the Conservation Commission has been opened and continued, as well.

Alex Escamilla, Head of Development for Bluewater Property Group, provided a summary of some of the topics that will be discussed tonight and outlined the project details on the plans.

Ms. Escamilla introduced Luke Norton with Sanborn, Head & Associates, Geotechnical Engineer on the project. Mr. Norton was involved early in the project conducting subsurface explorations, a series of standard tests pits and borings, and even some limited rock coring. Once those explorations were completed, they used the information gathered along with lab results to inform their recommendations related to site foundations and support for storm water and retaining wall development.

The site is predominantly glacial tills that are suitable for building construction. They also identified shallow bedrock at various site locations and provided recommendations related to the foundation system and bedrock removal and the reuse of excavated materials to provide a balanced site. Mr. Norton showed the Board examples of the bedrock cuts (vertical wall with exposed face of rock) proposed on site which includes a rock-fall zone. He reviewed the construction and material of the proposed retaining walls that contain geo-grid reinforcement buried into the soil behind the wall.

Ms. Escamilla introduced Benjamin Mueller for further discussion on the sound. She noted they had received some questions regarding the decibel levels on the eastern side of the truck court and since re-ran the analysis showing additional features.

Mr. Mueller showed the updated plan which now has a 10-foot wall for sound screening and coverage on the eastern side of the truck court. Adding this feature brought the noise level down from 50 decibels to 41. He showed the concept detail of the wall which is a cityscape product that provides a large mouth gate area with matching panels. Ms. Escamilla noted that the gate is not for security reasons so it will not need to be locked, it would only need to be accessed in the event of an emergency.

Ms. Escamilla showed the Board renderings that show the relationship of the residential abutters to the parking lot below, as well as a rendering of what they will see through the trees from their property. She displayed a section view that showed the closest abutting residence in relationship to the vegetation, bedrock wall, rock fall zone, parking lot and building. Based on some photos from residents, she was able to confirm that they would be able to keep about 30 feet of existing vegetation screening

between the residential property and the project. Their goal is to keep as much of the mature growth as possible with additional landscaping where sparse. Ms. Escamilla invited architect, Mark Ford, to speak. He briefly discussed the plans and noted the significant difference in grade between the properties.

Board Questions & Follow Up

<u>Air Quality Impacts:</u> Report submitted to Planning Board, prepared by Tech Environmental on June 20, 2023

Randolph Road Details: Additional analysis prepared by Ostegaard Acoustical Engineers; additional solid fence system proposed as show on revised plan by DiPrete Engineers

<u>Visual Follow Up</u>: Additional view and section diagrams presented; phone calls with abutters clarifying visibility

<u>Planning Board Questions:</u> Questions received on 6/23/2023 - Team to run through each question with response and clarifications.

<u>Rockwall/Bedrock natural stone face:</u> Mr. Buckley noted that since the project inception, one of the critical components was to mitigate any impact on abutting residential properties. The rock face minimizing grading and preserves the mature vegetation along the perimeter supplemented by additional plantings in any gaps in the existing vegetation.

Considering the 10' removal for overburden at the top of the bedrock and the size of the rockfall zone, Chairman Plizga is concerned there won't be as much of a vegetation buffer between the properties and wondered if the rockfall area could be minimized. Mr. Norton noted it could not be any less than 12-15'. Chairman Plizga asked if there is any way to shorten up the 60' isles for the truck court so the building could be shifted back to maximize the buffer. Mr. Buckley noted that to relocate the building at this point would be a monumental task as all the project calculations have already been prepared. There was a discussion regarding ways that the catchment (rockfall) area and overburden area could be minimized to preserve/increase the vegetative/landscape buffer. Mr. Buckley suggested a condition whereby the applicant would endeavor to minimize the catchment area. Chairman Plizga would like the team to look at ways they could keep the vegetated area to a minimum of 25 feet. Mr. Buckley said they will seek to minimize the catchment area where possible, and where safety outweighs the ability to do so, they would enhance screening in that area. Mrs. Alexopoulos does not want to sacrifice too much on the safety side and would like screening (plantings) added with attention to placement.

<u>Fencing:</u> The fence along the Broadmeadow side will be 6' tall redwood fence at the top of the bedrock wall. There is a 10' sound barrier wall. There is a green coated chainlink along the driveway retaining walls.

<u>Dumpster/Compactor Pad:</u> Dumpster will be located near the pedestrian entrances in the truck court and the compactors in the dock locations marked in blue.

<u>HVAC Units:</u> Chairman Plizga asked if sound barriers could be placed around the units. Ms. Escamilla noted that they have a 4' parapet proposed for around the

building which will screen the units quite a bit. Mr. Mueller said the parapet was not factored into his sound models, but believes it will provide enough of a screening.

Outside amenities (smoking areas, benches etc): Ms. Escamilla said they did not have anything like that planned, but may come in the future via specific tenant request.

<u>Stonewall:</u> Chairman Plizga asked if the stonewall on the property line behind Broadmeadow would be disturbed. Ms. Escamilla said it would not. Chairman Plizga said he will make that a condition on the decision.

<u>Sheet 5/Disturbance Area:</u> Chairman Plizga asked about the disturbance area marked in orange on the plan that shows work out onto North Street. Kevin DeMers noted that area is where they will need to access the gas main on North Street. They are checking with Eversource for a more detailed location.

Improvements on Randolph Road: a revised set of plans were submitted along with a cross section detailing the improvements to Randolph Road. The top course will be milled and saw cut at the driveway openings as applicable along Randolph Road. The utilities will be trenched and backfilled along Randolph Road from the North Street intersection. At the driveway openings, the top course will match existing pavement. Replacement of asphalt sidewalk at the existing location on the north side of Randolph. They proposed granite curbing on either side of the intersection transition from North Street to Randolph Road.

Ensure property line is delineated, ensure protection of abutting trees and shrubs during grubbing and clearing, soil erosion: Kevin DeMers noted they have a slip prepared for the project and per section 6.1 they will need to locate the limit of disturbance and inspect this once every 7 calendar days or when rainfall is greater than a quarter of an inch.

<u>Future rooftop solar, photovoltaic array?</u>: Yes, the building will be structurally designed for an extra 5 pounds per square foot to accommodate future solar install. They plan to install EV charges on site.

<u>Plans to mitigate impacts of storms, ie heavy snow?</u>: They will have snow storage areas identified on site - a combination of snow melt, snow storage and if required, trucking off.

<u>Concerns for wind and flooding:</u> Designed for 100-year storm. Added some grading to the passenger car lot to allow for some ponding and then for an extreme storm event, any extreme flow that backs up from the drainage system would drain down the roads north and south of the building.

<u>Any water reclamation?</u>: Ms. Escamilla noted a building like this has a small water usage that the gray water/reclamation is great for more water intensive warehouse uses, for this facility it is such a small amount.

<u>Clarify the number of anticipated daily trips:</u> 78 passenger vehicles entering and existing per day. 36 trucks entering and existing per day. Mr. Sahlu asked how they arrived at that number. Mr. McNaughton said they look at peak house and estimated 1-2 trips per hour, but a facility like this tends to have traffic pretty evenly spread out over the course of the day. This is proposed to be open 24 hours per day.

Mrs. Alexopoulos asked if it is possible to get the planting screening for abutters as soon as possible during the process? Ms. Escamilla noted that the landscaping is typically completed at the end of the project. She can certainly take a look at mobilizing the landscaping team to get those in place during construction, but seasonality also is a factor for the plantings to be successful.

Mr. Taveira asked about snow building up on the roof and the load bearing capabilities? Mr. Ford noted that building code takes that into consideration. Ms. Escamilla noted that Massachusetts has one of the most stringent codes in New England. Mr. Taveira commented that water reclamation from the rooftop would be a good use for things like irrigation on site rather than drawing from a well.

<u>Building Finish and Styles:</u> Mrs. Santos-Pina wondered where the signage would be placed if there was a third tenant. Ms. Escamilla noted the signage would be placed in the center "knockout" of the building.

Chairman Plizga asked the team to consider a policy that limits the use of horns, especially considering the 24 hour usage.

Chairman Plizga would like to continue the hearing to come back with a list of draft conditions discussed tonight.

The construction time frame to be within 2-years, as-built within 90 days after that.

At the next meeting, Chairman Plizga would like to discuss the intersection at North and Oak. He plans to bring forth a mitigation number to help with the cost of the street light system and will bring forth a number at the next meeting after discussion with the DPW Superintendent. Chairman Plizga said the applicant's share would be a quarter of the cost, understanding that light systems range from \$400,000 to 1 million.

Mr. Buckley summarized the items covered tonight. He asked if any plans for the intersection at North and Oak have been prepared? Planner Tyler noted they have not, that funding is being provided by the State to begin the engineering study. Mr. Buckley noted State funding is sometimes contingent upon the preparation of plans. He would like to discuss this further as it may be an area where they can make a meaningful contribution.

Motion made by Plizga, Seconded by Alexopoulos to continue the public hearing for Randolph Road to July 11 at 6:15pm.

Voting Yea: Alexopoulos, Plizga, Santos-Pina, Taveira, Sahlu

2. Subdivision - Mill Street (continuation)

Planner Tyler noted that they are working through a potential easement for a water line. The attorney for the applicant is trying to negotiate a deal with the abutter, so they did ask for a continuation to July 11. She asked for them to formalized the request in writing as it has been 90 days from since the hearing open, which she received by email.

F. Old/Unfinished Business

1. Subdivision - Pham Estates - Overhead Electric Service

Chairman Plizga was not present for the last meeting, but has viewed the entire meeting and signed an affidavit so that he is able to participate in any proceedings this evening.

Planner Tyler gave an overview of the project noting the the applicant has provided the Board with an electrical plan from National Grid which includes the installation of two electrical poles for overhead utilities, as opposed to underground utilities required by the subdivision rules and regulations. At the last meeting, the Board had some concerns over the placement of the poles. With only four members present, a vote was taken and failed. Applicant, Mr. Pham and his engineer, Mr. Bunavicz asked to come back when the full Board was present.

Chairman Plizga has driven by the property and took some photos, he noted that the first pole by the road has been installed.

Mr. Bunavicz of Borderland Engineering was present on behalf of the applicant/owner Mr. Pham. He noted that the underground power was never on the subdivision plan. In order to get the building permit issued over a year ago, the roadway had to be constructed for the bond to be released by the Planning Board. At this point, it would be a costly to dig up the road to install the underground electrical service.

Chairman Plizga explained that the subdivision plan never showed the designation of the electrical service. Both parties missed it from the start. He showed the Board some photos taken from South Main Street to get an idea of how close the poles are from the neighboring residences. Chairman Plizga believes the best course of action is to put the utilities underground, as the road only has a base course. A trench could be dug and patched in before finish pavement is installed.

Mr. Bunavicz feels this issue has gone back and forth with the Board several times and his interpretation of previous meetings and conversations was that all the Board needed at this point was to see the locations of the poles.

Chairman Plizga's recalls that two weeks ago, was the first time the sketch was presented to the Planning Board. Prior to that, he remembers the Board requesting to see that pole locations on a plan for an administrative review based on what came back.

Mrs. Alexopoulos asked when the project first came before the Board? Planner Tyler noted back in 2020. And, how the Board missed it? Chairman Plizga noted that both Planning and Engineering missed it. He believes the Subdivision Regulations still stand and since the road is not finished, they could still install the utilities underground. If the road was finished, he would feel differently about it.

Mr. Bunavicz noted that there was a waiver form submitted on the original subdivision showing a cross section detail that would have shown the underground electrical that was approved. Chairman Plizga noted if it was missed on the plan it would not be shown on the cross section either, and that again, all parties missed it. Mr. Bunavicz noted that most of Randolph has overhead lines.

After some discussion, Chairman Plizga entertained a motion.

Motion made by Plizga, Seconded by Taveira to deny the overhead electrical service as presented on the sketch dated April 1, 2023 by National Grid and require that the electrical service go underground from pole 81, as shown on the sketch.

Voting Yea: Plizga, Santos-Pina, Taveira

Voting Nay: Alexopoulos Voting Abstaining: Sahlu

G. New Business

1. ANR - 34 Scanlon/High Street

Planner Tyler explained that one of the conditions of the Scanlon Drive project was to combine the multiple lots into one conforming lot in order for construction to proceed. She presented the plan and notes with a mylar for signatures.

Motion made by Plizga, Seconded by Santos-Pina to approve the ANR drawing sheet one of one, issue date of 3/9/2023 for the project location of 451 High Street and 34 Scanlon Drive in Randolph, MA..

Voting Yea: Alexopoulos, Plizga, Santos-Pina, Taveira, Sahlu

H. Staff Report

- *Active Subdivision Review
- *Active Project Review
- *Upcoming Projects

33 Mazzeo Drive/Splash Car Wash - Windows needed to be removed due to the location of mechanicals on the block wall. She received a drawing that shows an alternative to the windows by filling in the space with two graphic details. Mrs. Santos-Pina asked how these images would be applied. Chairman Plizga thinks for symmetry they should apply the water drop graphic to the right side as well.

249 Allen Street - The contractor and owner have had a significant disagreement that may or may not have resulted in some damage to the site and Cultech system. Grading on the site needs to be redone, as there has been some erosion creating an unstable site.

647 North Main Street/Daycare - Continuing work. Working with MassDOT for a traffic signal. There was discussion with an abutter about chainlink fence versus a vinyl fence which the applicant was not in favor of.

30 South Main Street/Daycare - Planner reached out requesting that they move along with signage. They sent over 3 designs, 2 of which will require ZBA approval.

19 Highland Avenue - sidewalk work has been done. Trying to do some grading in anticipation of landscaping this fall. They are doing some excavation to locate cooler and compressor units. Building Inspector is continuing his interior inspections.

34 Scanlon Drive - ANR complete, they still need their storm water permit.

Mexicali Grill - It appears that the 12 1/2' driveway is actually on the Mexicali property not the Grow Associates property and there is a right of easement for travel. Planner does not believe the matter will be back before the Board and will be handled between the parties.

Popeyes - gave applicant 90 days to install gate, which has not been done yet. Planner will follow up. Planner had a visit from the director of Grow Associates over continued concerns with the trash and traffic from Popeyes and what they can do on their own site to mitigate with some speed cushions and signage.

MBTA Zoning - Planner sent an invite to the Board for a joint meeting on August 2 meeting with RKG Associates and the Town Council.

Zoning Analysis Audit - longterm project to rewrite the zoning making them easier to read, easier to access and comply with statutory law. Planner will be seeking funding to hire a consultant.

Chairman Plizga asked what the Planning Board's role in the Master Plan process. Planner noted that Planning Board has statutory authority over it so the Board would need to decide if they should move forward with the update and take a vote.

I. Board Comments

J. Adjournment

Notification of Upcoming Meeting Dates

Adjourned at 8:30pm