



Town of Mansfield
Planning Board

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERKS OFFICE

Meeting Minutes
April 26, 2023

2023 MAY 25 A 8:57

MEETING HELD IN PERSON IN MEETING ROOM 3 AND
AND VIRTUALLY USING GOTOWEBINAR PLATFORM

Present: Joseph Cerretani, Chair; Sharon Friedman, Clerk; Michael McClanahan, Acting Chair; Ralph Penney; Adrian LeCesne; Michael Feck; Brendan Roche, Alternate and Mark Corsillo, Alternate

Sarah Raposa, Director of Planning & Development
Priscilla McGill, Administrative Secretary

Absent: None

1. Planning Board Meeting Called to Order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Correspondence

Minutes – April 19, 2023

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted and amended per discussion (Cerretani – Feck)
Six (6) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, One (1) abstained PASSES

3. Site Plan Modification Bicentennial Ct./Hawthorne Ct., Mansfield Housing Authority, Applicant

Mr. Feck recused himself for this hearing.

Michael Andrade of Grave Engineering participated remotely. Josh Reinke, Mansfield DPW Director was present.

Mr. Reinke said that he was present for discussion relating to Graves Engineering's four waiver requests. He said that Bicentennial Court and Hawthorne Court are private ways and that there is no intent by the Mansfield Housing Authority to make them public ways. Mr. Reinke recommended that the Board grant all four waivers. If they should choose to pursue making the road a public route in the future, the Mansfield Housing Authority would be subject to numerous costly changes to make the road current to subdivision standards.

7:11 pm Mr. LeCesne arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Andrade said that the waivers requested are related to the budget and this is a significant project for the Housing Authority. Any additional asks to the submitted plan would have monetary fiscal impacts which could render the project not feasible. Mr. Andrade reviewed the four waiver requests and Graves Engineering responses clarifying the requests as submitted in their letter dated April 14, 2023. He further elaborated on the letter Comment #7 and defined the pavement reclamation process and suggested that

reuse of existing materials is a reasonable process for cost savings and a sustainable solution for a light traffic roadway with long lasting results. Mr. Cerretani asked Mr. Reinke if he does agree with the four waivers. Mr. Reinke said that to his knowledge, the Mansfield Housing Authority has no intention of making the roads public ways. Mr. Andrade confirmed that there is no intent of making the road public now or in the future. Mr. Cerretani noted that if that changes in the future, the Town would expect that the roads would be brought up to Town standards to make them public ways.

Ms. Friedman asked Mr. Reinke if it includes the angles between the drain manholes and into the pipes. Mr. Reinke replied that considering that the location is at the beginning of the drain line flowing into the larger pipes down the road, that he agrees with the waiver request.

Motion to approve waiver request - Comment #1 Requirement of a Professional Land Surveyor's Stamp. (McClanahan-Penney) Four (4) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, One (1) abstained PASSES

Motion to approve waiver request - Comment #3 Angles between Inlet and Outlet Pipes within a Manhole. (McClanahan-Penney) Four (4) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, One (1) abstained PASSES

Motion to approve waiver request - Comment #6 Sloped Granite Curbing. (McClanahan-Penney) Four (4) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, One (1) abstained PASSES

Motion to approve waiver request - Comment #7 Full-depth Pavement Reclamation. (McClanahan-Penney) Four (4) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, One (1) abstained PASSES

4. Site Plan 89 Forbes Blvd.; Whelan Associates, LLC, Applicant

Mr. Feck returned to the meeting.

The applicant submitted a request for continuance to May 24, 2023.

Motion to continue the hearing to May 24, 2023 at 7:05 pm. (Cerretani – McClanahan) Six (6) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, Zero (0) abstained PASSES

5. Discussion – Preliminary Special Permit Modification Reservoir Ave., Marco Crugnali

Marco Crugnali of Crugnali Properties went before the Board for discussion of a Special Permit modification at 30 Reservoir Avenue for a proposed extended stay hotel. He proposed to place this on pad number one of the existing site plan which is already approved for 6,200 square feet. The ground floor would remain the same and there would be five stories above. This would accommodate about 50 rooms with kitchenette for extended stay. The existing site plan parking would remain the same. Mr. Crugnali asked what he would need to do to accomplish this. The Board asked for clarification of the building placement and Mr. Crugnali presented renderings and described the placement. Conference rooms and meeting spaces would also be included. Discussion ensued for use of parking and building access. It was confirmed that the parking as approved is compliant with requirements. Mr. Crugnali also noted that the professional office building only uses the parking during the day. There is EV charging that is currently available at the site.

Ms. Raposa said that a hotel/motel is allowed by Special Permit Site Plan approval by the Planning Board. Mr. Roche recommended better pedestrian access with better signage. Ms. Raposa said she can further review directly with Mr. Crugnali as to whether a new or modified Special Permit is required so that he can move forward with the application process.

6. Site Plan CONTINUED –19 Knight Way Montessori School Phase II; FOD, LLC Emily Miller, Applicant

Emily Miller, applicant and Attorney Mark Lanza were present.

Mr. Cerretani noted that the public hearing was previously closed and this meeting is for consideration of approving the Site Plan application. He clarified that since this is a Site Plan, the alternate members cannot vote, but can participate in discussion. There were six voting members present.

Mr. Cerretani summarized his point of view. Per legal counsel, the project appears to qualify as protected use under the Dover Amendment and that this would have to be considered under educational and/or daycare use. He referenced the applicable previous Site Plan Bylaw rather than the new Site Plan Bylaw that could be used for decision.

Mr. Cerretani expressed that he feels that the 2017 Traffic Study appears to be valid and applicable to 2023 based on review by the Board and Town officials. He expressed his opinion that the public roadways are adequate to accommodate a peak increase of 800 vehicles per day.

Mr. Penney inquired as to the final police submitted comments. Mr. Feck read the Police comments from Chief Ellsworth as submitted dated April 10, 2023.

Mr. Cerretani suggested discussion on conditions to be added to the Board's decision. He recommended that the applicant provide a vehicular pedestrian traffic management and monitoring plan for the Traffic Safety Officer to approve, due to potential issues with queuing on site. The applicant agreed to that option. Mr. Feck said that he would like the applicant to provide a more detailed schedule for drop-off and pickup of students for the queuing. The current schedule would process 110 cars at 4 cars per minute without queuing and he felt that is not an accurate depiction and a Site Plan modification may be required. Ms. Miller explained that there is the extra parking area for cars to move to when unforeseen issues arise. She said that when the school opens they will monitor drop-off and pickup, but it should run smoothly as the parents learn the procedures and would not required constant monitoring.

Mr. Roche asked how the parking and drop-off/pickup information is given to new parents. Ms. Miller explained that there is a mandatory New Parent Information night every August before school begins and they distribute a handbook with details and maps. She offered that once the map and schedule is created with the assistance of the Traffic Safety Officer, she will share it with the Board. The school operates 164 days per year with four days of parent/teacher conferences and a Professional Development Day about once per month. They currently do not operate during the summer.

The Board agreed that past issues with public roadway parking by neighbors or parents would not have bearing on any conditions that the Board imposes to this application. Mr. LeCesne expressed his opinion that the 2017 traffic study should be limited to the Board's interpretation and margin of error when making a decision. He noted that there may be gaps in the study relating to the decision for this application. Mr. Corsillo agreed that the interpretation of 800 trips per day is reasonable.

Mr. Cerretani read a proposed condition for the planting of a vegetated buffer strip consisting of evergreen trees and shrubs to create a visual buffer between the street and the developed area. Ms. Miller said that currently there are 22 evergreen trees planted at the raised berm. Mr. Cerretani suggested that it should be reviewed and more landscaping should be added. Ms. Friedman said that she would like to include the planting at the island area as well. The Board agreed this is a warranted condition and suggested the submission of a revised landscaping plan. Ms. Raposa read her proposed standard conditions for Board consideration to this Site Plan. She noted clarification to times that contractors can be on site and when work could begin with restrictions to no work on Sunday or Massachusetts holidays, but not restricted to interior work. Ms. Raposa also referenced the proposed condition for vehicular management, which would be modified to incorporate the Board's comments. Mr. LeCesne asked what would trigger review of disputes to traffic or safety. Mr. Feck suggested that it would fall under the public safety officer to review disputes.

Mr. Cerretani recommended that a condition be added that the applicant shall provide annual confirmation that the applicant is engaged in a use protected by the Dover Amendment.

Mr. LeCesne suggested that the Board request a report from the Public Safety Officer referencing the date and time of any site complaints, prior to review of any future Site Plan modifications.

Conversation ensued with the applicant relating to speed monitoring devices. It was determined that this would not be the purview of the Planning Board, but that the applicant could discuss with the Police Department.

The Board agreed that the collaborative approach by all parties working on this Site Plan was appreciated.

Motion to approve the Site Plan with conditions as discussed and drafted by the Director of Planning and Development. (Friedman-McClanahan)

Five (5) in favor, One (1) opposed, Zero (0) abstained PASSES

7. Discussion – Mansfield Station Revitalization overlay District/TOD Bylaw Amendment

Ms. Raposa read a suggested parking language change relating to ground floor parking and Board discretion so that it promotes Board discussion for what the ground floor parking would look like for each submission as they may vary considerably based on size of the building.

The review continued with General Development Standards of the Bylaw amendment draft. Mr. Corsillo suggested adding more specific lighting language for the building pathways. Discussion continued and concluded that Section 4.3 provides general guidance and that lighting would also be a consideration at the Site Plan application review.

The Board discussed the redundancy of some definitions and sections to the overall Bylaw. Ms. Raposa agreed and suggested that a more in-depth review be considered in the future.

Mr. Penney asked if the five-foot building height exemption definition means the same as the Site Plan Bylaw as referenced on pages 15 and 16. The Board agreed that the language is different, but they both have the same meaning.

Mr. Corsillo suggested that proposed building material “asphalt” be removed on page 15 item E due to heat retainage. The Board discussed pros and cons of alternatives and decided to keep the asphalt reference.

Mr. LeCesne referenced Section H, subsection F - planting reference to native species or adaptive to region. He suggested striking the reference to “or adaptive” as it is too ambiguous and not well defined. The Board discussed the approved tree list and species subject to diseases. Ms. Friedman referenced a publication that referenced trees that grow in this region. Ms. Raposa said she would check with the Tree Warden and access the link to the prohibited tree list.

Ms. Friedman referenced the MBTA mixed use development, which would not be by right but would be by special permit. Ms. Raposa clarified that the MBTA excludes the portions of the Bylaw that are mixed use. The 30 units per acre by right use portion of the Bylaw would be used in order to qualify on MBTA communities to allow 30 units by right. If a project were to be approved with higher than the 30-unit density, the extra units would not be considered for the MBTA community counts.

Mr. LeCesne referenced page 17 section 5.c, “materials for non-residential uses shall be stored inside or under cover and shall not accessible to residences of the development” for further clarification. After discussion it was agreed that the reference is for building management materials.

Bill Clemmey, a developer, referenced page 18, Materials noting that wood and siding are not referenced, but they are the most used on projects and suggested adding both to the list of materials. The Board agreed to add the reference.

Reference was made to section 1.1.c for transpose letter of acronym and correct to EIFS.

The Board discussed page 20, roof profiles and set-backs as it relates to design and perception of size. The Board agreed that the text should be further clarified relating to the diagrams and descriptions.

The Board discussed the acronym of MSROD and whether to change it to MSOD and concluded to keep it as it is.

Mr. LeCesne referred back to page 10 for green stormwater infrastructure, the second-tier incentive and as this should be an automatic item for one to follow best practices. He suggested changing “should” to “shall” so that it becomes mandatory. Discussion ensued for best practices and minor concessions with agreement to further clarification at the next meeting.

Ms. Raposa suggested further discussion of the mixed-use component and referenced the comments provided by Mr. Clemmey and Attorney Bobrowski. She had conducted an informal poll of her peers and received feedback relating to 10% being an ideal number with additional feedback that some communities had 50-100% of the ground floor for mixed use. She expressed her opinion that the number should be lower than 25%. The Board discussed current trends for apartments, parking and mixed-use. Mr. Feck did not see that 25% would be a barrier to developers and feels that most of the spaces are being rented. Mr. McClanahan noted that moving further from the downtown area may be more difficult to have 25% mixed for retail. Mr. Penney referenced changes in trends and that the current market may be different than the future market.

Ms. Raposa referenced the MassPlanner Query responses which had been previously submitted to the Board. She summarized the responses noting that the comparison is not apples to apples, but for context only.

Mr. Penney referenced that 3.5 FAR is allowed for mixed use, which seems high, currently zone B1 is 2.5 and that seems high. He asked if the 3.5 FAR needs to be allowed to achieve 50 units per acre. Ms. Raposa clarified that although 3.5 is overly generous, it provides flexibility in design.

Mr. Friedman referenced page 22 for the affordability requirements that developments subject to this bylaw, that every 10th unit be affordable and noted that it is not what the current requirements are. Ms. Raposa clarified that it is different because it needs to comply with the MBTA community guidance.

Mr. Cerretani asked about the status of the early adopter to the MBTA community program. Ms. Raposa said that it was an early technical assistance program to help the communities understand where they are at by general guidelines and also help DHCD perfect their compliance model. The information provided by the DHCD is for how the Town should proceed in becoming compliant with MBTA communities. When the current Bylaw amendment passes, then that would be the benchmark for compliance and they would then review requirements for phase two and three over the next 18 months. She noted that the DHCD compliance model was only released a few months ago, but that she would review it further for the next discussion.

Mr. Clemmey spoke about Attorney Bobrowski's comments referencing the 25% requirement with incentives to gain more units and suggested an alternative consideration compromise to add incentives for allowing less than the 25% and add more public realm. He also asked for consideration to combine the waivers into one waiver.

Ms. Raposa noted that the May 10th Planning Board meeting will be the first public hearing for Bylaw Amendment. Edits will then be added for final language to be submitted for the May 24th continued hearing date at which time the Board will vote on the amendment.


8. Around the Table

Ms. Friedman noted the next CIP meeting will take place on April 27th.

9. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 9:56 p.m. (McClanahan-Penney)
Eight (8) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, Zero (0) abstained PASSES

Date of Next Planning Board Meeting May10, 2023 at 7:00 p.m.



Sharon Friedman, Clerk

5.24.2023

Date of Approval