

**Rowley Planning Board Minutes
For Regular Meeting on June 29, 2016
Approved on October 12, 2016**

Members present: Chris Thornton (Chairman), David Jaquith (Vice Chairman), Cliff Pierce (Member), Curtis Bryant (Member), Mark Savory (Member) are present.

Larry Graham (Engineer/Technical Review Agenda), is also present.

Jean Pietrillo (Associate Member) is absent.

Thornton calls the meeting order at approximately 7:30 pm. He notes there is only one item on the agenda which is the continued public hearing for the proposed Medical Office/Daycare buildings located at 414 Haverhill Street.

Continued Public Hearing:

414 Haverhill St – Medical Offices/Daycare – SPR

The developer and applicant, John Coughlin is present. Also present are: Charlie Wear, P.E. of Meridian Associates, and John Mueller, the applicant's Traffic Engineer. Wear states they have received the peer review comments from the Planning Board Technical Review agent, and, from the Conservation Commission's peer review consultant and there is much overlap in the comments between the two reviewers. Wear states that they have made their revisions and had resubmitted the plans earlier in the week. Wears indicates that he is willing to go over those revisions with the Planning Board at this time.

Wear begins by noting the modification made to the increased amount of additional landscape vegetation for the proposed rain garden to be located between the parking area and Haverhill Street. He notes the parking area was pushed back to make room for the proposed raingarden. Wear further notes that, per the Board's recommendation that they have added landscaped parking islands to the plan as well.

Thornton then asks Wear if the proposed additional plantings do not come into conflict with sight lines at the entrance onto Haverhill Street. Wear states the planting locations, as proposed, will not interfere with sight visibility at the entrance.

Wear then discusses some modifications to the elevations of the catch basins for the site. He notes that the edge of the rear basin which had been just within fifty feet of the wetlands was relocated so as to meet the 50-foot buffer requirement pursuant to stormwater management design requirements. He then states that, per the Conservation Commission peer reviewer's recommendation, they agreed to install an offline configuration water-quality device that would capture and treat stormwater runoff from smaller storms carrying a more concentrated pollutant load, but also, allow the more diluted runoff loads from bigger storm events to bypass the unit.

Pierce asks about the effect on the parking requirement, due to the loss of four spaces from the reconfiguration. Wear notes they are required to have 102 spaces but are proposing 116 parking spaces.

Bryant asks Coughlin if his arrangement with his tenant will be affected. Coughlin notes that they have a good faith agreement in place, but he notes he had hoped to have completed the process sooner. Thornton notes this is the second meeting. Wear states that it took sixty days to hold the public hearing (NOTE – actually 50 days) and states that he submitted the application on March 27 (NOTE – the actual submittal date was April 6) with the public hearing being held on May 25. Bryant notes that 21 days is the bare minimum timeframe required to carry out the required notifications, and that there is also the time required to conduct departmental and peer reviews. Graham notes that several rounds of comments had occurred allowing them to resolve a number of issues prior to the public hearing.

Wear also discusses the addition of signage and markings that would prohibit vehicles from blocking the driveway. He turns the discussion over to John Mueller, the traffic engineer gives his summary of the traffic study conducted at the intersection of Route 1 with Haverhill. He goes over the times during which the counts were conducted, and the crash history of which

there was a significant number, resulting from, in his assessment, from the large number of turning movements posed by the intersection's design.

Mueller further mentions that MADOT has an improvement plan for the subject intersection and its recommendation has been to install new left signal turns that will include a flashing signal indicating that oncoming traffic should yield. He also notes that although the counts between Route 1 (north to south) and Haverhill Street (east to west) are essentially equal, the signal timings favor Route 1 traffic, thus backing up the traffic flow along Haverhill Street. Mueller states that he has already made an informal recommendation to MADOT that modification to the signal timing is necessary. Pierce states he would like to receive something in writing from the State that they will follow through with the signal timing modifications.

Thornton asks about the entrance width if there is enough room for vehicles to stack in order to do both left and right turns out of the site. He states this would be most needed at times when daycare pickup traffic is added to the hourly traffic exiting the medical facility. Mueller responds no there is not sufficient space to do both at the same time, but that the daycare pickup times are staggered over a three-hour period, and the volume of traffic flow should be more dispersed over that period of time.

Graham notes that the eastbound speed limit drops abruptly from 45mph to 25mph. He suggests that they look at making the transition more gradual. Mueller states that MADOT would have to approve the change, but first, a speed study would have to be done. He suggests installing the yellow traffic warning signs which don't require MADOT approval.

The Board also discusses the width of Haverhill Street, whether there is enough space so that vehicles stacked at the entrance for a left turn into the development won't cause westbound traffic to back up. Graham suggests that the westbound passing lane be designed and depicted on a plan for approval but that the installation of the lane would be done by the town at a later time after the baseball field is relocated.

The Board agrees to hold the continued meeting on July 13th, but at 7pm, which will give them a half-hour before the other scheduled public hearings.

Jaquith makes motion to continue the meeting at 7pm on July 13th. Pierce seconds the motion. All vote to approve the motion 4-0.

Adjournment

Pierce makes motion to adjourn the meeting. Jaquith seconds the motion. All vote in favor (4-0). Meeting adjourns at 9:00 pm.