

RECEIVED  
PLANNING BOARD CLERKS OFFICE  
2021 MAR 24 10 56 AM

**Planning Board Minutes**

**March 24, 2021**

**MEETING HELD VIRTUALLY USING GOTOWEBINAR PLATFORM**

Present: Beth Ashman-Collins, Chair; Joseph Cerretani, Clerk; Richard LeBlanc, Michael McClanahan, Ralph Penney, Sharon Friedman, Michael Feck; Adrian LeCesne, Alternate Shaun P. Burke, Director of Planning and Development; Jennifer Davis, Administrative Secretary

The chair read the following statement:

*Whereas both the Federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Massachusetts Department of Public Health have advised residents to take extra measures to put distance between themselves and other people to further reduce the risk of being exposed to COVID-19, Governor Baker has issued an order suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law, Massachusetts General Law c. 30A, §20.*

*In order to satisfy the Open Meeting Law requirements, today's Town of Mansfield Planning Board meeting will available for to public via GoToWebinar and Mansfield Cable. The instructions for joining via GoToWebinar are in the Meeting Notice on the Town's Website at [www.mansfieldma.com](http://www.mansfieldma.com) and then clicking on today's date on the calendar.*

**1. Planning Board Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m.**

**2. Correspondence**

1. March 10, 2021 minutes

**Motion:** To approve the March 10, 2021 minutes as submitted (Penney-Cerretani)

Friedman – In favor

Penney – In favor

Cerretani – In favor

Ashman-Collins – In favor

Four (4) in favor. Zero (0) opposed. Zero (0) abstained. PASSES

**3. Form A (ANR) Plans**

None

**4. Site Plan/Municipal Clearinghouse – 99 Maple Street – PFAS Treatment Facility – Cate Springs Well – Town of Mansfield**

Lee Azinheira, DPW Director, introduced Mike Ahern, DPW Special Projects Manager; Steve Robbins and Bradley Mustain, Woodard & Curran

Mr. Robbins explained Cate Springs is one of the town's largest producing wells, and the state has issued new requirements regarding additional treatment for PFAS. He explained larger filters are required, but the existing facility does not have the space to accommodate them, so they are proposing the addition of a new treatment building behind the existing facility, which would be shielded from the road by the existing tank. He said the existing driveway will be extended to the new 30'x70' building. There will be approximately one-quarter acre of land disturbance, and Mr. Alves has observed the test holes on site. The plan has gone through the Conservation Commission because part of the site is within the wetland buffer.

Mr. Azinheira said they are proposing a green steel building to blend in with the pine trees in the background. Mr. McClanahan said if it blends in, it shouldn't be a problem. Mr. Penney agreed and asked about the construction schedule. Mr. Azinheira said they are working with DEP on the SRF schedule and have to get final approvals before advertising, which he hopes will be sometime this summer. He said there should be minimal construction traffic on Maple Street. Mr. Ahern said there may be four tractor trailer trips to deliver the tanks, then there will be concrete trucks trips for the foundation work. The second phase will be to put the building up.

Mr. Penney asked about the tanks. Mr. Robbins said the carbon will be replaced annually using a large vacuum truck. He said half the filter would be replaced each year.

Mr. Penney said he understands there are new DEP regulations for drinking water standards.

Ms. Friedman asked if the building in front is being used now; Mr. Robbins said the Water Department uses it for storage. He said they looked at using that building for the PFAS equipment, but it is not large enough.

Mr. Cerretani asked about the cost; Mr. Azinheira said it will be around the same as reusing the building. Mr. Robbins said they are within the original cost estimate.

Mr. Cerretani asked if PFAS levels are up; Mr. Azinheira said Cate Springs and Walsh are shut down and they have not been testing those wells. He said they are trying to keep PFAS levels in all the wells below 20 parts per trillion.

Mr. Cerretani said water usage goes up in the summer and asked if this would create problems. Mr. Azinheira said the town hits peak usage at the end of June-beginning of July, so they will be monitoring the water table. He said the state has already started up the drought task force and water levels already low for this time of year. He said in an emergency like a major fire, the wells could be restarted.

#### **Department Head Comments**

The clerk read memos from Ms. Gonyer and Mr. Burke

**Motion:** To approve the site plan for the Cate Springs PFAS Treatment Facility at 99 Maple Street (McClanahan-Cerretani)

LeBlanc – In favor

Friedman – In favor

Penney – In favor

Cerretani – In favor

McClanahan – In favor

Feck – In favor

LeCesne – In favor

Ashman-Collins – In favor

Eight (8) in favor. Zero (0) opposed. Zero (0) abstained. PASSES

**Motion:** To send the Select Board a positive recommendation on the Cate Springs PFAS Treatment Facility at 99 Maple Street (McClanahan-Penney)

LeBlanc – In favor

Friedman – In favor

Penney – In favor

Cerretani – In favor

McClanahan – In favor

Feck – In favor

LeCesne – In favor

Ashman-Collins – In favor

Eight (8) in favor. Zero (0) opposed. Zero (0) abstained

#### **5. Planning Board Workshop on Business 1 (B1) Zone Issues**

The board has discussed lowering the FAR in B1 from 2.0 to 1.25 for Retail, Office and Other Non-Residential uses, and from 2.5 to 1.5 for Business/Residential uses.

Mr. Burke presented some examples of what the FAR change would mean using a 25,000 square foot building as an example. He said during the Master Plan process, there was significant discussion and concern about the height and scale of some of the newer buildings downtown. This draft change came about in response to that concern; he noted the board had not reached consensus about the correct density.

Mr. Feck said neither 1 Mansfield nor 300 North Main Street hit 2.5 FAR. Mr. Burke said that is true, mostly because of parking issues. Mr. Feck said very few sites could get to that FAR because of parking issues. Mr. Burke said part of the reason behind the 2.5 FAR was to encourage assembling parcels. Mr. Penney said the business/residential FAR was higher to try to encourage mixed use, but agreed it would be difficult to achieve that because of parking issues. He suggested 1.5. Mr. McClanahan agreed.

Mr. LeCesne said if none of the existing FAR maximums can be reached because of parking, this discussion may be for nothing. Ms. Ashman-Collins said she thinks the change may not result in material changes in what can be developed downtown.

Consensus was to consider FAR at 1.5 for Retail, Office, Other Non-Residential and Business-Residential uses. Mr. Feck suggested a lower density for All Residential uses to try to encourage mixed-use development.

Mr. Cerretani asked if a revised building height definition would affect B1. Mr. Burke said he has drafted several options, most of which cap the height at 45 feet. He said mixed use was made a use by right to encourage mixed use downtown, and suggested .08 if the board wants to change the density. Mr. Penney suggested leaving All Residential uses as special permit and lowering density for the other uses to 1.75. Mr. Burke said that would provide some incentive for mixed use.

Mr. Feck said Station Landing [300 North Main Street] had an FAR of about 1.6, which he thinks is the highest density that could be achieved on a lot in that zone. Ms. Friedman said that

resulted in no green space on that site and a building that is too big and too dense. She said we should encourage development that is compatible with the Master Plan and architecturally pleasing for the surrounding residential areas. She said additional buildings at the same density would not solve the problem.

Ms. Ashman-Collins said she would be comfortable with 1.5 FAR.

Mr. Feck said he is in favor of keeping density for All Residential relatively low and requiring a special permit. He said All Residential should be used on smaller lots, and the larger lots should be mixed use. Mr. Penney noted All Residential in B2 is .5. He said the board had discussed .5 for All Residential and agreed that might be too low. Mr. Cerretani suggested .6 or .7 for All Residential; Mr. Burke said he thinks that would be reasonable.

The board discussed .75 FAR for All Residential in the B1 zone. Mr. Cerretani said without setback requirements in B1, it makes sense for the density to be a bit higher than in B2.

Mr. LeBlanc said the numbers may not be achievable because of parking, but said he is struggling with 1.5 FAR.

Ms. Friedman said the idea is to find the best way to build a building that will fit in with the rest of the landscape downtown. Mr. LeCesne said All Residential is a special permit, so the applicant would have to carry the burden, but he would not want to tie developers' hands with a number.

Ms. Friedman asked how much of the B1 can be developed without knocking down buildings and rebuilding, which could result in more large buildings. Ms. Ashman-Collins said there is one empty lot, which has been permitted but not built out, and an empty lot next to the North Main Street Fire Station. Mr. Penney said if the numbers work, buildings will start to come down.

Mr. LeCesne said he thinks the problem with 1 Mansfield is traffic, but the B1 on North Main Street has a relatively smooth traffic flow. Ms. Friedman said most of the new development has come right to the sidewalk; Mr. Cerretani said that is part of a vibrant downtown. Mr. LeCesne said downtown has curbing, sidewalk and building, and said some green space between the curb and sidewalk would soften the look of a building. Ms. Ashman-Collins said downtown has had no required setbacks for a long time, and it would be hard to change that to require grass strips. She agreed with Mr. LeCesne's point that for a pedestrian, it isn't so much the height or density of a building, but with its face at ground level.

Ms. Friedman said she attended a webinar on vacant buildings, one of the presenters said to put something in the windows to make it more attractive until it is used for something else.

She said she is comfortable with 1.25. Mr. Penney suggested 1.5 for retail, office, non-residential; .75 for residential and 1.6 for business/residential to encourage mixed use.

Mr. Feck said residential at .75, a 10,000 sf lot could accommodate 4-5 units, or about 20 units/acre.

Mr. Penney said the condo development on West Church Street was originally four units and ended up with three units; he asked how that came about. Mr. Burke said that was a special permit. Ms. Ashman-Collins said there are a lot of lots between the business area and residential area.

Freidman - .5  
Penney - .6  
Cerretani - .65  
Mc - .7  
Feck - .75  
Rich -

Mr. Cerretani asked about adding FAR to the downtown table

*[figure out some examples of buildings and their FAR – what does 1.5 look like?]*

Ms. Friedman said the table is for existing buildings, but in the future, buildings can be taken down and parcels combined to build larger buildings.

Mr. Penney said the board had talked about removing some of the incentives downtown; Mr. Burke said that was in the North Main Street Business Overlay District.

*[add to agenda]*

Mr. LeBlanc asked if the Roosevelt had the same reaction as some of the more recent buildings; he said he thinks the length of the building at 300 North Main Street was more of a problem than the height. Mr. Burke said the Roosevelt replaced a building of a similar height, so that wasn't as big a change. Ms. Ashman-Collins said she thinks the long, undifferentiated buildings are part of the problem.

## **6. Around the Table**

Mr. Penney asked about the revised building height definition. Mr. Burke showed the board three draft definitions. The first would give the board special permit option on buildings above 10 feet over the maximum height. Mr. Penney said he would not want a definition that encourages just flat roofs that don't fit the character of the neighborhood because developers are trying to max out the building height. Mr. Burke said there is significantly less architectural detail on new buildings than there was on the older buildings that have been replaced.

Mr. Feck said he doesn't like the idea of having to take off a floor for the sake of not wanting a flat roof.

Ms. Ashman-Collins said the feedback from the neighborhood was that they want a definite height.

Mr. Penney suggested adding "rooftop structures including but not limited to..."

Mr. LeCesne said the third definition would allow rooftop items above the maximum.

**7. Adjournment**

**Motion:** To adjourn at 8:30 p.m. (McClanahan- )

Friedman – In favor

LeCesne – In favor

Penney –In favor

McClanahan – In favor

Ashman-Collins – In favor

Cerretani – In favor

Feck – In favor

LeBlanc – In favor

Eight (8) in favor. Zero (0) opposed. Zero (0) abstentions. PASSES

Date of Next Planning Board Meeting: April 14, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. /

Joseph Cerretani  
Signature of Clerk

April 14, 2021  
Date of Approval