

Planning Board Meeting Minutes
May 25, 2022

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERKS OFFICE

2022 JUN -9 A 9:19

MEETING HELD IN PERSON IN MEETING ROOM 3 A/B
AND VIRTUALLY USING GOTOWEBINAR PLATFORM

MANSFIELD
MASSACHUSETTS

Present: Beth Ashman-Collins, Chair; Joseph Cerretani, Clerk; Sharon Friedman; Michael Feck; Brendan Roche, Alternate and Adrian LeCesne, Alternate

Shaun P. Burke, Director of Planning and Development
Priscilla McGill, Administrative Secretary

Absent: Ralph Penney and Michael McClanahan

1. Planning Board Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Correspondence

Minutes - April 13, 2022

Motion to approve minutes as presented. (Cerretani-Friedman)

Four (4) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, One (1) abstained PASSES

3. Form A (ANR) Plans

There were no Form A plans submitted.

4. Scenic Road Public Hearing - Williams St. and Old Elm St. 7:10 p.m.

7:10 p.m. Mr. Roche arrived at the meeting.

Scenic Road Public Hearing for roadway improvements to be made to a portion of both Williams Street and Old Elm Street. The applicant, the Town of Mansfield, proposes to remove and relocate approximately one hundred twenty-six feet (126') of stone wall and remove approximately four (4) trees due to drainage and grading issues within the right of way at Williams Street and Old Elm Street.

Rick Alves, Town Engineering Division was in attendance for the hearing. Mr. Alves explained the project scope as stated in the application memorandum dated March 31, 2022, Road Construction Plans by Town of Mansfield Department of Public Works (DPW), dated March 31, 2022, and submitted project photos.

He noted that the DPW project will consist of approximately 3,000 linear feet of scenic road with drainage improvements to a portion of Williams and a portion of Old Elm Street. There are a few areas of concern regarding tree removal and relocation of field stone walls. The first location is between 214 and 230 Williams St., where approximately 76 feet of stone wall needs to be pushed back to its front property line. A registered surveyor was hired to verify the front property line. The relocated wall is necessary in order to maintain a minimal 20-foot width of pavement.

Mr. Alves stated that the second area of concern is located at 190 to 206 Williams St., where two trees need to be removed. One being a 48 inch the other a 72 inch and both are at the edge of pavement and will become problematic when paving with roots being exposed and potentially destroyed jeopardizing the trees health. The other two trees located at 2 Jewel St. and 21 Williams St. are both dead and need to be eliminated due to public safety concerns. In order to accommodate the minimum width of paving and shoulder width, approximately 50 feet of stone wall will be relocated along the front property line. Mr. Alves suggested that if during construction additional trees need to be removed, that the DPW work with Mr. Burke to amend the permit accordingly. The location and type of tree would like to be left until the end of the project due to the strict limitations of the layout and would be confirmed with Mr. Burke.

Mr. Burke requested if Mr. Alves could explain pavement width versus right-of-way width and what is changing. Mr. Alves explained the scenic road existing pavement varies in width and concerns with paving and utility pole placement in relation to safety precautions. He further explained the property lines in relation to the rock walls and pavement maintenance to maintain 10 foot travel lanes, which is acceptable for this area.

Mr. LeCesne confirmed that there are no sidewalks in this area. Mr. Alves confirmed that when moving the stone walls the existing stone will be used and relocated maintaining proper slope, base, and leveling.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Motion: To approve the Scenic Road Special Permit as submitted (Cerretani-LeCesne)

Discussion

Ms. Friedman commented that the application was very thorough and well thought out. Mr. Alves further noted the difficulty with moving the existing trees and it would be best to replace them. He will work with Mr. Burke for location of new replacement trees. Mr. Alves also noted two drainage issue locations involving the existing culverts where existing pipe will be removed and replaced and permitted through conservation. They will also reconstruct about 100 feet at the intersection of Winter St. and Old Elm St. Mr. Alves further noted that the existing failed leach basin will be redirected and explained the proposed process.

Michael Anderson of 225 Tremont St. inquired as to the timing of the project. Mr. Alves said that the timeline has been moved due to the construction on the Balcom St. bridge scheduled for 2024. The drainage needs to be completed before the bridge construction and the drainage is estimated to begin this year with estimated reconstruction of scenic roads in spring 2023. Mr. Alves further explained the swales and conservation areas in answer to Mr. Anderson. Mr. Anderson asked about test holes. Mr. Alves also explained that test holes were done and alternatives for an inground infiltration system and required easement(s).

Six (6) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, Zero (0) abstained PASSES

5. Mansfield Crossing, 280 School St. Public Hearing to Amend Special Permit; 7:20 p.m.

Mansfield Crossing, 280 School Street Public Hearing to Amend a Special Permit under Section 5.5 Special Permits for Mansfield Crossing, 280 School Street to allow the inclusion of a grocery store/food retailer in excess of 10,000 square feet as a primary use within the Mansfield Crossing Development. The project site is owned by Route 140 School Street LLC and is shown on Assessor's Plat 012 as Lots 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 31, and 41.

Amanda Chisholm, Development Manager for Mansfield Crossing was present for the hearing. She stated that she is present for application to modify the existing Special Permit to remove the current 10,000 square foot cap. She explained that the goal is to increase the economic vitality of the center and mentioned that they have had an increased interest from larger than 10,000 square foot grocery stores for the vacant spaces. She clarified that they are not seeking new space, but for use in the existing available spaces and referenced the old NRG space at about 22,000 square feet and old Sports Authority space at 38,000 square feet. By filling the two large spaces it would bring in job opportunities and increase tax revenue.

Ms. Chisholm referenced the submitted Traffic Analysis letter from Ron Muller, who has worked with Mansfield Crossing from the beginning. The analysis concludes that re-occupancy of existing retail space with a supermarket use will not significantly alter the traffic generation characteristics of the center. She noted that trip monitoring after the Center opened showed less traffic generated than originally approved by the Town and to which mitigation was tied. Based on the recent department head discussion, current traffic counts will be conducted and provided.

Mr. Cerretani read into record the submitted department head comments, which are in the project file. Ms. Ashman-Collins clarified that what is before the board for decision is only the provision for limiting the grocery store to 10,000 sf. and that the Board is not being asked to approve a specific grocery store or chain. Any future proposed alterations or changes would need to be submitted as a new application to the Planning Board.

Mr. LeCesne inquired for future reference, what the timing process is for approval of additional street lighting. Mr. Burke replied that the process is typically over a year. Ms. Chisholm noted that increased lights requires further traffic studies to prove to MassDOT that added lighting is warranted based on traffic volumes or conflicts.

Mr. Cerretani asked why a 10,000 square foot cap was required at the time of original Special Permit issuance. Mr. Burke replied that there were traffic concerns and potential concerns with a large retailer superstore space of over 100,000 square foot. Mr. Burke referenced a recent SRPEDD traffic study at the intersection of Plymouth and School Streets meets the warrants for full signalization based on existing traffic at Mansfield Crossing and the Industrial Park. Mr. Burke referenced that Police Department referenced a similar site in Lynnfield which has an internal round-about. Ms. Chisholm noted that placement of round-about at Mansfield Crossing could have impact with significant push-back from existing tenants and could make the change difficult.

Mr. Roche expressed weekend traffic concerns relating to sports at the complex on School St. He inquired if similar tenants for existing spaces are required to come before the Board.

Mr. Burke explained that they would not, and clarified that what is before the board is to modify the existing special permit to increase the current 10,000 sf cap. Mr. Burke recommended that Ms. Chisholm have the traffic study completed and submitted to the Board prior to decision. He expressed his opinion that a grocery store would be a benefit to the site and the Board could also vote to change the cap to a slightly higher cap.

Mr. LeCesne asked if a future large tenant is interested, when is the next time to address the traffic. Mr. Burke noted that Plymouth St. versus the main entrance to Mansfield Crossing are different. Plymouth St. according to SRPEDD's traffic counts has met the warrants for full signalization and expressed his opinion that the Town of Mansfield should pay for that through the Capital Improvement program. If the new traffic study determines that at the main or secondary entrances to Mansfield Crossing needs to be fully signalized then the Town would not pay for that. He suggested that if the Board acts on the modification to lift the cap, that Ms. Chisholm still move forward with the traffic study, meet with Public Safety, and then have Ms. Chisholm return for a Site Plan when a tenant is known and at that time revisit the need for signalization.

Mr. Cerretani disagreed with the traffic study letter of not impacting existing traffic. He noted that it could impact morning traffic with a new grocery store tenant. Mr. Feck agreed and noted that the type of tenant would matter with potential traffic impact. Ms. Chisholm said that the traffic study would project counts based on a new grocery store tenant. Mr. Cerretani said that the average grocery stores between 20,000 and 60,000 sf. and suggested a cap at 40,000 sf.

Motion to approve modification to the Special Permit limit use in excess of 10,000 square feet to limit use in excess of 40,000 square feet for grocery stores with condition that the traffic study be completed and submitted to the Planning Board and that Site Plan approval is required for any new grocery store tenants. (Friedman-Roche)

Public Comment

Mark Corsillo of 1604 West St. asked if a traffic study would also include details on potential impact of specific grocery store. Ms. Chisholm said that is tricky without a specific tenant, but that if the tenant is known, they could add that to the traffic study.

Ms. Chisholm inquired that if the traffic study determines that a signal is not required would signage be a required discussion. Mr. Burke said that if warrants are not met then no signal is required and then internal traffic movements would be reviewed, which would include signage and pavement parking. Ms. Chisholm also noted that there are two existing pads that are undeveloped at the site.

Motion vote Six (6) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, Zero (0) abstained PASSES

6. Mansfield Crossing, 280 School St. Pylon Sign

280 School Street, Mansfield Crossing to amend existing Special Permit to allow an increased height for the Pylon sign.

Amanda Chisholm, Development Manager for Mansfield Crossing was present.

Mr. Burke apprised the Board of the previous preliminary discussion between Ms. Chisholm and the Planning Board where there was a concensus of support without formal vote prior to submission to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Ms. Chisholm applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals for relief on the height of the sign, which was approved. A condition of the Planning Special Permit stated that any variance granted by the Zoning Board requires the developer to come back to the Planning Board.

Ms. Chisholm summarized the approved Zoning Board Variance decision, which was submitted as part of this application. A compromise was established with MassDOT with a sign height of 60-feet and tree limb trimming would be allowed for sign visibility. She also referenced the letter submitted by MassDOT for support of the sign and tree trimming. The style of the sign will remain similar to the existing sign for consistency to what was originally permitted.

She said that she is back before the Planning Board requesting to incorporate the ZBA Variance as part of the original Special Permit. She presented pictures for sign placement, visibility of proposed sign, and noted that sign visibility will help to drive new tenants to vacant spaces at Mansfield Crossing.

Mr. LeCesne inquired if MassDOT will be regularly cutting/trimming the tree limbs. Ms. Chisholm noted that the developer will be required to trim trees by submission of a maintenance permit to MassDOT, they approve it, then trees can be trimmed.

Mr. Burke summarized that Ms. Chisholm is seeking a field modification requiring two votes. One to confirm if the change can be handled through a field modification and if the answer is yes, then then second motion and vote would be to permit the field modification.

Motion that the request does constitute a field modification to the Special Permit. (Feck-Cerretani) Six (6) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, Zero (0) abstained PASSES

Mr. Burke explained that a field modification is something that affects a condition of the Special Permit that does not go to the use.

Motion to grant the requested sign field modification to the Special Permit. (LeCesne-Friedman) Six (6) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, Zero (0) abstained PASSES

7. Around the Table & Continued Meeting Minute Approval

Minutes - April 20, 2022

Motion to approve minutes as presented. (Friedman-Roche)

Four (4) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, Two (2) abstained PASSES

Minutes - May 11, 2022

Motion to approve minutes as presented. (Cerretani-Friedman)

Four (4) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, Two (2) abstained PASSES

Mr. Roche inquired as to status of School Street and railroad bridge development of sidewalks or bike paths. Mr. Burke said that there has been discussion but he is not aware that it in the Town's survey improvements design phase. It will be looked at, but not a project for a number of years.

Ms. Friedman inquired as a result of the site plan review ATM approval, what is the status of administrative implementation process. Mr. Burke confirmed that he expecting a submission by the Consultant soon.

Mr. Cerretani asked about the Chocolate Factory status. Mr. Burke updated the Board that with the past issues of water damage they recently settled with the insurance company. Material has been delivered to the site but the work has not progressed. He has not been in direct contact with the general contractor for a status update, but that the Building Inspector has been told that they would be ready for CO's by the end of July.

8. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn at 8:30 p.m. (Friedman-Feck)

Six (6) in favor, Zero (0) opposed, Zero (0) abstained PASSES

Date of Next Planning Board Meeting: June 8, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.

Signature of Clerk

Date of Approval



