

# ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS



19 WASHINGTON STREET  
SHERBORN, MASSACHUSETTS 01770

## MINUTES June 30, 2015

**Members Present:** Alan Rubenstein and Richard Novak

**Members Absent:** Ron Steffek and Paul Kerrissey

**Others Present:** Philip Paradis, Jaklyn Centacchio, Peter Liffiton, Charles Morris, Michael Lesser, Pat Le Blanc, Robert Michaud, Ben Stevens, Ed Marchant, Peggy Novak, Gene Ham, Michael Barbiero, Cheechong Tai, Eliot Taylor

Chairman Alan Rubenstein called the meeting to order at 8:02 p.m. in the Sherborn Town Hall, Room 204B.

### MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting on May 21, 2015 were approved as amended.

### PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE FIELDS AT SHERBORN

This is a continuation of the public hearing for the proposed 40B project, known as The Fields at Sherborn, which began on March 12, 2015. During this meeting, Chairman Rubenstein hopes to establish a schedule of future meetings between the applicant, Trask Incorporated, and the Board of Health (BOH) and Conservation Commission (Con Com). The scheduling of these meetings and the accomplishment of certain tasks in the 40B application process dictate when the next meeting of the applicant and the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) should take place. The applicant, Ben Stevens, reports that he expects to file a Notice of Intent with the Board of Health and a septic disposal permit with the Con Com by Friday, July 10, 2015. Michael Lesser, speaking as a member of Con Com, stated that, generally, Con Com needs to have an application filed with accompanying engineered plans before a walk of the site takes place with the peer reviewer. After that site walk, Con Com expects to receive detailed comments from the peer reviewer. Pending the receipt of those comments, a hearing to discuss the comments will take place. No specific dates were set for these milestones at tonight's meeting. However, a target date of sometime during the week of July 20, 2015 was set for the site walk with the intent of holding a public hearing during the first week of August. Once the date of the site walk is set, the

BOH will be informed and invited to attend. As a representative of the BOH was not present at tonight's meeting, the peer reviewer will contact that Board about their intentions for future hearings regarding this development.

Awaiting the actions of the BOH and Con Com, there are no further steps to be taken by the ZBA on this matter at this time. However, a meeting of the ZBA to continue the hearing for this 40B application is set for August 12, 2015 at 8:00 p.m. This meeting is scheduled with the understanding that the BOH and Con Com may not yet have substantive comments after likely having had only one public hearing each with the peer reviewer

Representatives of the Beta Engineering Group, the peer reviewer selected for this project, were present at tonight's meeting to provide the ZBA and the public with the results of their traffic impact study review, based on the plans provided by the applicant for the proposed 40B project. Jaklyn Centracchio gave a summary of the findings contained within the submitted traffic report. This traffic report, accompanying comments, and an appendix on traffic volumes will be made available on the Town website shortly following the date of this meeting.

The traffic impact statement concludes that the traffic impact in the area of the proposed Fields at Sherborn development will be negligible. The plans meet or exceed minimum requirements for driveway and intersection sight distance as determined by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), meaning there is adequate visibility for those exiting the development as well as for those entering or driving past the development. The peer reviewer suggests that the applicants design the landscape architecture and landscape maintenance plans to allow for greater visibility when exiting the development; the applicant had no opposition to this. The peer reviewer reports that while they were provided with the traffic volumes that the applicant had collected for this traffic impact report, they were not given the details or supplemental information for how and when the data was collected. This appendix will be provided to Beta. Mrs. Centracchio noted that, typically, most traffic impact reports contain a projection of traffic impacts five to seven years in the future, taking into account population growth, other development in Town, and several other factors; this projection was not provided in this traffic impact report. The applicant responded that because of the relatively small size of this development and the low impact it will have on traffic, this projection will not show any findings of particular value. The development team is willing to discuss performing such a projection but hold that the value of such a study will be minimal. The current level of service – a letter grade given to portions of roadways ranging from A, being the best, to E, being the worst – for Washington Street at the proposed location of the development is an A, while the current level of service for the intersection of Washington and Knollcrest Farm Lane is a C. Including the Fields at Sherborn, Washington Street would remain at a level of service A, while the intersection of Washington and Knollcrest would become a D, which is still an acceptable level of service. The peer reviewer noted that there are no sidewalks or pedestrian accommodations in or around the development, to which the applicant confirmed that such features are not proposed in the plans. Mr. Rubenstein raised the question of why the entrance to this development and the entrance to Knollcrest Farm Lane cannot be aligned. The reasoning was given that there will be septic fields of differing sizes on either side of the roadway which would affect its placement within the development. The applicant, with the assurance of the peer reviewer, stated that the off-center placement of the two streets will not pose a safety issue as there will likely be very little vehicle interaction between the two neighborhoods.

The public raised concerns about the lack of sidewalks in and around the proposed development. Concerns were also brought up about the actual impacts of wait times caused by turning vehicles at this and other nearby intersections, which several people felt were underrepresented. The developers insisted that the impacts on traffic flow at this location and at nearby intersections will be nearly imperceptible; this opinion was echoed by the peer reviewer when asked. Additionally, the question of where school children will wait for the school bus was asked. Ben Stevens responded that he typically contacts the superintendent of schools, while construction is underway, and asks for his or her input on where the best location for a bus stop should be.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Samantha Shepherd

Minutes approved August 12, 2015