

Planning Board  
Minutes  
Longmeadow Police Department Conference Room  
Thursday, January 25, 2007  
7:00 pm

Chair Person Walter Gunn called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**Present at the meeting:** Walter Gunn, Bruce Colton, Louis Kornet and Roy Johansen.

**Announcements:** None

**7:00 pm Eric Twarog – P.V.P.C.** Mr. Twarog distributed Version 3 of the Planning Board Rules and Regulations, a revision based on comments from the last Board meeting. The Board reviewed Version 3 and comments and changes were noted by Mr. Twarog and will be available as Version 4 at the next Planning Board meeting.

The Board then reviewed the submitted comments by Town administrators concerning the Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land. Version 2 of the Rules and Regulations, its review by the PVPC and associated comments prepared by the PVPC were commented on by the Board. Generally, all review comments by the PVPC were accepted by the Board. Suggestions and Board comments made tonight will be transmitted by Lou Kornet to the appropriate administrators for further feedback.

Those commenting were:

Robin Crosbie, Town Manager

Mike Wrabel, Department of Public Works

Beverly Hirschhorn, Board of Public Health

Eric Madison, Chief, Longmeadow Fire Department

Mr. Twarog will prepare Version 4 of the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations in addition to Version 3 of the Subdivision Regulations. He was asked to research lighting standards and research examples of Tree and Planting requirements for the subdivision regulations used by other towns.

**7:45 pm Acceptance of Minutes** for the Regular Meeting of January 4, 2007 and the Public Hearing Minutes January 9, 2007. It was Moved to accept these minutes at next regularly scheduled public meeting.

**7:48 pm Visitor Comment and question Period (10 minutes total time)** - None at this time.

**7:50 pm** The Continuation of the Public Hearing for the Dwight Professional / Medical building was opened. Mr. Rajat Mathur of Purcell Associates, traffic engineer for this project addressed the major concern of the Board: The project's effect on the flow of traffic on Dwight Road including the safe exit and entry into the facility. Mr Mathur presented two concepts; both incorporating previously presented engineering detail

including a timed traffic control gate, dedicated left turn lane into the facility on the northbound lane of Dwight Road and a dedicated right turn lane into the facility from the southbound lane of Dwight Road. Both concepts concern the ability to turn left out of the facility on to the northbound side of Dwight Road.

Concept 1: A 205 foot taper lane would be created starting from the dedicated left exit lane of the facility. The beginning of the taper would be a 10 foot wide grooved pavement with painted demarcation to discourage simultaneous vehicle entry from the facility in to the northbound traffic of Dwight Road. This grooved pavement zone just north of the left hand turn lane on the northbound side of Dwight Road would also discourage the illusion of a dedicated left turn lane on to Converse Street. Painted arrows direct traffic in the proper direction.

Concept 2: A 205 foot taper (refuge) lane would be created starting from the dedicated left exit lane of the facility. The taper would allow the dedicated entry of vehicles turning left from the facility and merge into the northbound traffic on Dwight Road. Painted arrows direct traffic in the proper direction.

Mr. Mathur presented photographic examples of timed traffic control gates and their specific function. The Board asked what was the suggested time of operation of the gate. Mr. Mathur and Police Officer Kirby advised that between the hours of 4 pm and 6 pm the gate should be in the closed position.

Mr. Mathur advised the Board that he preferred Concept 1 for the reasons mentioned above in addition to the fact there exists no Federal guidelines to Concept 2.

Officer Mike Kirby also concurred with the preference of Concept 1 over Concept 2 in favor of the rumble strip eliminating the illusion of access and visibility issues associated with Concept 2.

Regardless of either concept, Mr. Gunn advised the applicants that any road improvements associated with this project would require the approval by the Town Select Board.

8:35 pm The Public Hearing was closed. A motion was made and seconded to open the public meeting of the Planning Board to deliberate on the application. In general, the Board favors the project in all its elements. Discussion continued on Concept 1 and 2 as presented and the effectiveness of the Timed Traffic Control Gate.

Roy Johansen favors Concept 2 without the Traffic Control Gate. He is concerned the traffic gate, in the long term, will become inoperative and does not significantly improve traffic control to warrant its need. He feels drivers will ignore the traffic control measures proposed and the rumble strip in Concept 1 will cause further traffic problems.

Bruce Colton indicated that he was persuaded by Roy Johansen that Concept 2 was the better alternative. While Concept 1 might be marginally less confusing for northbound through traffic on Dwight Road, the real problem is with traffic exiting the proposed development, and Concept 2 seemed to better address that problem. The rumble strip

may cause exiting drivers to panic and increase the likelihood of accidents - - potentially serious ones. As long as it properly maintained, Mr. Colton has no concerns regarding the traffic gate.

Walter Gunn and Lou Kornet advised the Board to accept Concept 1 with the Traffic Control Gate as the Board should defer to the professional and expert opinions rendered on the subject, especially those of Officer Kirby and Rajat Mathur.

Walter Gunn made a motion to approve Site and Design with the following conditions discussed by the Board:

1. Storm Drainage Maintenance: Per the plan labeled 20061109 and dated "Revised" January 18, 2007, the "Infiltration Trench" on the Southerly side of the property. The applicant shall file annually, with the Building Inspector of the Town of Longmeadow, the name of its designated party responsible for the preservation of service, functionality, and integrity of the "Infiltration Trench", the date of service and the action taken. Annual shall be defined as the anniversary of the date of issuance of the certificate of occupancy by the Building Commissioner.
2. The traffic control gate shall be maintained to the standards prescribed in this decision of the planning Board and maybe reviewed periodically. The traffic control gate shall be in the closed position from the hours of 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM, Monday through Friday. The gate shall be maintained in good order by the owner of the premises. Needed repairs shall be remedied within forty-eight (48) hours.
3. If the approved traffic plan proves ineffective in the opinion of the Traffic Safety Committee, the applicant shall thereby agree to remedy the situation as directed by the Traffic Safety Committee.

Failure to comply with the above conditions shall result in enforcement by the Building Commissioner.

The motion was seconded. While Mr. Colton still felt that Concept 1 was inferior to Concept 2, he acknowledged that he is not a traffic engineer. In light of the fact that Officer Kirby, the developer's traffic engineer, and half the Planning Board favored Concept 1, and the approval motion explicitly stated that, in the future, the town's Traffic Safety Committee could compel the petitioner to make changes in the traffic plan if it proved ineffective, Mr. Colton voted in favor of the proposal. He hoped that Concept 1 would prove to be effective. Walter Gunn called a vote and the motion carried unanimously. (4:0)

**9:00 pm ANR Application** – The Board discussed the requested approval of an ANR Application for the sale of Land from "Parcel B" of Amy & Edward Carroll, 788 Longmeadow St. to Patricia Lincoln Low, "Parcel A", 31 Chandler Ave. Neither "Lot B", 788 Longmeadow St., nor "Lot A", 31 Chandler Ave., as shown on the Plan submitted, meet the frontage requirement as specified in the zoning bylaw. Lot A is 88.92' and Lot B has frontage of 64.12'. The minimum required frontage in

Longmeadow Zone A-1 is 125 feet. The Board notated the Plan, specifically “New Lot A” on 31 Chandler Ave. as “Not a New Building Lot”.

A motion was made to vote and seconded. Voting for the endorsement were Gunn, Colton, Kornet, and Johansen. The endorsement was granted by a unanimous vote of 4-0

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Walter Gunn