



TOWN OF WEST BOYLSTON PLANNING BOARD planningboard@westboylston-ma.gov
140 Worcester Street ** West Boylston MA 01583 ** Phone 774-261-4073

PUBLIC HEARING MEETING MINUTES

**Senior Center
120 Prescott Street
February 14, 2018**

Members Present: Vincent Vignaly (Chair), Marc Frieden, Cheryl Carlson, Barur Rajeshkumar, Paul Anderson

Members Absent: None

Others Present: See Attached Sign-In Sheet

All documents referenced in these Minutes are stored and available for public inspection in the Planning Board Office located at 140 Worcester Street.

The Chair opened the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m. Mr. Anderson read the notice into record. William Murray, Director of Planning (Places Associates) was present. Green card abutter notifications and proof of advertising in the Telegram & Gazette were provided by the Board of Selectmen Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Murray gave an overview of the project. Construction of the new senior center on the former Mixter Building property is approximately 11,350 square feet on approximately 13.8 acres. The building will be a single story, slab on grade, wood framed. The bituminous concrete walk that connects the central portion of the site to Horseshoe Drive to the east will remain. A portion of the existing ball field will be temporarily disturbed to place new utilities underground from Prescott Street to the building. It will be restored to the pre-development condition, matching the existing grades and grass types. A total of 51 parking spaces will be provided (48 parking spaces will be in the front and 3 parking spaces will be designated for the staff in the back); 12 parking spaces are being designated as "handicap accessible spaces". The access driveway off Prescott Street is proposed to be reconstructed in part to accommodate the connection of the facility's overall parking area, depending on bids received. Mr. Murray explained the "hydro-dynamic separator" that will be used for drainage. The drainage system for the site has been designed to meet DEP Stormwater requirements. There is a wetland; they have submitted a Request for Determination of Applicability to the Conservation Commission. Three separate exterior light fixtures will be used: (1) 16' tall, full cut-off light post; (2) wall pack which will provide down lighting around the perimeter of the building; and (3) flush at grade, spot, up lights for the flag. All will be LED lighting. No lighting is proposed along the edge of the ballfields because there is no activity at night. A fire services water booster station is being proposed. A new fire hydrant will be placed adjacent to the fire booster station. Landscaping trees will be ALB resistant. There is a dumpster which is fenced on three sides.

Mr. Frieden asked about the low-tech drainage idea and was there any underground piping between the initial basin and the older basins or was it through gravel. Mr. Murray explained that there is piping and trench stops which is a sheet of rubber with a wooden frame that goes around

the pipe and stops the water from following along the pipe within the trench; it stays and percolates back into the ground. They designed the drainage and sewer system with stops to make sure the water does not follow the sand and gravel that does into the pipe. The hydro-dynamic separator will be needed for one location.

Waivers are being requested for Sections 3.6 C.2.a) that the plans be drawn at a scale of 1"=20'; 3.6.C.2.e) review fees; 3.6.D.1)o) parking calculations shown on the plan; and Section 3.6.E.9) lighting impact. Mr. Frieden asked why they are requesting a waiver to not include the parking requirements on the plan. Mr. Murray said because they were included in the narrative.

Comments were received from the Building Inspector and the Fire Department. Mr. Herget was present and said they addressed the issue of the portico ceiling height; it has been resolved. He also said if the portico, which has a dry sprinkler head, could be built with non-combustible materials, a sprinkler would not be needed and would be a cost savings. Mr. Anderson read the Fire Department's comment letter which requested FISP to reconsider installing an emergency generator instead of the smaller generator being supplied for the fire pump so that the building can be used as an emergency shelter. Mr. Murray said the FISP Committee voted not to make it that type of facility. He said there are already reserve wires in place if the change is viable in the future. Mr. Rajeshkumar will bring the letter to the FISP Committee.

Mr. Vignaly asked how the hydro-dynamic separator will be maintained; can the town maintain it or is a contractor needed. Mr. Murray said a vacuum truck is needed for maintenance. He was asked if the sign complies with the sign bylaw and, if it does not, to request a waiver. He was told the fencing around the dumpster is required to include four sides. There is adequate parking for events. Mr. Vignaly asked if they used the old rainfall numbers for the drainage calculations or the updated numbers. Mr. Murray said they used the old numbers that are in the referenced drainage calculations. He said the basins are designed for vehicle maintenance. Mr. Vignaly asked about the flows going toward the basin and commented that the baseball infield area floods. Mr. Murray said there are two existing catch basins rendered inoperable by the town years ago; they will come out or be paved over. The curb will also be removed, and it will sheet flow as it does. Mr. Vignaly said the Parks Commission talked about turning the field around and making improvements and was hoping to have it ready to be able to use the contractor on site which could be a cost savings for the town. He asked was there any coordination with FISP to help that along? No. Mr. Rajeshkumar said the cost of the project would rise. Mr. Vignaly said the cost would go up, but the final costs would be less and would be taxpayer savings if they are working on the field and the building at the same time. Mr. Frieden asked if the bathrooms would be open for field use; no. The town has a 30' screening requirement around residential districts. Mr. Murray said what is existing now will stay; it is not being altered except near the fire pump that will have additional plantings. Mr. Frieden asked what the grade of the driveway will be after it is saw cut and the level raised; Mr. Murray said 5%.

Fred Foley (4 Linden Street) asked how far the new hydrant is to the building and was told 40'. Mr. Murray said it meets the Fire Department criteria. The Fire Department wanted the existing fire hydrant to stay, but it will be removed, and the town will have to remove it; it is no longer part of the scope of the project. Mr. Foley also had concerns with the access. Mr. Frieden asked if there was any construction that would possibly dig up the line underneath the existing hydrant; Mr. Murray said no.

Janet Halpin (90 Prescott Street) asked where the sewer line was coming in. It is coming from Horseshoe Drive and south of the existing path. Mr. Murray showed and explained the doghouse manhole they are proposing and pointed out where sewer line will be. It is next to the walkway. He also showed the placement of the temporary fencing and erosion controls. Construction will take one year.

Dave Femia asked about the sign location; Mr. Murray pointed it out on the plan. There are no signs on the building itself.

Peter Weiskel (49 Horseshoe Drive) asked about the detention basins and drainage. Mr. Murray explained the berm, the basin, the structure and how the storms would be contained. He also explained how they arrive at their calculations and said Cornell Engineering calculations were used for the 2-, 10- and 100-year storm.

It was asked if the lighting will be on all the time and if it was bright. Mr. Murray said the director of the facility will have access to control the lighting.

Before closing the hearing, Mr. Murray asked if he could verbally request a waiver from the sign bylaw. After discussions, it was determined that the sign appeared to comply.

Mr. Frieden made a motion to close the Public Hearing; Mr. Anderson seconded; all voted in favor; motion approved. A draft approval will be forwarded to Mr. Murray for review.

Date Accepted: _____

By: _____
Paul Anderson, Clerk

Submitted by: _____
Melanie Rich