

TOWN OF WEYMOUTH  
PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES

The Director of Planning and Community Development for the Town of Weymouth conducted a Planning Board meeting on Thursday, May 25, 2000 at 7:30 P.M. at the Town Hall in the Council Chambers.

Present: James Clarke, Director of Planning and Community Development

Mr. Clarke opened the meeting at 7:33 P.M.

Mr. Clarke stated that he is sitting as the Planning Board until a new ordinance is approved by the Town Council creating a new Planning Board and new Planning Board members are appointed.

1. Petr: Yiannis Davos of Davos Supreme Enterprises  
Locus: 1680 Main Street  
Sheets 61 and 64, Block 641, Lot 17  
Zoning: B-1

Request to re-apply to the Board of Zoning Appeals within 2 years of a denial as per MGL Chapter 40A, Section 16

Present on behalf of the petitioner was Gregory Galvin, attorney for the petitioner; and Rick Bryant from Rizzo Associates.

Mr. Clarke stated that Mr. Davos is requesting to re-apply to the BZA within two years of a denial. The rules say that the Planning Board has to consent, with all but one of the members consenting, to the ability of the petitioner to go back before the BZA and that there be a proceeding where that consent is considered. We have always in the past used the special permit public hearing process. We have advertised this and sent notice to abutters. At this point, Mr. Clarke stated that he will open the hearing.

Mr. Galvin stated that he is an attorney and he is representing the applicant, Mr. Davos who is unable to be here this evening. Mr. Rick Bryant from Rizzo Associates is also present. The applicant wishes to express his regrets that he could not attend. Mr. Davos is attending his son's graduation which is out of state. Mr. Vin Albanese is here and has been working with Mr. Davos on the project.

Mr. Galvin stated that this is the applicant's request to the Planning Board for permission to return to the special permit granting authority with a new application. Under the statute and the town's bylaws the Planning Board

must find that there were specific and material changes in the conditions upon which the previous unfavorable action was based. They believe that this new application and new design does meet that standard. They have provided some plans specifically sheets 3 and 4 that are designed to show the differences. Sheet 3 is what the applicant proposes to be the new plan.

Sheet 4 was the prior plan that was presented to the former special permit granting authority. He asked Mr. Bryant to highlight some of the specific and material changes for consideration.

Mr. Bryant from Rizzo Associates stated that the substantive changes that were made to the plan have been made as a direct response to the negative comments that were made on the prior plan. The objections from Planning Board members on the prior submittal had to do with the magnitude of traffic this project would generate and the potential for on site conflicts with respect to traffic circulation caused by the presence of two drive through windows on the site. Relative to the first matter – trip generation, the Board had grave concerns about there being two drive through windows on the property because it generates additional traffic to the site creating issues both at the driveway and adjacent streets. The current plan eliminates one of the two drive through windows. They have prepared a comparison of trip generation rates for uses with and without a drive through. The bank drive through has been eliminated. Their analysis of the Institute of Transportation Engineers trip rates shows that by eliminating the drive through, you potentially reduce the traffic generated by the bank component by 65% which is a major reduction in the generation of traffic. In looking at the total forecasted traffic for the site, that translates to about 500 vehicle trips daily in the afternoon which is about a 25% reduction relative to the total traffic. The original daily estimate for the site was 2,000 vehicles per day and there is about 500 that would be eliminated by eliminating the second drive through so it is a 25% reduction in daily traffic. That in and of itself would be a very substantial and dramatic change particularly in the context of the concerns raised by the Planning Board. The second issue is the internal circulation on the site. The drive through for the bank had a very limited queuing space – approximately 3 to 4 car lengths. Beyond that queue distance the back of the queue had the potential of spilling into the circulation isles to provide access to parking on the property.

Since a couple of people came into the hearing, Mr. Clarke explained the process and asked Mr. Bryant to go over what had been said.

Mr. Bryant recapped what had been said.

Mr. Bryant stated that eliminating the drive through improves on site circulation. The potential for the queue to spill back and block the internal

circulation isles and restrict access to spaces forcing people to back down a circulation isle where they want to drive forward is totally eliminated by the drive through facility. There will be no queues spilling back to the drive isle. The other aspect to that is that there were some concerns over how the two drive throughs relate to one another. At the south end of the building there was the bank drive through and upon leaving that drive through lane you would actually loop back behind the building and mix into traffic that is waiting for the other drive through window. The peaks for the two drive throughs may be different to minimize that problem, but to the extent that there is some overlapping peaks for the two uses, by eliminating the second drive through that problem of traffic mixing together behind the building is eliminated so that problem has been solved as well relative to traffic circulating on the property.

Mr. Bryant stated that as a final note there had been on the initial plan a proposal for site access that shows striping of the left turn lane into the property. However, that concept did not include adequate accommodations for access into Michele Drive that enters Route 18 from the opposite side of the road, nor did it suitably provide access to the Yellow Freight building in the eyes of the Planning Board. That access scheme has been revised and the new concept plan shows the revised plan and does in fact provide sufficient accommodations for those two abutting properties. Overall, they came in with a plan initially that had two drive through windows that was perceived as overburdening the site in terms of traffic and circulation. They have eliminated one of the drive through windows to make the situation far more manageable traffic wise.

Mr. Clarke asked if it was correct that they have increased the islands around the building where the drive through was. Mr. Bryan replied in the affirmative. He stated that by eliminating the drive through lane, that has become added green space on the property.

Mr. Clarke asked if it was correct that they have added an island for central parking area that could be landscaped. Mr. Galvin replied in the affirmative. He stated that they don't need the area for queuing at the back area so they can put in additional landscaping.

Mr. Clarke stated that he did receive their fax regarding information they have verbally discussed concerning the trip rate comparison with a drive through and without a drive through, and the change specifically for a bank where in the peak hour there is a reduction of 65% for the bank traffic. That is also 500 trips daily for the whole project.

Mr. Clarke asked if there are any other changes that are proposed. Mr. Galvin replied that the only other change is that they eliminated a parking

space but he believes that is shown on both the current plan and the old plan. The parking space had been there on an earlier plan. The space was located in the northwest corner of the lot. With the elimination of that parking space, it allows for better flow coming around the building. That was something that was agreed to by the applicant prior to the Board voting on the plan.

Mr. Clarke asked if it was correct that through the last hearing before the Planning Board all of the changes that occurred through the review process including the public hearing, were incorporated and remain in the plan. Mr. Galvin replied that is correct.

Mr. Clarke stated that this is a proceeding to determine whether this should be allowed to come back before the special permit granting authority. In this case the special permit granting authority will be the Board of Zoning Appeals. He is conducting this, as we have in the past, as a public hearing. He asked if anyone present would like to ask questions or had any comments.

Mr. Frank DeAngelis stated that he owns property at 1662 Main Street. He asked what bank is going in. Mr. Galvin replied that at the present time the applicant does not have any tenants under lease. He has had discussions with several tenants, but no one is willing to make a commitment until his client has approval from the town.

Mr. Harvey Welch, 674 Pond Street, asked about a stockade fence in the back. Mr. Galvin replied that he believes that a stockade fence was discussed at the prior Planning Board meeting and that is what they would expect if this is approved here. The plan still has to go through the Board of Zoning Appeals process and they set conditions. The applicant would make that suggestion. If the Board of Zoning Appeals wants something else, the applicant would have to comply with the Board of Zoning Appeals conditions.

Mr. Clarke stated that he had asked the question during the last process of the Planning Board if all of the changes that were suggested and incorporated in the plans were they in these plans and the answer was yes they were.

Mr. Dennis Lynch, 664 Pond Street, stated that they are having a problem with Yellow Trucking. It is 24 hours a day and they are trying to get them to abate the sound from their operations. He asked if something like an abatement fence could be considered as opposed to a stockade fence. Their biggest concern right now is noise.

Mr. Welch asked about the dumpster and who would be responsible to make sure the dumpster is cleaned. Mr. Galvin replied that the owner of the property will be responsible, not the tenants, and that would be Mr. Davos.

Mr. Welch expressed concern that it would be the tenants that would be there on a daily basis and not Mr. Davos. Mr. Galvin replied that he will make sure the residents have Mr. Davos' phone number. He stated that Mr. Davos was not able to be here this evening, but Mr. Davos does not build these units to sell. He builds and maintains the property.

Mr. Galvin stated that if there is a concern over the dumpster, that concern can be brought to the Board of Zoning Appeals and they can set conditions.

Mr. Welch expressed concern over water runoff to property on Pond Street. If they fill in, it will create that much more runoff.

Mr. Clarke stated that when the plan goes before the Board of Zoning Appeals, they will review the drainage plans with DPW, but they are 100' away from the wetlands.

Mr. Clarke closed the hearing on the proceeding to come back within the two year timeframe at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Clarke stated that at this time based upon the information presented in the application and the information that we have heard tonight, both from the applicant and concerned citizens, he is going to grant the request to come back within the two year timeframe. He thinks they have shown through the elimination of one of the drive throughs that there is going to be a reduction of 25% in the daily trip generation. There will be some elimination of potential conflicts between the two different queues by only having one queue. They have shown a new striping scheme for Route 18, different from the application that was considered by the previous Board. They have added an extension of island adjacent to the southern end of the building and a new island on the southern end of the central parking area in the parking lot. Those changes he considers to be significant enough to allow the application to come back before the Board of Zoning Appeals.

## 2. Approval Not Required Plans

### a. Granite Post Lane – Sheet 27, Block 352, Lots 48 & 49

Mr. Clarke stated that the Form A Plan is a re-alignment of two properties. The areas remain the same. The building line on one of the lots is reduced as per the Board of Zoning Appeals case # 2428.

He will grant approval on the Form A Plan for Granite Post Lane since it meets all of the requirements for a Form A Plan.

- b. Great Republic Avenue – Sheet 46, Block 525, Lots 1, 16 & 20

Mr. Clarke stated that this is a piece of property that is part of the Weathervane project. When survey work done, it was noticed that a small out-building on an individual's property at the end of Great Republic Avenue encroached upon some of the Weathervane land. Weathervane has created a new lot so that piece of property can be deeded over to the homeowner. The plan meets all of the requirements for a Form A Plan so he will grant approval of the plan.

- c. Weathervane Planned Unit Development (5 sheets)

Mr. Clarke stated that this has been approved by the Planning Board under Special Permit and Subdivision so it meets the requirements of a Form A submittal and he will grant that plan.

Mr. Clarke stated that being there is no other business to come before the Planning Board, he will adjourn the meeting at 8:05 P.M.

Date Approved/Signed: 11/21/00



James Clarke  
Planning Director

## Public Meeting Citizen Attendance

Date: May 25, 2000

Location: Town Hall - Chambers

Name

Address

## Organization

Phone #

Frank DeAngelis 20 Accord Pond Drive Hingham 74019416

Harvey Welch 674 Pond St Weymouth 335-6694

DENNIS' LYNCH 664 POND ST WBY

Vin Albrecht 35 Lakewood Rd. Wey 337 3993

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper appears to be a standard notebook page or a sheet of stationery. There is no handwriting or other markings on the page.