



# Water Supply District of Acton

025 (1) 06/06/2016

693 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 953  
ACTON, MASSACHUSETTS 01720

TELEPHONE (978) 263-9107

FAX (978) 264-0148

DATE: May 23, 2016

TO: Town of Acton Planning Department

FROM: Chris Allen, District Manager

RE: Comments on 429 Great Road SPSP 04/22/16-462

1. All existing water service material must be renewed to meet existing specification and existing service must be shutoff and disconnected in the Public Right of Way.
2. Any new water service or fire line from the water main to a dwelling, building or structure will be in a separate, underground trench. No other utility will be in the same trench unless the District determines that the conditions prevent a separate trench. In such cases, a suitable plan prepared by a registered Professional Engineer will be submitted to the District for approval to insure safety and accessibility for repair, replacement or inspection of the lines located in the same trench.
3. All water mains, services, appurtenances and installation of such must comply with AWD specifications. (Hard copy may be picked up at AWD main office)
4. A proposed "As-Built" plan of the water infrastructure must be submitted, reviewed and approved by AWD prior to any installation of said infrastructure.
5. A final "As-Built" plan denoting exact locations of all water infrastructure will be submitted by the contractor prior to filling of any water mains for pressure test or disinfection per AWD specifications.
6. The developer should make all efforts to implement water conservation for both indoor and outdoor use. We recommend use of US EPA Watersense rated fixtures, or equivalent, wherever practicable.
7. Outdoor landscaping should utilize Low Impact Development (LID) principles to minimize irrigation needs.

Respectfully submitted

Chris Allen  
District Manager



## **DRB Memorandum**

### **429-433 Great Road**

Project Location: Site of the existing Pegasus Tack Shop

Project Description: A one-story retail car dealership consisting of an eight-bay vehicle service area, showroom, support facilities and a basement area evidently for vehicle storage.

Architectural Plans: The proponent submitted:

- Existing Conditions Plan;
- revised architectural floor plan, sheet A-1 titled Basement Floor Plan; sheet A-2 titled First Floor Plan, and A-3 titled Exterior Elevations;
- Layout Plan;
- Grading and Drainage Plan; and
- Landscape Plan (sheet L-1).

The applicant, Leo Bertolami, Architect Manny Rempelakis, R.A., of E.J. Rempelakis Associates, and Civil Engineer George Dimakarakos, P.E. of Stamski and McNary were not present.

**Date of DRB Third Review for this project proposal: 05-4-2016**

#### Background

The site borders existing apartment buildings and adjacent retail uses on Great Road. The existing building is a wood frame, barn-type structure with condition problems. The building is not located in an historic district nor is it located on the Acton Cultural Resource List as a protected structure. Therefore, demolition of the existing building is allowed. The proponent will be seeking a Special Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The existing building violates a 30-foot setback from Great Road and the proponent will be seeking to replace the existing building with a new structure that does not conform with the required setback.

In general, in its third review, the DRB found the revised drawings confusing. We recommend that the Applicant and/or the architect and civil engineer appear before the DRB in order to provide clarifications. In order to enable the DRB to perform an appropriate review, the Applicant should provide exterior elevations that are consistent with the proposed site plan modifications. There appears to be a grade change that is reflected in the plan and is not depicted in the submitted building elevations.

The comments below, which follow the review of the submitted drawings depicting revisions to the proposed project, should be read in conjunction with prior memoranda regarding this proposed project.

The DRB is concerned that the newly introduced basement level is proposed to have a clear height of 7 feet, 6 inches, and is provided a single means of egress. For these reasons, the DRB recommends further study of the basement concept by the design team and would like to understand the intended use of the basement level. The DRB is also quite concerned with the proximity of the depressed drive to the basement level in relation to the street edge of Great Road. The exterior elevations do not suggest the planned pedestrian ramp leading to the entrance facing Great Road, which causes concern for the DRB. The first floor appears to be five to six feet above the Great Road sidewalk at its eastern corner. The DRB suggests that the drawings should show the Great Road façade in relation to the road and illustrate how the grade change is to be managed along the facade in relation to the first floor and Great Road. The DRB disfavors the proposed five-foot high exposed foundation. The applicant should bring the finishing down. The building needs a base from which the brick and stone can start. In general, the DRB considers it unwise to lift the building four feet above grade. This approach is out of character with attractive commercial development and appears to be a gimmick to accommodate the basement. It will require considerable earth-moving. The ramp leading to the basement level will require fencing that will also be unattractive and will not be hidden by the proposed plantings. The DRB recommends an additional rock wall along the front if the applicant is insistent on raising the building above the sidewalk, which, as noted, the DRB does not encourage.

The DRB suggests that the entrance portico is not in keeping with the design of the building and should be reconsidered.

The design of the front of the building is a conventional flat-roofed commercial structure that does not relate well to the taller rear portion of the building which has been drawn with a gable roof. The pitched roof at the rear of the building is a very flat pitch and therefore not reminiscent of a barn-like structure as has previously been suggested is the concept for this. Thus the DRB suggests that it may be better if the whole building is constructed with a roof line that is a series of flat-roofed elements. Or in the alternative all portions of the building should be provided with appropriately pitched gable roof lines. The DRB commends the applicant for revising the proposal to include uniform materials.

With respect to the proposed plantings, the DRB recommends that the applicant find a different mid-sized tree as the proposed tree is considered invasive.

Finally, the DRB requests that in the future this applicant (and all applicants) heed the DRB's guidelines regarding the need for two copies of drawings to be submitted in full scale in advance of the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Design Review Board

Members in attendance: Holly Ben-Joseph, Peter Darlow, Michael Dube.

**From:** [Robert Hart](#)  
**To:** [Kim Gorman](#); [Planning Department](#); [Building Department](#); [Engineering Department](#); [Health Department](#); [Natural Resources Department](#); [Fire Department](#); [Chris Allen](#); [Design Review Board](#); [Municipal Properties Department](#)  
**Cc:** [Lisa Tomy](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Munis link: Permit Application 1655 - 429 Great Road Site Plan Special Permit  
**Date:** Thursday, April 28, 2016 1:25:34 PM

---

Kim,

The Fire department has no issue with the site plan as depicted.

Respectfully,

Robert Hart  
Acting Fire Chief

---

**From:** Kim Gorman  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 27, 2016 9:59 AM  
**To:** Planning Department; Building Department; Engineering Department; Health Department; Natural Resources Department; Fire Department; Chris Allen; Design Review Board; Municipal Properties Department  
**Cc:** Lisa Tomy  
**Subject:** Munis link: Permit Application 1655 - 429 Great Road Site Plan Special Permit

Hello,

I am in receipt of an application for 429 Great Road Site Plan Special Permit #04/22/16 - 462 – Site Plan Special Permit to be filed with the Board of Selectmen.

The location of the documents are within docushare, here is the link to view -  
<http://doc.acton-ma.gov/dsweb/View/Collection-7627>

The Board of Selectmen meeting is scheduled for June 6, 2016.

Please review and submit your comments into the below munis link, no later than Monday, May 23, 2016.

[Permit Application 1655](#)

<https://yvwlnash03.tylertech.com:20105/sites/mu9690/Live/Views/PassThru.aspx?-E=wKC6fsMDInDw6WE3O3QCIQArv8qbpLTgC7EPrQyWP1ega46w1ujSCdXNP/rzdfcA&>

If the above link is inactive, please copy and paste the URL into your browser's address bar.

For those that do not have access into munis, please submit your comments by email to the Planning Dept – [planning@acton-ma.gov](mailto:planning@acton-ma.gov), no later than Monday, May 23, 2016.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Kim Gorman, Secretary

Acton Planning Department

472 Main Street

Acton, MA 01720

[kgorman@acton-ma.gov](mailto:kgorman@acton-ma.gov)

978-929-6631



**TOWN OF ACTON**  
472 Main Street  
Acton, Massachusetts 01720  
Telephone (978) 929-6631  
Fax (978) 929-6340  
[planning@acton-ma.gov](mailto:planning@acton-ma.gov)

**Planning Department**

---

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Board of Selectmen

**Date:** June 1, 2016

**From:** Robert Hummel, Assistant Town Planner *RH*

**Subject:** Site Plan Special Permit #04/22/16 – 462 (429 Great Road)

---

**Applicant:** Country Properties, LLC (Bertolami)  
**Property Owner:** Country Properties, LLC  
**Location:** 429 Great Road  
**Map/Parcel:** C5-67  
**Zoning:** LB, Groundwater Protection District Zone 3 and 4.  
**Proposed Net Floor Area:** 8,856 Square Feet  
**Proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR):** .175  
**Proposed Use:** Vehicle Sales and Vehicle Service Station  
**Hearing Date:** June 6, 2016  
**Decision Due Date:** September 4, 2016

---

**Background**

This application is for a Site Plan Special Permit for 429 Great Road under the Zoning Bylaw (hereinafter ZBL) Section 10.4. The Applicant proposes an 8,856 square foot Vehicle Sales and Vehicle Service Station and an associate structured parking lot located under the proposed building. The proposed uses are allowed by-right under the ZBL, but it requires Site Plan Special Permit approval under Section 10.4. The Applicant received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeal in 2015 to locate his proposed building 15.3 feet from the street rather than the required 75 foot setback required under Section 5 of the ZBL.

**Comments**

1. The proposed Site Plan meets the front, side and rear yard setback requirements for the LB zoning district with the approved variance from the ZBA.
2. The Site Plan meets the 50% open space requirement for the LB zoning district.
3. The proposed FAR of 0.175 does not exceed the max FAR of 0.20 in this zoning district.
4. The proposed Site Plan meets the minimum parking requirements for both Vehicle Sales and Vehicle Service Station uses (16 spaces).
  - a. The maximum number of parking space calculated per ZBL 5.4.6. is 16 spaces.
5. The Site Plan shows 2 bicycle parking spaces, which is the minimum required under Section 6.3.7 in the ZBL.

---

<sup>1</sup> The minimum parking spaces are based on the parking schedule requirements for (1) Vehicle Service Bays, including ancillary facilities, and (2) the total Net Floor Area dedicated to Vehicle Retail sales

6. In all other respects, the proposed parking lot dimensions comply with Section 6.5 in the ZBL.
7. There is a 10 foot perimeter parking lot landscape area shown on the plans; which is not required in this location.
8. A proposed sidewalk in front of the building is shown on the Site Plan to be constructed.
9. The Applicant has provided a lighting plan and it complies with the total wattage allowed on site.
10. On the lighting plan, there is no lighting shown for the front sidewalk and entrance of the building.
11. Since the proposed building will produce less than 30 trips in a peak hour and less than 400 trips on a weekday, this project is not subject to traffic impact study.
12. The Applicant has indicated on the Site Plan a proposed location for a freestanding sign. This is good site planning. However, there is no authority under site plan to approve signage. The Applicant would be advised to contact the Planning Department for a sign application upon the approval of this Site Plan Special Permit. The applicant has not yet filed for a dealership license with the Board of Selectmen.
13. The Applicant has filed a demolition permit with the Building Department. The building is not on the Town's Cultural Resource list.
14. Interdepartmental comments were gathered for this Site Plan Special Permit request. The Design Review Board made note of a structural issue that they had with the submitted plans. To clear up that issue, the applicant should explain the height of foundation exposure on the building side facing Great Road.

**Recommendation:**

The Planning Department has no objections to the Site Plan Special Permit request as shown on the plans. A draft decision is attached for your review.