

**Foxborough Planning Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**July 12, 2011**  
**Town Hall**

**Members Present:** Kevin Weinfeld, William Grieder, Gordon Greene, Ron Bressé, Shannon McLaughlin, Alternate John Rhoads

**Also Present:** Planner Sharon Wason, Building Commissioner William Casbarra

**7:00 p.m. Continued Public Hearing – Site Plan Review**  
**Boyden Library**  
**10 Bird Street**

Library Trustee Chairman Jeff Lovely was present along with Library Director Jerry Cirillo, engineer William Buckley and architects Julie Janciewicz, Eric Smith and Jason Maurer of LLB architects. K.Weinfeld stated that the Board wanted the applicants, neighbors and the Design Review Board to do their best to come to an agreement. He stated that there have been several meetings and he would like to give the applicant a chance to explain what changes they have made to try to satisfy the neighbors and the Design Review Board. He explained that public comments or questions would be taken after the presentation.

J.Lovely stated that on June 13<sup>th</sup> the Library Trustees held a joint meeting with the Permanent Municipal Building Committee and invited the Design Review Board and neighbors to attend. He stated that they received input from Mr. Davis on behalf of neighbors. On June 14<sup>th</sup> a work session was held with the neighbors and the Design Review Board. On June 21<sup>st</sup> the Design Review Board issued a letter with comments. On June 23<sup>rd</sup> another working session was held with the Design Review Board and the neighbors. Between June 14<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup>, he exchanged emails with attorney Mark Stopa. On July 6<sup>th</sup> there was a meeting with the Trustees and the architect team. On July 11<sup>th</sup>, a joint meeting was held with the Permanent Municipal Building Committee and the Design Review Board. He stated that architect Julie Janciewicz would present the changes made to the design.

J.Janciewicz presented the drawing of the building as was filed and the changes to the design. She stated that the concerns presented by the neighbors were and how they were addressed:

- Access to rear of Smith property; relocated the dumpster and added a way to access the property.
- Travel path of cars, specifically concerning headlights at north side of site; changed the traffic pattern to one way and added signage.
- Proper buffering between Library and Smith property via shrubs and a cedar fence; landscaping and cedar fence were added (showed elevations with plantings and fence)

J.Janciewicz stated that the Design Review Board requested to see renderings of the building and compared to nearby buildings, she showed elevations and demonstrated that the buildings have similar roof elevations. The Design Review Board also presented concerns and she discussed how these were addressed:

- “change white trim to better match existing building” – changed the tone of the trim on glass stairway to match the rest of the building

- “make the fascia/parapets of similar color and height as the roof overhang on the original building” – added a roof overhang
- “use window trim on the vertical windows similar to the original building and of like-looking materials.” – changed windows to taller windows and higher, similar to existing windows, trim would be metal
- “replace the large horizontal running bond panels with vertical grained panels of a similar color and texture as the original walls.” – changed the panels to horizontal panels and found a stone veneer that can be used on the first floor facing Baker Street and added a reveal at the base of the windows
- “continue the fieldstone on the Baker street side north to the entrance and utilize a fieldstone corner on the north side of the entrance.” – added fieldstone to highlight the entrance and enhances the signage and added taller windows on side facing smiths

K.Weinfeld stated that the Board received letter issued by the Design Review Board on June 23<sup>rd</sup>. J.Lovely stated that they addressed many of the concerns submitted by Design Review. Planner Sharon Wason stated that Design Review requested changes to mitigate glass stairwell. J.Lovely stated that windows are to provide light to the interior and children’s section, were unable to come up with changes that didn’t detract ambient light and adding panels to the stairway wouldn’t de-emphasize it.

G.Greene stated that they did a great job improving the windows, but didn’t implement on changes to stairway, adding that it’s obvious that the stairway is the architectural highlight, but it’s the main concern of the DRB and residents. J.Rhoads asked where the stairwell ended. J.Janciewicz showed location at the entrance to second floor. J.Rhoads stated that the stairway offers access and egress and provides space for children’s section. He stated that adding vertical panels to the glass can be done without losing LEED certification. W.Griender stated that light source comes from above, not perpendicular to the entrance, asked what the impact of adding panels at the bottom of the glass stairwell would be. J.Lovely stated that they were unable to make themselves comfortable with adding panels, but if it would make people happy, can be done, but not sure that it would de-emphasize the stairway. K.Weinfeld stated that as the sun travels across the sky, there is lesser light that would be provided by the stairway, asked if they could use glass on the ceiling. J.Janciewicz responded that it could only be added at the entrance to the building. Trustee Janet Pineault stated that the glass is not there to make an architectural statement, Baker Street entrance is very dark and the reason glass is there is to let as much as natural light as possible. She stated that there are practical aspects to the glass, it lights up the stairway with natural light and provides natural light for children’s section in the upper level.

S.Wason read portion of Design Review Board memo requesting changes to the upper level by using solid panels in three or four sections. J.Lovely responded that they would reluctantly agree to add 3-4 vertical panels to break up the vertical panels. S.Wason asked how the heat would be mitigated on hot days. J.Janciewicz responded that the glass has solar E-coating that tones down heat. W.Griender stated that there would still need to have additional air conditioning to mitigate the heat.

S.Wason stated that Design Review Board needs to be satisfied in order to issue an approval of site plan. She asked G.Greene asked if concerns were addressed, aside from the glass. G.Greene stated that the glass is not compatible with the existing building. J. Lovely stated that they would consider adding panels, adding that they are married to the stairway for reasons of design and cost. He stated that they considered different ways to deal with the cascading effect and would reluctantly agree to vertical panels. J.Pineault stated that it would helpful to know how exactly and where exactly to locate the panels. J.Rhoads stated that the architect should determine

location. J.Pineault stated that they would want a percentage and leave to the architect to do it. Bob Capece, Chairman of Design Review Board stated that they acknowledge that staircase and light are important, but 40-50% would soften the impact.

Building Commissioner William Casbarra stated that the Trustees need to have a Building Permit in hand by October 2, 2011 in order for the variances granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals to still be valid.

W.Grieder stated that he has received more calls about the Library than any other project in Town, including the new Stadium. He stated that the Library would be expected to be embraced by everyone. He stated that what is troubling is the fact that people are losing or have strained friendships due to this project. He stated that the Board's decision to approve or deny may be appealed, adding that as a community we need to move forward on this project.

Comments from the public:

Warren Liljegren, 163 South St. – stated that the Library is 45 years old; Trustees started working on this library expansion 12 years ago, adding that as a taxpayer, don't know how we can say we don't need \$4.3 millions to fix the library.

John Schleyer, 5 Ouimet Lane – stated that he is an architect and has never seen a circus like this, urged the Board to get the project done. J.Rhoads stated that it is down to one point, softening of the glass.

J.Janciewicz showed second floor, pointing out that bottom glass panels are opaque with bookcases in front of them. J.Lovely stated that they would agree 3-4 vertical panels on top and 3-4 on the stairway, but would prefer vertical vs. horizontal panels. W.Grieder asked to see a night view from the corner of Bird and Baker to show the light emission at night. He suggested that they look at the illustration showing where no light shines out where panels could be added.

Charles DiPompo, 96D Main Street – stated that he has followed the process and the presentation tonight is the result of the work of the neighbors and Design Review Board, if it's only the glass panels then they should determine the amount and end the process.

Attorney Mark Stopa, representing the neighborhood group, stated that they have worked very hard at identifying what the focal issue and the point is. He stated that the external staircase was the problem. He stated that this Board has site plan review and design review responsibilities. They have boiled down to the external staircase as the main issue and there has been no movement to change it, additions presented last night were a good start. He stated that the stair sticks out and doesn't match the existing building or the neighborhood, adding that the zigzag doesn't match the lines of the current building. He stated that his clients don't trust that giving the Trustees a condition to add panels would be sufficient. K.Weinfeld asked what would happen if his clients don't have consensus that a new design is acceptable, stating that the Library belongs to the entire community, everyone needs to be able to compromise. M.Stopa stated that when we entered the process issues were height, footprint and all other issues; he thinks that the changes are acceptable but would like zigzag to be removed and questioned how does stair tie the buildings together.

J.Lovely stated that they have asked the neighbors for sketches to get ideas, but were not provided with one until June 13<sup>th</sup>. He stated that the neighbor group has come from many different perspectives. He stated that they have time and budget constraints. K.Weinfeld stated that there is

a final issue: revisiting the staircase in a way that's acceptable to the Design Review Board, Trustees and neighborhood group. He stated that essentially Mr. Stopa has stated that all other issues were addressed. M.Stopa stated that all other issues would be set aside if a consensus is reached on the stairway, but if a consensus is not reached, then all other issues will be brought up.

J.Lovely asked if adding the panels the Design Review Board will consider that the design meets 9.2.5. B.Capece stated that the softening of the stairway may be considered that it meets the standards. Design Review Board member Sheila Masterson stated that she appreciates what has been done, but the shape of stairway and zigzag is a concern.

Jeff Davis, 13 Baker Street stated that this process has been going on for 90 days, and changes have been made in the last 26-27 hours. He stated that at last night's meeting, they saw some things that meet the desires of the Design Review Board and until tonight, the Trustees hadn't said that stairway can be changed. He stated that they don't want to be seen as a group that is costing the Town money. He stated that they need to see revised drawings from the architect.

Tom McGee, 389 South Street – stated that he has been a member of the Library Board of Trustees for 2 months. He stated that the Design Review Board's requests have changed during the time he has been serving in the Board. He stated that the Design Review Board was invited to a meeting but they didn't attend. He stated that his deep concern is that people will change their opinions after this meeting.

G.Greene stated that the suggestions were to break up the stairway, things that were done to the windows are good.

Shannon McLaughlin stated that the discussion is now down to two issues to be addressed: the shape of stairway and the mass of glass. Need to get to a point of compromise from both sides.

J.Lovely requested a recess so the Trustees can discuss the issues in private with their architects and engineer.

### **8:30 pm Town Planner's report**

S.Wason presented her report to the Board. She stated that there are funds available through the South Coast Rail initiative and suggested requesting funds for a housing plan. She stated that the town of Sharon had their housing plan funded by them. She requested permission to apply for the grant, the Board approved the request.

### **8:40 p.m. Continuation of Library hearing**

W.Griender stated that the Design Review Board has rendered a decision on the matter and asked if a substantial enough change in the design is required to reopen their discussion. W.Casbarra responded that they can reconsider their decision at a public meeting. J.Lovely stated that the Design Review Board has begun their reconsideration process by attending the work sessions. G.Greene stated that the Design Review Board would like to continue to work to bring this project to an agreeable resolution.

J.Lovely stated that they would like to return to the July 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, adding that they cannot commit to anything but need some time to draw plans and meet with neighbors and the Design

Review Board. He asked that a vote be taken at the next meeting. He stated that a massive re-design of the stairs would require a new structural re-design, but they could take an angle out, have a taller glass area in the bottom with some reduced angularity.

G.Greene requested that Mrs. Masterson attend a meeting with the Trustees and architects when the design is being discussed. J.Lovely stated that the next meeting of the Library Building Committee is scheduled for Thursday, July 14<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m. and would agree to a working session.

Ron Bressé asked why use panels rather than stone on the façade. J.Janciewicz responded that the structure couldn't withstand the weight of stone.

**Motion** by W.Grieder to continue to the hearing to July 28, 2011 at 8:30 p.m. in the Town Hall meeting room. Seconded by G.Greene. Unanimous Affirmative Vote (5:0)

**9:00 p.m. Discussion of the Environmental Impact Report for "Big Y" supermarket**

Engineer William Buckley and attorney Frank Spillane were present for the discussion. S.Wason stated that she reviewed the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Big Y. She stated that a new traffic light will be installed at the entrance to the plaza on Forbes Boulevard, the lights at the intersection of Forbes and Route 140 will be improved as well. MassDOT is also requiring the addition of a traffic light at the intersection of Central and Commercial streets. She stated that Mr. Buckley and his client believe that the cost for the lights would be \$600,000. She stated that the intersection is 1.3 miles from site. The intersection is already failing and other projects have been approved in the area and were not required to install a light. She stated that she is a resident of Walpole and Big Y has been a good corporate neighbor to the community there. The project would improve an existing site and having Big Y in Town would be a great benefit to the community. She stated that she discussed the situation with Lionel Lucien of MassDOT and visited the site. She stated that the applicant has offered to design the light at 100% design. Since they will be adding an increase in traffic of 2.8% on weekdays and 5.4% on weekends, she suggested that they should contribute a percentage of the construction equaling the amount of traffic being added by their project. She stated that her calculations show that their portion would be \$35,000.00. J.Rhoads suggested adding a left-turn lane to the intersection. S.Wason stated that it would help solve some of the problems. W.Buckley stated that they would prefer to give a set amount. S.Wason stated that the PWED application window is September 2 to 8, 2011. She stated that Commonwealth Capital application is no longer being used, but Smart Growth initiatives and South Coast Rail are used to rate municipalities. She stated that the project would be a good fit for a PWED grant. She suggested that the Town respectfully ask MassDOT to not require the third light because the applicant is not causing the intersection to fail. She stated that she would like the Board to vote to back this request.

**Motion** by W.Grieder to ask MassDOT to not require the traffic light at the intersection of Central and Commercial Streets. Seconded by R.Bressé. Unanimous Affirmative Vote (5:0)

S.Wason asked that the applicant send a letter to MassDOT consenting to the 100% design and agree to pay their fair share \$35,000 and assist the Town with a PWED application. Mr. Buckley and Mr. Spillane agreed to send a letter with the commitments described.

**9:30 p.m. General Business**

**Correspondence**

The Board reviewed correspondence received from abutting Towns and a letter from Mr. Casbarra approving a parking lot expansion at the Lutheran Church.

**Review of Minutes**

The Board reviewed the minutes of March 24, April 14, May 5 and June 9, 2011. There was a correction noted by J.Rhoads on the minutes of June 9.

**Motion** by W.Grieder to approve the minutes of April 14, 2011 as submitted. Seconded by R.Bressé. Unanimous Affirmative Vote (5:0)

**Motion** by R.Bressé to approve the minutes of May 5, 2011 as submitted. Seconded by S.McLaughlin. Unanimous Affirmative Vote (5:0)

**Motion** by G.Greene to approve the minutes of March 24, 2011. Seconded by K.Weinfeld. Unanimous Affirmative Vote (5:0)

**Motion** by S.McLaughlin to approve the minutes of June 9, 2011 as corrected. Seconded by W.Grieder. Unanimous Affirmative Vote (5:0)

**Subdivision Regulations**

W.Grieder stated that as part of a review of Subdivision Regulations, the Board should consider discussing cul-de-sacs and the 800' rule for roads that loop back to itself since this is a type of road that will be seen in projects to come.

**9:45 p.m. Meeting adjourned**

Approved by: Kevin Weinfeld, Chairman

Date: December 8, 2011