TOWN OF LUDLOW PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
December 12, 2019

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

Raymond Phoenix – Chairman (Present)
Christopher Coelho – Vice Chairman (Present)
Joseph Queiroga (Present)
Kathleen Houle (Present)
Rafael Quiterio (Present)

The meeting began at 6:45 p.m. in the Selectmen's Conference Room.

PUBLIC HEARING – SPECIAL PERMIT / HOME OCCUPATION – Crystal & David Williams – 121 Arnold Street (SSD Tactical Training)

SEE ATTACHED MINUTES

PUBLIC HEARING – SPECIAL PERMIT / HOME OCCUPATION – Miguel A. Cordero – 43 Russell Street (welding business)

SEE ATTACHED MINUTES

SITE SKETCH – 484 & 488 Center Street (Assessors' Map 16A, Parcels 58 & 59) Inspired by Opportunity LLC (connection between parcels; Wendy's Restaurant & Pride Station)

The Board tabled the appointment until later in the meeting due to the fact that the applicants were not present.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN & SPECIAL PERMIT – Colvest/Wilbraham, LLC – 450 - 456 Center Street (Assessors' Map 15B, Parcel 135) (to reduce the footprint of the existing concrete foundation and construct a new 1,500 sq ft bank building with associated parking and drive-up ATM lanes. Loam, irrigate and seed the expanded lawn area) *(Mail items #69 & 70 included)*

Mail Item #69 – Letter from Theresa Carrington re: objection to Revised Site Plan submitted by Colvest Group for proposed bank with 2 drive thru ATM lanes

Mail Item #70 – Letter from Derek DeBarge, Chairman, Board of Selectmen re: Colvest Group People's Bank Project

SEE ATTACHED MINUTES

Consent Agenda:

The Board approved the Consent Agenda under unanimous consent.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

- FILE Mail Item 71. - Legal Notices from surrounding communities
- APPROVE/SIGN Minutes of November 14, 2019
- APPROVE Change of Occupancy:
  - Victoria A. Dias (A Touch of Care) – 314 Sewall Street (from chiropractic office to home health care school)

PUBLIC HEARING - SITE SKETCH – 135 Carmelinas Circle (Assessors' Map 26, Parcel 7D) Scott Shaw (selling used cars)

SEE ATTACHED MINUTES

File Mail Item #65 – Copy of 30 Day Engineering Models Notification from FEMA

File Mail Item #66 – Change of Address – 15 Hubbard Street (Map 12D, Parcel #178) from Dept of Inspectional Services

---

File Mail Item #67 – Letter from Safety Committee re: lighting and security system concerns at the new Senior Center

---

File Mail Item #68 – Letter from Dept. of Inspectional Services re: Parking of Equipment & Junk @ 312 Miller Street

---

SITE SKETCH – 484 & 488 Center Street (Assessors' Map 16A, Parcels 58 & 59)
Inspired by Opportunity LLC
(connection between parcels; Wendy's Restaurant & Pride Station)

The applicants were not present for the appointment.

Mr. Phoenix read the comments from the Town Planner, the Fire Department, and the Safety Committee. He also mentioned that there was a request submitted from the applicant for a waiver of the full site plan in favor of a sketch, and the public hearing.

Mr. Stefancik said that the only change on the plan is creating an access to the adjacent property.

Mr. Coelho **MOVED** to waive the full site plan in favor of a sketch for this.

Mr. Phoenix: And the public hearing?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Coelho: And the public hearing.
SECOND Ms. Houle.
5-0 in Favor.

Mr. Coelho **MOVED** to accept the sketch as submitted.
SECOND Mr. Quiterio.
5-0 in Favor.

Documents included: Master application; Waiver request; Comments from Town Departments/Boards; Site Plan: Wendy's Restaurant, 484 Center Street (MA Route 21) Ludlow, Massachusetts (08/01/2019)

Mr. Coelho: I make a **MOTION** to adjourn.
SECOND Mr. Quiterio.
Mr. Phoenix: Always in order, not debatable.
5-0 in Favor.

Meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

APPROVED:

Kathleen J. Houle
Kathleen Houle, Secretary

su

(All related documents can be viewed at the Planning Board Office during regular business hours.)

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

TOWN OF LUDLOW PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING – HOME OCCUPATION/SPECIAL PERMIT
121 Arnold Street – Crystal & David Williams
(SSD Tactical Training)
December 12, 2019

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

Raymond Phoenix – Chairman (Present)
Christopher Coelho – Vice Chairman (Present)
Joseph Queiroga (Present)
Kathleen Houle (Present)
Rafael Quiterio (Present)

Hearing began at 6:46 p.m. in the Selectmen's Conference Room.

In attendance: Crystal & David Williams

Mr. Phoenix read the legal notice, advised the attendees that cameras are recording, gave Mr. Williams a copy of the invoice from Turley Publications, and reviewed the application. The legal notice included the description of: Home Office – SSD Tactical Training.

Mr. Phoenix: And the application we have in front of us pretty much summarized in what I already read. What we have in the detailed description is; want to use approximately 25 square feet for business office space. No business will be conducted at residence, just need computer to do paperwork, no retail. According to the supplement sheet we have no to pretty much all of the questions as far as signage at the property related to the business, customers at the house, deliveries unlike a normal residence, and changes that would make it look less residential. We have no commercial vehicle, and we do have the 25 square feet is what we're looking at. Additionally, we have a request for the waiver of the full site plan in favor of a sketch and photos as prepared by the applicant. So, that's what I have on my side. If you want to just explain for us what you're looking to do.

Mr. Williams: We're just looking to use a laptop computer and a printer, and just an office desk. That's all we need it for.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok, and as far as anything you're doing with relation to the business, that's all taking place off site? It's just…

Mr. Williams: Everywhere else. We travel all over the place to do it, but we have licensed facilities that we actually train at.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok, any other questions from this side of the table at this point? Ok, hearing nothing, the first thing that I would ask for is we haven't had a finding or the waiver approval yet. Can we get a finding on whether or not this business proposal sounds suitable as a home occupation under the Bylaw?

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Coelho.

Mr. Coelho: I **MOVE** to find that the home occupation under tactical training using a computer as described by Crystal and David Williams of 121 Arnold Street is a suitable home occupation use under the Bylaw.
SECOND Ms. Houle.
5-0 in Favor.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Coelho.

Mr. Coelho: I further would like to waive the site plan, I **MOVE** to waive the full site plan for SSD Tactical Training at 121 Arnold Street, in favor of a sketch and photos to be prepared by the applicant since this is in relation to a home occupation and in doing so is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Bylaw.
SECOND Mr. Quiterio.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Coelho – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes.

Mr. Phoenix: So, we found that it is a suitable home occupation and they don't need to hire a surveyor to detail what they're looking to do just to use a computer in the home. Beyond that, I will open it this up to public comments, questions, concerns at this time. The standard thing that I tell everybody is that if you do have something to contribute, please state your name and address for the record, and address everything through myself as the Chairman, and we'll try and get you answers or responses that you need. Does anybody have anything at this time? Hearing nothing, is there a motion on the actual request?

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Coelho.

Mr. Coelho: I **MOVE** to approve the Special Permit under 7.0.4 a-m and the Home Occupation under Section 6.2.1 thru 6.2.13 for SSD Tactical Training at 121 Arnold Street in relation to home occupation and doing so is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Bylaw. I'm sorry, that was the wrong sentence, with the restriction that the permit will run with the applicant and not with the property.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok, and just for the sake of clarity, you're just making the motion in the standard form and kind of filling in the blanks.

Mr. Coelho: Yup.
SECOND Mr. Queiroga.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Coelho – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes.

Mr. Phoenix: Is there a MOTION to close the public hearing?
Ms. Houle: **SO MOVED.**
SECOND Mr. Coelho.
5-0 in Favor.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Hearing ended 6:52 p.m.

APPROVED:

Kathleen J. Houle
Kathleen Houle, Secretary

su

Documents: Master application; abutters list

(Documents pertaining to this hearing are available for viewing in the Planning Board Office during regular business hours).

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

TOWN OF LUDLOW PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING – HOME OCCUPATION/SPECIAL PERMIT
43 Russell Street – Miguel A. Cordero
(welding business)
December 12, 2019

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

Raymond Phoenix – Chairman (Present)
Christopher Coelho – Vice Chairman (Present)
Joseph Queiroga (Present)
Kathleen Houle (Present)
Rafael Quiterio (Present)

Hearing began at 6:53 p.m. in the Selectmen's Conference Room.

In attendance: Miguel Cordero

Mr. Phoenix read the legal notice, advised the attendees that cameras are recording, gave Mr. Cordero a copy of the invoice from Turley Publications, and reviewed the application. The legal notice included the description of: Home Office – welding business.

Mr. Phoenix: And on the supplement sheet we have 50 square feet that are looking to be used, zero non-resident employees, yes to planned signage, which you do understand that that's limited to up to two square feet and it cannot be lighted, correct?

Mr. Cordero: Sorry?

Mr. Phoenix: Any signage that you want to put up at the property for the business, it would have to be less than two square feet and can't be lit.

Mr. Cordero: I know that.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok. No customers at the house, no deliveries unlike a regular residence, no changes that would make it look less residential, and the commercial vehicle that is looking to be used in connection with the business is a F250 that weighs in at 10,000 GVW and meets the Bylaw. Similar to the last one as well, we do have a request for the waiver of the full plan in favor of a sketch and photos prepared by the applicant. So, with that said, would just ask you to briefly describe what you're looking to do. What are you looking to do for the business at the property?

Mr. Cordero: Just my business is a mobile welding business.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok.

Mr. Cordero: I got a welding truck. I go anywhere, you know, --- customer ---.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok. So, and that's all kept inside of this vehicle?

Mr. Cordero: Yeah.

Mr. Phoenix: Any questions from the Board? Hearing nothing, just like with the other hearing, I will open it up to public comments, questions, and concerns. If anybody does have anything that they would like to add or ask, I would ask that you address through myself as Chairman and we'll do our best to get you any answers that you need. And if you do need anything, please state your name and address for the record. That said, do we have anything from the public?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2019 DEC 19 P 3:
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Lemieux: Yes, my name's Joe Lemieux. I live at 38 Shawinigan Drive, just beneath this gentleman.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok.

Mr. Lemieux: And Mr. Chairman I just wondered at this particular time, is he going to be working there in the mornings, and I don't know what the sound variances are in town? I have no idea.

Mr. Phoenix: Yeah basically, based on the description he's given, I believe you said all the work is going to be done off site. So, you're just keeping the vehicle on site, and just using a small space for office, for like phone, computer, that sort of thing. No work actually happening at the house.

Mr. Coelho: No fabrication?

Mr. Cordero: No, no.

Mr. Lemieux: I have nothing else.

Mr. Phoenix: With that said, we do need to have motions on the finding and the waiver request if anyone would care to make either of those please.

Mr. Queiroga: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Queiroga.

Mr. Queiroga: I **MOVE** to find that the home occupation as described by Mr. Cordero at 43 Russell Street is a suitable home occupation under the Bylaw.
SECOND Mr. Coelho.
5-0 in Favor.

Mr. Phoenix: We do also have the waiver, is there a motion on that?

Mr. Queiroga: Mr. Chairman, I **MOVE** to waive the full site plan for Mr. Cordero at 43 Russell Street for his welding business, in favor of a sketch and photos to be prepared by the applicant since this is in relation to a home occupation and in doing so is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Bylaw.
SECOND Mr. Coelho.
5-0 in Favor.

Mr. Phoenix: On the actual matter at hand, the actual application itself, is there a motion on that?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 21 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Queiroga: Mr. Chairman, I **MOVE** to approve the Special Permit for Mr. Cordero at 43 Russell Street under the Special Permit under 7.0.4 a-m and the Home Occupation under 6.2.1 thru 6.2.13 for Mr. Cordero at 43 Russell Street with the restriction that the permit will run with the applicant and not with the property.
SECOND Mr. Coelho.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Coelho – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes.

Mr. Phoenix: Is there a MOTION to close the public hearing?
Ms. Houle: **SO MOVED.**
SECOND Mr. Coelho.
5-0 in Favor.

Hearing ended 6:58 p.m.

APPROVED:

Kathleen J. Houle
Kathleen Houle, Secretary

su

Documents: Master application; abutters list

(Documents pertaining to this hearing are available for viewing in the Planning Board Office during regular business hours).

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

TOWN OF LUDLOW PLANNING BOARD
CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – SPECIAL PERMIT & SITE PLAN
450-456 Center Street (Assessors' Map 15B, Parcel 135)
Colvest/Wilbraham, LLC
(to reduce the footprint of the existing concrete foundation and construct a new 1,500 sq ft bank building with associated parking and drive-up ATM lanes. Loam, irrigate, and seed the expanded lawn area)
December 12, 2019

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

Raymond Phoenix - Chairman (Present)
Christopher Coelho - Vice Chairman (Present)
Joseph Queiroga (Present)
Kathleen Houle (Present)
Rafael Quiterio (Present)

The public hearing began at 7:00 p.m. in the Selectmen's Conference Room.

The hearing was continued from October 24, 2019

In attendance: Ellen Freyman – Shatz, Schwartz, and Fentin, P.C.; Frank Colaccino – The Colvest Group; Peter LaPointe – The Colvest Group; Scott Hesketh – F.A. Hesketh & Assoc.; David Goncalves – Mott Macdonald

Mr. Phoenix read the Review Findings from Mott Macdonald dated 12/11/2019 *(see file)*, and Mail Items #69. Letter from Theresa Carrington re: objection to Revised Site Plan submitted by Colvest Group for proposed bank with 2 drive thru ATM lanes, and #70. Letter from Derek DeBarge, Chairman, Board of Selectmen re: Colvest Group People's Bank Project.

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Coelho.

Mr. Coelho: Is that letter indicative of the entire Board of Selectmen or just a citizen that sits on the Board of Selectmen?

Mr. Phoenix: It is addressed from Derek DeBarge, Chairman, Board of Selectmen. It does not say that it is from the Board, it says that it is from him as the Chairman.

Mr. Coelho: Ok.

Mr. Phoenix: Is that satisfactory in answering your question?

Mr. Coelho: Well it sorta does. I guess we can ask that question more formally if we have to.

Mr. Phoenix: So, I've read an awful lot. I'm gonna take a break. From where we left off last time, I think we all have a pretty good idea where the discussion was at. I believe it might be

most prudent to ask for a response to the traffic study report that we got, and then we can possibly go from there. Does that sound reasonable to the Board?

Mr. Queiroga: Sure.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 29 P 1:43
TOWN OF LEDYARD

Atty. Freyman: Ok, good evening. I'm Ellen Freyman here on behalf of Colvest. And just before we go into, I just want to take a step back and just remind everybody the history and background of this project. This was first approved, it was site plan approval back in 2010. At that point there were two buildings approved for a total of 11,974 square feet. In 2015, in anticipation of the Starbucks coming in, there was another modification to the plan to add in the drive-thru, and that also was a, also included a reduction of the total square footage of the project down to 10,142 square feet. And now we're here tonight asking for yet a further reduction down to 2,000, I'm sorry, down to 6,842 square feet which is almost in half of what we had originally approved. So, I think that's important to keep in mind that we're here basically to modify the site plan, but to making a whole project a lot smaller. In the meantime, there were two full curb cuts, that is now down to one full curb cut, with one being an exit only. So, I think those are material changes that, to remember what we had approved and if we weren't here making this change, that we would still be able to develop 10,142 square feet in that location without having to come back.

Mr. Coelho: How does square footage translate to use and impact? ---

Atty. Freyman: Well, if you have a larger building you can put more businesses in. You can put, you know, it definitely is a more, you could put in a more intensive use.

Mr. Phoenix: If we're going to believe the traffic engineers, both the one that wrote the report that I read tonight, as well as the one sitting across the table, the use, although it's going to be a smaller square footage, is going to increase the number of cars entering and exiting the site. That's a conclusion that was reached by both groups of people that are knowledgeable about traffic and the way that it flows. So yes, it is a reduction in square feet, but the larger square footage does not necessarily mean, and I would argue if we are going to believe any traffic engineer about anything they say, we need to believe that their numbers are correct and that this usage would increase the total number of trips over the prior approved usage. That's what everybody agrees on.

Atty. Freyman: If you're going to use that data, ok.

Mr. Phoenix: What else would we use?

Atty. Freyman: Well we have, you see what's out there now and what's happening. You know…

Mr. Phoenix: It's horrible, it ---.

Atty. Freyman: We also know from the banks that are also on Center Street, there's a number of banks, and they don't create problems with, there's no stacking, there's no issues, you know, so that's, you have experience with the use that we're proposing. And so, you can use numbers to an extent, otherwise, I mean, you do have real life experience to base it on too. I think you have to suspend sometimes some of the data to, based on reality.

Mr. Phoenix: Yes, and I also know the part of that whole site functioning is that there's already an existing special permit on that. And if having that ability for that drive-thru on top of other uses on the site creates a hazard and increases the danger in that neighborhood, there's nothing that says that this Board wouldn't revisit that special permit. So, even if you didn't need to come in for the special permit that we're talking about tonight, that property is still required to be safe and to have the ability to have conditions put on it by the Planning Board in order to make that happen. Otherwise, that drive-thru could go away, and I don't think that that's what I want as a consumer, and I don't think it's what you guys want as the people proposing the project.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Atty. Freyman: And there's no basis --- at this point.

Mr. Phoenix: At this point, I think it's debatable. I think if it were to get worse, I think that becomes more clear.

Atty. Freyman: Ok, we will have Scott Hesketh talk about the report.

Mr. Hesketh: For the record, Scott Hesketh. First question is, you read the M&M report into the record. Are we going to her from your consultant this evening, are they gonna present their findings or are we just gonna, 'cause it's difficult to respond to his findings, conclusions and things without hearing from if he's gonna speak, so just wanted to give him the opportunity to do that before we…

Mr. Stefancik: Dave is here in the audience.

Mr. Hesketh: Yes, it might make sense for him to say something first before we try to respond to it that's all.

Mr. Goncalves: ---

Mr. Hesketh: Not too bad, how are you?

Mr. Goncalves: David Goncalves with Mott and MacDonald. We were asked by Doug and members of the Planning Board take a review of the data that was available. So, what we ended up doing is we took the documentation that was provided to us, what we looked at were the 2010, the 2015, the most recent document that we were just provided. And so, we were just trying to get a general understanding based on the 2019 document was primarily the document we were trying to review.

Mr. Hesketh: Right.

Mr. Goncalves: And trying to understand where the data, where the numbers came from and so, in essence, what we found, there were some areas where data was different or information was different in certain documents, and so that's what we're stating here. And then from an analysis perspective what we've identified is that, I think we all know, in town there's a poor level of service of traffic there. And the impacts were just based on the numbers that we had, the numbers that we ran. Again, it's a desktop, we didn't have anything further that the documentation we were presented. And the increase in traffic is a couple of seconds, I think, is what we concluded in the report, anywhere from 1 ½ to 3 ½ seconds. So, is there an increase?

Yes. Is it substantial? It's really for the Planning Board and for members here to make that determination. So, we wanted to just identify what it is that we saw based on the data that was presented to us.

Mr. Coelho: I have a question that might be outside of your scope, but it's still relevant to your professional judgement. Is there an obvious configuration to this site currently that would help traffic flow more easily at that intersection as it's laid out now? Something obvious that we're not seeing? That's kind of what I was hoping for when I asked for this study! It wasn't as much of a critique to traffic 'cause I think we all kind of knew whatever goes there is gonna increase traffic, but are we missing something here on this site? I mean, it's a tough site, I see that, you know?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Goncalves: One of the observations that we made was the right hand turn only. That was the comment that we had provided. I think we all know, we've seen folks trying to take a left there, and we've seen incidents there as well. I did not, we didn't have sufficient time to reach out to the police department to request records on incidents, you know, at that intersection, but I'm sure we all know, we've seen, or we've probably seen some there. That was a method of avoiding some of the potential conflict that you could have in movement turns in the area.

Mr. Coelho: And that would be out of this driveway?

Mr. Goncalves: The bottom driveway, the southern driveway there, yes.

Mr. Coelho: This driveway, right turn only.

Mr. Goncalves: Yes, sir.

Mr. Phoenix: What about the other driveway?

Mr. Goncalves: We, our focus was primarily the, you know, the data that we had and the addition. I'm certain we could take a look at that as well, but, I mean, you've got, you know, we could certainly come up with something but we didn't necessarily --- great detail.

Mr. Coelho: Was out of scope, yeah.

Mr. Queiroga: Mr. Chairman? Dave, --- one question. Did your analysis, and also with you, you're both working up the same set of data.

Mr. Goncalves: You know, I'm not quite certain.

Mr. Queiroga: 2010, 2015.

Mr. Goncalves: Those were the documents we used.

Mr. Queiroga: Do any of you, any of the conclusions you've come to affected by the addition of the extra lane that will be on the highway, that is on the highway now as opposed to when it wasn't and was just a two-lane highway?

Mr. Goncalves: Mr. Hesketh do you want to respond, or do you want me to?

Mr. Hesketh: Why don't you respond and then I'll.

Mr. Goncalves: Yes sir, no that's fine. Our data was based on the information that was presented on the drawings which shows the three-lanes coming north here. In terms of the totality of the arrangement, the revised configuration, we did not look at that.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Queiroga: We tried to forecast what the impact is.

Mr. Goncalves: We haven't seen anything, it just was recently rebuilt --- so it's.

Mr. Queiroga: Yeah, I looked at the report cites an increase of 21, 22, and 16 trips which is probably not, and all of these refer to the a.m. and the p.m. rush hour, 'cause you can go there after rush hours and plenty of easy movement going on, so all this is targeted during the busy time and not so, and it's not a surprise being the road is what it is. It's our busiest highway on the busiest intersection and the busiest business area in this town. I do remember when the Mobil Station, Mr. Orchulek's Mobil Station, he had two curb cuts and it was the busiest gas station in town. It was practically the only one until the one on East Street came in, and he had two curb cuts and the house next door had a third curb cut.

Mr. Colaccino: Plus a car wash and an oil change place.

Mr. Queiroga: Correct, and so, you know, things are forever changing here, and we know that nothing we do will completely ameliorate the problems at rush hours. Center Street today is what it is. It's our busiest road and that's also the area that produces the most amount of income for the town. I echo what the attorney said, which is that we haven't had a real problem with banks. The way they, whether the people are in there for twenty minutes putting in an auto loan, or people are going through the drive-thru getting their cash and coming out the other end. So, I guess what I am trying to get to, and I know it's what the Chairman is trying to get to, is what kind of a real honest to goodness impact is this thing, with one 1,500 square foot bank going to have?

Mr. Colaccino: Can I just say something? I just…

Mr. Queiroga: Go ahead.

Mr. Colaccino: I don't mean to, just, the way we looked at this project was that, we took a look at what we had there, and this is the third version of a site plan. Back in 2010 we had a different concept and there was a traffic study done then. '15 we were able to get Starbucks interested in the site and we came in and we got a modification of the site plan that was approved back in 2010. And, basically, what we did is we reduced the size of the buildings as Ellen said earlier. And so now, and we've got the 4,800 square foot. So, we built the Starbucks, as you all know, and we built that building, and we put a foundation in the ground for a 4,800 square foot building. That is what exists. What we asked the traffic engineer to do was to compare the traffic from a bank with 2 ATMs, drive-thru's, versus what we have there, which is the Starbucks and the adjacent tenant and assuming that we built a 4,800 square foot building, what the difference in traffic was. You're right Mr. Chairman, in terms of, it depends on the use. You know, yes, we reduced the spaces from eleven and change down to 6,800 square feet and change in terms of building sizes. But, the uses of in the building do determine the traffic. So, what we

further did, is we further asked the traffic engineer to analyze, saying ok, here you are, you've got 4,800 square feet that we're able to build and put up. And so now, in the 4,800 square feet, if you use it for general retail, what's the traffic, and now compare it to the bank, then make an assumption that you do a 1,200 square foot Subway type restaurant and 3,600 square feet of retail, what does that traffic look like, compare it to the bank. Then we asked him to further do an analysis of a 2,400 square foot Five Guys type restaurant with a 2,400 square foot retail, compare that traffic to the bank, and that's the analyzation that we asked our traffic engineer to do. And I think, Scott, I think, you put a table like that together, correct?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Hesketh: I have a table, yes.

Mr. Colaccino: And Dave, you got a copy of that?

Mr. Goncalves: If it was in the August 29th report.

Mr. Hesketh: It's not in that report, no.

Mr. Goncalves: So, I'm not sure I received that document sir.

Mr. Colaccino: Oh. I know, Doug, we sent it over to you. I mean, do you have that with you now Scott?

Mr. Hesketh: I do have it, yes.

Mr. Colaccino: Alright, can you share that with Dave and maybe present what your findings were.

Mr. Hesketh: Let me go through, I think now's a good time to respond to some of the comments and everything, explain some of these discrepancies. Perhaps we can…

Mr. Goncalves: Sure, sure.

Mr. Hesketh: …figure out what's going on here. As you've heard, there was several reports, or traffic impact report prepared for 2010, and an update letter in 2015. I was asked to provide an updated letter as to the trip generation potential of making, comparing the approved site plan to the proposed site plan, so that's why I didn't do a traffic study, I did a letter outlining the trip generation differential. And the trip generation differential, in my opinion, was relatively small, therefore, you know, you've got an existing shopping center; you've got a change one building to another building; you've got a certain approved traffic; you've got things approved. Difference in traffic regardless of what the existing traffic or background traffic or future traffic is, is pretty small. Therefore, I don't think we need a lot of time studying --- 'cause you guys have heard the levels of service at this signalized intersection of the ramp in the last, well, I've been here for at least three applications where it's been before you and you know you're not happy with the levels of service out there for any of those and it's understandable. And so, my opinion was it's a very minor increase in traffic, there's gonna be no significant impact to the traffic operations in the area, let's not waste a lot of time in doing an analysis and study. I know you guys have asked him to review our report, really a letter, and they've done some traffic analysis and they basically found that with the numbers that we had, the light at the signalized intersection --- approximately one or two seconds and the driveway average overall delay goes

up two or three seconds, very minimal impacts which is what I had anticipated. So, let's go through some of the discrepancies. You asked if we did any analysis on our report, nope, we did a letter. It's not a traffic impact study so we didn't have any analysis in there for the reasons I just explained. You're asking about the total number of parking spaces and driveways and such; I suppose the site plan probably had some minor...

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Goncalves: No, this is more of a statement. ---

Mr. Hesketh: Some minor revisions during the plan and, you know, whether we picked up all the parking numbers, you know, 70, 71, I think that's pretty close and I'm not criticizing the comment. It's a comment, we just want to respond. The difference in data in the different reports; when I was asked to make this comparison, I said ok great. I didn't have a copy of the --- report at the time, but I said ok, what's out there on the site. I've got the site plan. I took a look at it. We had a coffee shop, we've got some retail. I went to ITE, I looked up the appropriate land uses based on that. I ran a projection based on those. So, what's the proposed plan gonna be? We got a coffee shop, we got some retail and we got a bank. I ran the trip generation on those, presented the two in my tables, came up with the difference in traffic, and we had the conclusion there's very little increase in traffic. So, whether you call the Starbucks a fast food restaurant or a coffee shop or a dog grooming center, it's generating what it's generating. It's on the ground. It's doing what it's doing. It's in the background conditions. It's going to be in the future conditions, so it's a wash. It's either generating 10 trips or 1,000, but it's generating --- on the existing plan or the proposed plan. So that's a wash, knock that one out. The difference is, we're going from a certain amount of retail and no bank, to less retail and a bank, and the difference between those two is the projections of the 11 or 22 trips that I presented on the previous report. Again, no significant impacts, so. I suspect after getting a copy of Mr. --- report, that 2015, he used the fast food restaurant to generate the trip generation for the Starbucks, subsequent, I think he's probable using the ITE trip generation, probably version number seven. It probably didn't have the coffee shop as a land use. Subsequent versions of that report do have it, so as traffic engineers we can be a little more specific. I will note that the fast food restaurants in the old versions of the report typically included a lot of Dunkin Donuts type restaurants. Starbucks wasn't a big thing nationally at that time, probably weren't a whole lot of Starbucks in there. I think if you looked at the published data by different engineers in different places, Starbucks has a lower trip generation than a Dunkin Donut's does. They tend to have, takes them a little longer to make coffees, they have higher end coffees, frappes and things and mixes and all that kind of stuff, where Dunkin you get a black or a regular and you're in and out the door. So, Dunkin Donuts tends to be a little bit higher. So, even though the coffee shop includes both Starbucks and Dunkin Donuts, it's probably weighted a little higher toward Dunkin Donuts than a Starbucks type facility. So, you'll probably get less traffic from the proposed, from this existing Starbucks than what I had presented in my analysis. But again, it's already there and it's a wash in terms of the numbers. In addition, the ITE trip generation information, they're average numbers. They're regression equations. You can have a Starbucks in Dubuque Iowa which is a little bit different than a Starbucks in Seattle Washington. One that's downtown is gonna be different than one that's out in the suburbs or out in the country. So, these are average rates to regression equations, and some facilities are more successful, and some are less successful and they have different ranges of traffic. You also can generate the traffic volumes based on the square footage of the facility. You can generate it based it on the traffic volumes of the traffic going by the site. So, depending on which data set you pick, you're gonna get trip generation numbers if you're on a 25,000 vehicle a day highway, you expect to get a little more traffic coming into your store, regardless of how big it is, than if you're on a roadway which only

has 2,000 cars a day. I think that's intuitive. And you may want to build a 6,000 square foot store on the road which has 2,000 trips, and a 1,000 square foot store on the road which has 20,000 trips, and the smaller store's gonna generate more traffic. So, you're gonna get different numbers based on how much you look at. So, you get six different traffic engineers and throw a bunch of numbers out there, somebody picks one set, somebody picks another set, you could get different volumes. They're gonna be in the same range, ok? Now, the retail, the shopping center land use code in the ITE trip generation report includes retail establishments, and it's Land Use Code 820. It's called shopping center, we tend to call it general retail. If you read the description: It's a shopping center is an integrated group of commercial establishments, planned, developed, owned, and managed as a unit. And under additional data it says: Some of these centers contain non-merchandising facilities such as office buildings, movie theaters, restaurants, post offices, banks, health clubs, and other recreational facilities. So, under the number of shopping center or retail use, you include all of those different types of developments. So, even in a shopping center, average rates, depending on the mix of uses you have, they could go up and down which is why Mr. --- asked us to look at the different uses for the 4,800 square foot facility. Now again, if you run the 4,800 square foot facility under the retail use, you're gonna get trip generation of 5 peak hour trips in the morning, 18 in the afternoon, and 23 on Saturday. Now that general retail use says general retail, and maybe if you had a 100,000 square foot shopping center and you had two restaurants and the rest were Best Buy and telephone stores and a hair salon, you know, you get average rates similar to that. When you got smaller facilities and you split them up as we're talking about here, you could have 3,600 square feet of general retail and a fast food store of 1,200 square feet like a Subway or something like that, and the trip generation on that would be in the range of 80 trips in the morning, 86 trips in the afternoon, and, you know, 80 or 85 trips on a Saturday. Same building, same general, you know, same square footage, same general heading of shopping center or retail, much bigger numbers. If you had a larger fast food restaurant, you could go up to 155 or 135 or 145 trips. Same building, both allowed under regulations for the as retail development as long as you have the parking available. And I believe that our site plan has sufficient parking 'cause you guys treat restaurants and retail differently in the parking code, but not necessarily in the land use code. And a drive-in bank, again, the 1,500 square feet bank we're talking has 26, 40, or 39 trips. So, it's an increase over general retail certainly, but it would be a reduction over a retail facility which happened to have Starbucks or some other type of use in it. So, when we presented our information, we said worst case scenario, here's a bank with a drive-thru and it's gonna represent increase of, I think we said, 22 trips during the peak hour, which is one every three minutes. So, that's the reason for the difference in the land uses between the different reports and the conclusions of why we think it's an increase in traffic or perhaps, maybe not, depending on all the uses which could go into the facility. Since we didn't do a capacity analysis, we did not, you know, we didn't have baseline information and future traffic information, but I know that the M&M report, they did do a capacity analysis which was presented to you and presented the difference in the levels of service and increases in delay. We did not look at the, spent a lot of time looking at the geometry of Center Street, 'cause the geometry of Center Street is the same under the current site plan, it'll be the same under the proposed site plan, and whether we add a handful of cars to the driveways or not is not gonna affect that. Obviously, if you have additional traffic going into and out of a facility, there's a potential for additional accidents, but even if you don't approve this plan, there's gonna be more traffic on Center Street over the next thirty years, which is, you know, you can either have the development in your town or you can have it in another town cutting through. The geometry is not gonna impact whether or not this particular site plan or another site plan is approved on the site. Let's see, I think that, generally, I think that responds to most of the comments, maybe not in order.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Phoenix: So, just to make sure that I'm understanding everything correctly, so I think you're saying that originally what you submitted, as you've explained it, was a letter, it wasn't really a full traffic study. Is that a correct assumption?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Hesketh: It's a letter, yes. It's a letter outlining the trip generation potential between the two site plans.

Mr. Phoenix: Did we have a request for a waiver of the full traffic study that's required under the Bylaw? So, I think that might be where some of this came from. We have some question about what information was put into all of this. The Bylaw requires a traffic study, and instead we got a letter?

Mr. LaPointe: We submitted, if I may, Mr. Chairman, we submitted a traffic study in 2010.

Mr. Phoenix: Did you submit a traffic study with this application?

Mr. LaPointe: We did not. It was to modify.

Atty. Freyman: Modification, we're modifying the site plan.

Mr. Phoenix: Site plan approval requires a traffic study unless you request a waiver and then that waiver is approved by the Planning Board.

Mr. Hesketh: Does your bylaws define what a traffic study means?

Mr. Phoenix: No.

Mr. Coelho: ---

Mr. Hesketh: Well you've got traffic information submitted by ---

Mr. Coelho: American Society of Traffic Engineers defines that, no?

Mr. Phoenix: Well, you just literally just told me twice tonight that it wasn't a traffic study. I even asked a clarifying question as to whether or not that was a traffic study and I was told no.

Mr. Hesketh: It's not a traffic study by my definition. I'm not sure if it meets traffic study by the Town's definition, and I'm not sure if you guys have a definition of what a traffic study is.

Mr. Coelho: Do we need, what's the best practice definition of a traffic study?

Mr. Hesketh: The best practice definition would be that if you have a significant impact or potential significant impact, you would take a look at it. In my opinion, there's no significant impact for this particular development. I don't see the need to provide a detailed analysis. However, the M&M review provided the information which you are currently seeking. So, I believe that your file has the levels of service calculations which you would have us do. It's been presented to you by your consultant. So, I mean, we could recreate that supposedly, but it's

already in your file, and the information is there, and I think the results here are indicative of what we would see in the analysis of the capacity if we had undertaken it.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok. David.

Mr. Goncalves: Yes, sir.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2019 DEC 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Phoenix: I know that you had indicated that your review was limited to the information that was presented in that letter in analyzing that and looking at that. Would you say that what you provided to us, combined with what we had already, if we put some of those two together, would that be what you would consider to be a traffic study.

Mr. Goncalves: It's really more of an open-ended question there. What I mean by that is that one can consider, you know, how recent is the traffic data need to be to be considered valid for a traffic study. What we have, there's data, there are numbers from a variety of resources here; there's 2010, there's 2015, there's 2018. As we all know there's been changes in terms of traffic patterns, in terms of the layout here. Would it warrant something new? Potentially. Given the changes that have been out there. What we have here is the --- software that traffic engineers use to provide more of a desktop analysis. It doesn't replace having a, you know, true traffic study, but it's an analysis and this provides the general data that we've been provided. Now, is that the most up to date data? Those are the questions that were simply asking.

Mr. Hesketh: Yeah.

Mr. Goncalves: We had the 2015 data, we had, there was a 2018 Center Street Reconstruction piece there as well. Any combination of data can be used to develop something. It's really up to the town as to how recent and how current and how detailed they want that study to be. You have some general information here. I know we asked for a capacity analysis because we wanted to make sure we were using the right data. We used the data that was presented, whether or not is was accurate, that was some of the questions I think we were, or most recent, let me rephrase, we just wanted to make sure we were using the proper data and that's kind of where our questions came from, that's all.

Mr. Coelho: I think we have a systemic problem in the planning process to be honest with you. I am never gonna vote on a project, in favor of a project again unless I know what tenants are coming in.

Mr. Phoenix: Well we can't always do that though.

Mr. Coelho: I can vote no whenever I want, right?

Mr. Phoenix: That you can.

Mr. Coelho: So, that's gonna be my, well that's what I'm taking forward from this because it's very easy for these developers to come in and do this and then they pull the wool over eyes and it's gone.

Mr. Phoenix: But it's also very easy for them to completely in good faith say that we're gonna get tenant A that's gonna come in and then at the last minute that person backs out before the ink gets a chance to dry and…

Mr. Coelho: That's true, and I understand that but that's where the problem lies within all this. You know, we can have all the best studies in the world and we're gonna get…

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Atty. Freyman: But you do know ---.

Mr. Coelho: …we're gonna get people just gaming everything to their advantage. That's all. That's capitalism. I love it. And they're great at it, so we know how I'm voting tonight. Time to be done with this.

Atty. Freyman: You know the tenant.

Mr. Coelho: I don't care who the tenant is right now. Now I know who the tenant is.

Mr. Phoenix: Can I, let me just…

Mr. Coelho: This is just a foolish game.

Mr. Phoenix: …go in a different direction, and I think I'm gonna limit the discussion a little bit because this was slotted to end at 7:30 and we do have another hearing that was supposed to start at that time. But coming out of that last hearing, and I actually reviewed the whole thing again today myself, some of the comments that came in in the letter from the abutter as far as the lights. I know there were comments made, I believe it was actually by yourself, Mr. Colaccino, saying that you were going to be able to provide some additional screening for those lights?

Mr. Colaccino: We will, we will provide a stockade fence, so lights cannot shine through. And we, I told Mr. Mateus that we would do that, and I committed to this group that we would do that.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok, and in the intervening time that this hasn't made it on to the actual plan yet, it's in agreement between yourself and the neighbor that that will be on the plan before it's approved because obviously it needs to be on the plan.

Mr. Colaccino: Absolutely.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok. Is there anything else from the Board at this time? And again, I would just mention that I think we are gonna have to continue this, and we do have some people here that are in the audience and I'd like to give them a chance to speak --- if they have anything. So, if we have anything new, I'd like to get that out of the way and give them a chance.

Mr. Queiroga: Why don't you go ahead and give them a chance.

Mr. Phoenix: Would anyone from the public care to speak on the matter? If you would like to bring anything up, I would ask that you state your name and address for the record and address everything through myself as Chairman and we'll try and get you any information that you need. Does anyone have anything to add or ask at this time?

Mr. Coelho: Just --- today, huh?

Mr. Phoenix: That's good.

Mr. Hesketh: The line for autographs starts later.

Mr. Coelho: Yeah, right.

Mr. Phoenix: So...

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Queiroga: So, where are we on this, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Phoenix: I think where we are is we have some ambiguous input. I don't know what our path to clarity is to be perfectly honest. 'Cause despite what it might seem like, I am not, in principal, opposed to this development going in. I have some very strong ambivalence about it. I think that especially the entrance closer to the Turnpike is problematic. I think that for the immediate neighbor, the exit from the drive-thru is problematic. But, I think that for the total town, the bigger problem is the one that's closer to the intersection. I believe we had that conversation last time as well. And forgive me, even though I did review it today, I don't remember if it was you Mr. Colaccino, or if it was Peter, that did indicate that they thought that moving that traffic as much as can be through the drive-thru through that other exit, would be a benefit to that property.

Mr. Colaccino: I think it was Peter, but I think you're correct, yeah.

Mr. Queiroga: Were we also thinking about providing the same type of space in front of that part, as part of that exit?

Mr. Colaccino: The do not block the box?

Mr. Queiroga: The do not block sign.

Mr. Colaccino: It's not on there. No one has mentioned it, but I think it would be a good idea if we did that on that north exit as well.

Mr. Queiroga: Yeah, 'cause my ---.

Mr. Colaccino: And we would agree to do that.

Mr. Coelho: Ok. Is there a way we can request active enforcement of those boxes from the police station when the stuff gets going?

Mr. Phoenix: I believe the easy answer to that, although it might sound kind of odd, but it's true, is we can request anything. But, I believe the comment we got from the officer when you had asked him specifically about that last time is that it's very difficult to enforce that especially for the majority of the traffic that they'd be looking to, because on that side of the road a lot of the vehicles that would be an issue are the ones that are entering the Turnpike.

Mr. Coelho: And you know what? That's discussion for another time.

Mr. Phoenix: No, I believe that was indicated at the last meeting, so I just wanted to refresh everybody. So, I think that I believe the idea was that, you know, if everyone follows the rules, it's a good indicator for people. Hopefully people follow it more they don't, but it's hard to enforce.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Colaccino: Yeah, we have one at our office in downtown Springfield, a do not block the box, and I'm not gonna tell you 100% 'cause it's not, but for the most part, more times than not, people do kind of honor it. Wouldn't you say Peter?

Mr. LaPointe: They do.

Mr. Colaccino: And so, it helps. It's not 100%, but it certainly helps.

Mr. Phoenix: So, I mean, I think we have a couple things that I'd like to get a little bit more, I think sense of agreement on if at all possible, if that agrees what the Board wants. But ultimately, we do have our most recent comments from both the police officer that came in on Sergeant Shameklis's behalf and the Safety Committee and DPW were all expressing concerns about traffic and were all in favor of limiting the movement to right turn only on the exit. I don't know where the Boards' mind is, but I think…

Mr. Colaccino: Mr. Chairman? There is one additional piece of news or piece of information that you probably should be aware of, Peter was at the DPW meeting last night.

Mr. LaPointe: Actually, the Public Works Director's here.

Mr. Colaccino: And I think that if we went in and put in signs that said do not enter, and I think that was what…

Mr. Queiroga: Can we have your comments Mike?

Mr. Suprenant: Yeah, Mike Suprenant, I'm the director of Public Works, Town Engineer. And the Board of Public Works did meet with Mr. LaPointe on Tuesday night of this week and…

Mr. Colaccino: Tuesday, sorry.

Mr. Suprenant: …basically they wanted to receive the report from Dave Goncalves, and but they were not necessarily in favor of a right turn only as I had commented. So, the Board's opinion is not necessarily reflected by my initial comment. And I, again, I was waiting for the report of the peer review to come in which, in my opinion, indicates that there are minor increases in the traffic, but it also does recommend some minor additional analysis. It doesn't, I mean, this has been studied, the reports over the years in traffic, has been studied quite a bit at this location. So, there is a lot known about it. I think the recommendation, the way I read it, is that, to just clarify the capacity of the intersection. We know it's at, we know the level of service. We know it's not gonna change by, the level of service at this intersection is not gonna change by putting a bank at that location. So, and the Board of Public Works was, just wanted to, like the Planning Board, just wanted more information, and I think we've been provided with some additional information. And I think with the recommendation that's in the M&M peer review, I think if

you follow that, the Board will have the clarity that you're looking for as far as traffic. I mean, there's still gonna be, and it's gonna be a high incident location no matter what. I don't know if the bank will really change that significantly at all. I doubt very much there will be any major change whether you restrict it to right turn only or not. The southerly driveway is, I thought initially when I wrote my comments, I thought it was still on the cue for the I-90 ramp, but after going there and watching the cue ---, it's really not, you know, at peak hour the cue does not drop normally all the way back to that southerly driveway. Periodically it will for a couple minutes but not for a full hour.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Colaccino: So DPW was not in favor of the right out on the northern driveway? They were ok with the way it was?

Mr. Suprenant: Oh, right turn only out on the northern driveway?

(multiple people talking)

Mr. Colaccino: Southern. I'm sorry, southern driveway. They were ok with that.

Mr. Suprenant: They were ok with left turn.

Mr. Queiroga: Mike, can I ask you the same question…

Mr. Suprenant: At least the majority of the Board was ---.

Mr. Queiroga: …I asked some the other members which is, we only have half of that road really finished which is really down past McDonalds and so forth, but I noticed, even myself, going to the dentist the other day, being able to get into that middle lane and letting the traffic go by until you got the opening and off you go. Do you expect that that middle lane, the addition of that extra lane is going to simplify the traffic system a little bit?

Mr. Suprenant: It will relieve many of the…

Mr. Queiroga: ---

Mr. Suprenant: …conflicting movements. It's not gonna, there's still gonna be congestion.

Mr. Queiroga: Yeah right, there's no way of getting around that.

Mr. Suprenant: But, what it, the reason for that middle lane is to allow conflicting movements to occur without crashes, and it will, it should reduce the number of crashes by having that middle lane there, so that a vehicle can get in the middle lane and wait until the traffic clears so they can make their turn, where before they were trying to make the turn too soon and there was a lot of fender bender type of, almost head on collisions. So, that middle lane, at least in theory, will reduce the number of crashes.

Mr. Phoenix: So, I think we've reached a point where we need to take a path here. We can try and get more information. I know we talked about there's some capacity analysis that could be done. I know there was some talk about the fact that the northerly entrance wasn't really looked at in some of what we're talking about, so that could be looked at. I think we don't have a plan

that has some of the revisions on it that would want to see before we could really solidly approve it. Something that would alleviate some of the concerns of the neighbor which have to do with not just the proximity of the driveway, but with that light as well, the light and the noise. I believe we also had some questions last time about the logistics of taking care of the dumpster and when that would be, when that would fit into the scheme of things and how that maneuvering would work. So, I think there's some more things we could hammer out on that. Aside from trying to meet again with a little bit more information in hand, and I think our other options are deny or approve. Does anybody see another path or does someone care to make a motion in one of those three directions?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 29 P 1:42
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Coelho.

Mr. Coelho: I **MOVE** to approve and sign the site plan for Colvest Group at 450-456 Center Street with the caveat that the neighbor's concerns are met 110%, not just 100%.

Mr. Phoenix: I don't think that's possible because their concerns include moving the driveway.

Mr. Coelho: With…

Mr. Colaccino: We understand.

Mr. Coelho: I know you understand, that they actually reach out to them and make sure everything's as smooth as possible and should there be any tension between the two parties, well we're gonna be looking at everything.

Mr. Colaccino: Yeah, I talked to Tony after the hearing last time, and, you know, we want to make sure that he's happy.

Mr. Queiroga: Mr. Colaccino, the other items that were mentioned by the Chairman and by, which was…

Mr. Colaccino: Dumpster schedule and plan revisions.

Mr. Phoenix: There was, and just for the sake of sanity here, we are, kind of, in the middle of a motion.

Mr. Colaccino: Oh sorry.

Mr. Phoenix: I'd like to try and keep that moving forward one way or another. We can have discussion after we at least get through a second for discussion, but before we even do that, I'd just like to clarify that the motion itself is to approve the site plan and the special permit using our standard language, is that what you were conveying Chris?

Mr. Coelho: Mmmhmm.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok, is there a second on that for discussion?

Mr. Queiroga: **SECOND** for discussion. Mr. Chairman, the items that the Chairman mentioned, you have no problems with providing those before the plan is signed and sealed and.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Colaccino: Yeah, no problem.

Mr. Queiroga: Ok.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok.

Mr. Queiroga: With those caveats I would second.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok, so, once more to make sure everything is as clear as we can make it, this is to approve both the site plan and the special permit with the caveat attached that prior to the signature of any plan, that it include screening for the neighbors from any light and as much as possible, any noise pollution that might be associated with the drive-thru. Is that a fair assessment by everyone?

Mr. Quiterio: Yes.

Mr. Phoenix: Ok. So, all those in favor of that motion?

5-0 in favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Coelho - yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes.

Mr. Phoenix: That is 5-0 in favor and I'll entertain a MOTION to close the public hearing.
SO MOVED Mr. Queiroga.
SECOND Mr. Coelho.
5-0 in Favor.

Hearing closed at 8:07 p.m.

APPROVED:

Kathleen J. Houle
Kathleen Houle, Secretary

su

Documents: Master application; Comments from Town Departments/Boards; Proposed Commercial Re-Development Trip Generation – 450-456 Center Street – Hesketh (August 29, 2019); Stormwater Management Memorandum – Colvest Group – 450-456 Center Street (August 30, 2019); Site Plans – Colvest/Wilbraham, LLC – 456 Center Street Ludlow, Massachusetts (September 12, 2019); Layout and Materials Plan – Colvest/Wilbraham, LLC – 456 Center Street Ludlow, Massachusetts (August 29, 2019); Mail Item #69 Letter from Theresa Carrington re: objection to Revised Site Plan submitted by Colvest Group for proposed bank with 2 drive thru ATM lanes; Mail Item #70. Letter from Derek DeBarge, Chairman, Board of Selectmen re: Colvest Group People's Bank Project; Third-Party Traffic Study Review from Mott MacDonald (12/11/2019)

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 21 P 1:12
TOWN OF LUDLOW

(Documents pertaining to this hearing are available for viewing in the Planning Board Office during regular business hours).

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE

2020 JAN 24 P 1:43

TOWN OF LUDLOW

TOWN OF LUDLOW PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING – SITE SKETCH
135 Carmelinas Circle (Assessors' Map 26, Parcel 7D)
Scott Shaw
(selling used cars)
December 12, 2019

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

Raymond Phoenix - Chairman (Present)
Christopher Coelho - Vice Chairman (Present)
Joseph Queiroga (Present)
Kathleen Houle (Present)
Rafael Quiterio (Present)

The public hearing began at 8:10 p.m. in the Selectmen's Conference Room.

In attendance: Scott Shaw

Mr. Coelho said that he had the comments from the Safety Committee in his car and that there were no concerns.

Mr. Phoenix read the legal notice, advised the attendees that cameras are recording, gave Mr. Shaw a copy of the invoice from Turley Publications, and reviewed the application. The legal notice included the description of: selling used cars.

Mr. Phoenix: That said, the application that we have in front of us tonight is for a site sketch. There is a letter in here requesting a waiver of the full registered site plan in favor of a site sketch signed by the applicant. *Mr. Phoenix read the comments from the Ludlow DPW; Fire Department; and Mr. Stefancik, Town Planner (see file).* And that's basically what I have in the packet in front of me, do you just want to explain to us a little bit more what you're looking to do?

Mr. Shaw: I'm looking to sell used cars.

Mr. Phoenix: Nicely done.

Mr. Queiroga: How, what is the number of cars on that license?

Mr. Shaw: Twenty-three.

Mr. Queiroga: Twenty-three?

Mr. Shaw: Yup.

Mr. Queiroga: And are you gonna have any employees?

Mr. Shaw: No, at least I hope not. Anything's possible, but.

Mr. Phoenix: And, basically, for anyone playing the home game, if we do approve the waiver to a site sketch from a full site plan, the requirements on a site sketch basically are that we need to be able to see what's going on and we need the table that we require for pretty much everything with a site plan. That's where this is at. Does anybody feel that this needs to be a full site plan or does anyone care to make a motion on approving the waiver based on the nature of the proposal in front of us tonight?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 4:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Coelho: Now, let me just make this clear, we already have an auto repair facility here?

Mr. Shaw: Yes.

Mr. Coelho: And this would be in addition to that?

Mr. Shaw: Yes.

Mr. Coelho: Ok. I'll make a **MOTION** to waive the site plan in favor of a site sketch as it's in the best interest of the town.
SECOND Mr. Quiterio.
5-0 in Favor.

Mr. Phoenix: So, we've got that taken care of. As I said, Doug already looked at it and basically said the chart's there. I can see the chart from here and I believe him that everything's on it. I'm going to ask for any comments, questions, or concerns from the audience at this time. The crickets are overwhelming. So, we have the plan in front of us, if nobody else has anything on this, I would ask for a motion at this time.

Mr. Queiroga: Mr. Chairman, I **MOVE** to approve and sign the site sketch for Mr. Scott Shaw at 135 Carmelinas Circle. That license is only moving about 800 feet, right?

Mr. Shaw: Yeah.

Mr. Queiroga: Yeah, ok.

Mr. Phoenix: So, the motion is to approve. Is there a second?
Ms. Houle: **SECOND.**
5-0 in Favor.

Mr. Phoenix: I do need a MOTION to close the public hearing please.
Mr. Coelho: **SO MOVED.**
SECOND Mr. Queiroga.
5-0 in Favor.

The public hearing ended at 8:14 p.m.

APPROVED:

Kathleen Houle, Secretary

su

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2020 JAN 24 P 1:43
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Documents: Master application; Comments from Town Departments/Boards; Request for waivers; Site Plan – 135 Carmelinas Circle Ludlow, MA – Owned by Maria & Jose Baltazar (November 18, 2019)

(Documents pertaining to this hearing are available for viewing in the Planning Board Office during regular business hours).