

PLANNING BOARD

DATE: October 11, 2018

TIME: 7:00 P.M.

PLACE: Fire Station

FOR: Regular Meeting

PRESENT: Brandee Nelson, Chair; Malcolm Fick; Jonathan Hankin; Jeremy Higa;

Pedro Pachano

Chris Rembold, Town Planner

Due to an issue with the elevator at Town Hall, the meeting was relocated to the Fire Station at 37 State Road. Notification was made early afternoon on Thursday. Ms. Nelson briefly delayed the start of the meeting due to the change of the meeting location.

Ms. Nelson called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M.

FORM A'S:

There were no Form A's presented.

MINUTES: SEPTEMBER 27, 2018

Mr. Hankin made a motion to approve the minutes of September 27, 2018 as amended, Mr. Pachano seconded, all in favor.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER:

Garfield Reed submitted a letter of interest to the Selectboard for the Associate Member vacancy on the Planning Board. Mr. Reed was present.

Mr. Hankin said in the letter of interest it sounded as if Mr. Reed might be resistant to change in the Town.

Mr. Reed said he would like to have the Town keep its smallness. He said does not want to see the Town be stagnant.

Ms. Nelson said she likes a variety of viewpoints.

Mr. Fick agreed.

Mr. Fick made a motion to send a positive recommendation to the Selectboard for Mr. Reed's appointment as the Planning Board's Associate member, Mr. Higa seconded, all in favor.

COMMON DRIVEWAY: 181 DIVISION STREET

Michael Parsons was present for Attorney Susan Smith to discuss the common driveway application for 181 Division Street. Mr. Parsons said Daniel Bersaw owns the property at 181 Division Street. A portion of the land at 181 Division Street is being conveyed to Mr. Bersaw's daughter. A common driveway will access the two parcels.

Mr. Parsons said Ms. Smith had submitted the covenant. He said a waiver from the regulations was requested as the setback from the property line could not be complied with since the intention was to continue using the existing curb cut. He said it is his understanding that approval had been granted by the DPW and the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Rembold said the Fire Department wants 911 signs at the driveway entrance off of Division Street as well as where the driveways separate. Town counsel had suggested some minor revisions to the covenant submitted. He said staff has no issues with the proposal.

Mr. Hankin made a motion to approve the common driveway application as per 6.5 of the Zoning Bylaw with the condition that 911 signs will be installed to make the properties clear for emergency services and revisions to the covenant, Mr. Pachano seconded, all in favor.

26 MANVILLE STREET:

Developer Ian Rasch was present to continue discussion of the proposed mixed-use development at 26 Manville Street. Also present was Sam Nickerson, attorney Elizabeth Goodman, Traffic Engineer Juliette Locke from VHB, engineers Sarah Gapinski and Jim Scalise from SK Design Group.

A revised plan titled Framework Properties dated October 3, 2018 was time stamped in the Town Clerk's office on October 4, 2018 at 9:45 A.M.

Mr. Rasch said the requested peer review was conducted by Brent White from White Engineering. Mr. White's review was in agreement with the storm water drainage calculations submitted by SK Design.

Mr. Rasch said the original plan provided 53 parking spaces. Based on comments from the Board and the Manville St. residents the parking has been increased to 71 parking spaces providing approximately 1.5 parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Rasch said Building L has been shifted to the south. There has been an increase in the impervious surface but all the drainage will be captured in the storm drains and rain gardens.

Mr. Rasch said the Town did a camera test of the Manville Street drainage lines. The inspection was generally favorable. A small section needs repair that will be done in the spring of 2019.

Mr. Rasch said Mr. White made a couple of suggestions that we are agreeable to.

Ms. Nelson asked Ms. Gapinski if she had prepared the photometric plan.

Ms. Gapinski said no.

Ms. Nelson asked who was going to speak about the photometric plan.

Ms. Gapinski said the intent of the lighting on the site is to provide safety. The lights will be downward directed and will be located along the pathways and the parking lots.

Ms. Nelson said there are very limited illumination levels in the parking areas. She said there appears to be significantly less than the previous plan.

Mr. Rasch said that isn't so. We didn't provide a photometric plan before. We have not changed the fixtures or the quality. He did note that the height of the bollard used throughout the project had been raised slightly.

Ms. Nelson said the lighting in the north east corner has been eliminated. There were bollards shown on the last plan.

Mr. Rasch said no lighting has been eliminated. There would be no reason to take that lighting out. There is an error on the plan. We will submit a revised plan.

Ms. Nelson asked what sheet of the SK Design plans shows lighting.

Ms. Gapinski said none of the sheets shows lighting.

Mr. Rasch said revised plans will be submitted showing the correct lighting for the entire parcel. The lighting will follow the same intent as what was shown on the original plan that was submitted.

Mr. Scalise said there will be 3 or 4 bollards along the north east corner. He said he recently installed low level bollards on another project and the lights were very successful.

Mr. Hankin said he has questions about the parking. He asked if the need for the additional parking could be demonstrated before building the parking. He also asked where people will park in relation to where they will be living. He asked how people will get to their apartments.

Mr. Rasch said there will be parking along the railroad tracks. A community space is shown in between the buildings. We have invested time and money into creating the community space. We feel this will be a well-used space.

Mr. Hankin said he thinks an opportunity for social interaction is being missed. If people are crossing only a 22 foot span of pavement to get to the building, in lieu of walking through a common green space, there isn't much opportunity to interact with their neighbors.

Mr. Rasch said compromises have been made in many different directions, including the amount of parking, the location of the parking the storm water requirements. A lot of thought has gone into the increased parking. He said the ratio of parking per unit is now slightly under 1.5 spaces per unit. Adding additional spaces will alleviate the need for alternate parking. Once the project has been built out we can't go back. We have put a lot of thought into the parking configuration including fire truck access.

Ms. Goodman said the original concern from the neighborhood was that overflow parking would not be on the street. Additional parking is now provided on the site. It does exceed the Town's requirements. She asked if Mr. Hankin's comment is that too much parking is being provided.

Mr. Fick said if it is shown that more parking is needed, then it may be less of a concern than when not enough is provided.

Mr. Rasch said the apartments he built on Railroad Street were provided 19 parking spaces for 13 apartments. So far the parking is never full. Parking is not used as much as you think. There are single people who rent two or three bedroom units but they live there alone with one car. He said he is comfortable with the number of spaces provided.

Ms. Nelson said we always struggle with parking spaces. She asked Mr. Rasch if he would consider leaving 13 spaces a grassy area to see if they will be needed.

Mr. Nickerson said financially it is very difficult to complete the construction then need someone to come back to do more.

Mr. Pachano asked if the area could be left gravel.

Mr. Rasch said if the area is left gravel it might as well be green space.

Mr. Scalise provided additional information on how the number of 71 parking spaces was arrived at. He said the Urban Land Institute is the source that was used as they tend to provide the most accurate formula for figuring the amount of parking necessary for a development.

Mr. Rembold asked about the space on top of the buildings. He said he thought the elevations showed skylights or balconies but asked if it actually space for mechanicals.

Mr. Rasch said yes. We are sensitive to putting the heating/cooling equipment up high.

Ms. Nelson asked if something will be done to mitigate the noise.

Mr. Rasch said we are doing super insulated buildings. The heating/cooling units are quiet. They will be three and a half stories up.

Ms. Nelson asked about the location of the in-line grinder for the sewer.

Ms. Gapinski said the in-line grinder will be installed on our property at the far west end of Manville Street. The grinder will be in a collection manhole near the property line.

Ms. Nelson asked if the grinder will be hooked up to a generator.

Ms. Gapinski said no, it can run without power.

Ms. Nelson said a letter was received from the DPW that the development will be served with an in-line grinder.

Mr. Rembold said that is correct.

Ms. Nelson asked if the DPW superintendent saw the peer review report.

Mr. Rembold said yes. The Superintendent is satisfied with the on-site drainage. The repair to the Manville line will be done. He is satisfied with the storm water plan.

Mr. Rembold provided a two page Checklist to Guide Planning Board's Site Plan Review.

Ms. Nelson began going through the items on the check list.

Ms. Nelson asked how many loads of earth will be removed from the site.

Mr. Rasch said there will be 2000 cubic yards removed by 200 trucks loads.

Ms. Nelson asked when the work will start.

Mr. Rasch said he would expect to start in March of 2019 when the ground thaws.

Ms. Nelson asked if air quality monitoring needs to be done. She said reports should be referred to the Building Inspector or the Board of Health so that the reports are available if requested by the public.

Mr. Rasch said he is being sensitive to the neighbors. He said the reports are only a benefit if coordinated with the Building Inspector or Board of Health.

Mr. Pachano suggested that having the reports in the Town Clerk's office or the Town Manager's office might be easier for people to access.

Mr. Rembold said the reports need to be in plain English and available. He said the reports should be filed with the Town Clerk.

Mr. Rasch asked if the reporting would be for the duration of the site work.

Ms. Nelson said it is customary for there to be air quality reports during earthwork activities then discontinued.

There was a question about trash removal.

Mr. Rasch said the preference is to use small totes because large dumpsters are not emptied as much and they get smelly. He said the plan is for two 2 cubic yard dumpsters that will be emptied bi-weekly. Totes will be used for recycling. We have been working with Barbados to design a space for the receptacles. We feel the plan has been adequately designed and planned for the site. We can add another pick up if it is necessary.

Ms. Nelson asked about mail delivery.

Mr. Rasch said a delivery room will be provided to accommodate UPS and FedEx deliveries. Mail is not the issue; it is package deliveries that create issues.

Ms. Nelson said Brent White provided the peer review. There seems to be a general concurrence. She said the recommendations from the review will be part of the conditions.

Mr. Rasch said the storm drains will be cleaned out and reports for that activity will be sent to the DPW superintendent.

Mr. Hankin said the new heat pumps are more efficient but if it gets really cold they can't provide enough heat.

Mr. Rasch said they can handle cold down to -15 degrees. He said significantly less BTUs are used because in new construction the envelope is so tight. He said there is no concern about the heat pumps.

Ms. Nelson asked if trees will be removed.

Mr. Rasch said yes. There are major trees at the entrance to the property that will be impacted. He said every effort will be made to plant mature trees as is affordable.

Mr. Hankin asked if a tracking pad will be used during construction to keep the dirt off of Manville Street.

Mr. Rasch said it has been proposed for the site.

Ms. Nelson asked if there are measures in place to keep the mud from going on to Manville Street. She said the street will have to be swept as necessary.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Nelson said the traffic impact assessment shows that there will be no significant increase to thresholds to require traffic mitigation.

Ms. Locke said she does not expect the queues to be significant.

Mr. Fick asked how 200 trucks will impact Manville Street.

Ms. Nelson said the DPW will inspect Manville Street pre-construction and post-construction.

Mr. Rasch said we will pay for repairs as necessary.

Ms. Nelson said the sidewalk on the north side of Manville Street is in poor condition. She asked if there had been any thought about making a contribution to improve the sidewalk.

Mr. Rasch said he would be willing to have a conversation about the sidewalk. He said there will be sidewalks within the project.

Ms. Nelson said a crosswalk and stop sign will be added at the east end of Manville Street where it enters South Main Street. This will be a condition.

Mr. Rembold said it can be a condition or a revised construction document could be submitted. We are expecting a resubmission of the lighting plan. A revised construction site plan could be submitted.

Mr. Rasch said there could be a condition for acceptable revised plan(s). The site plan would only show the entrance to the project from Manville Street. It will not show all of Manville Street.

Ms. Nelson said an aerial photo marked up to show the crosswalk and stop sign would be acceptable.

Mr. Hankin asked if there should be a crosswalk within the project that goes from the handicap space on the west side of the parking lot to the building.

Mr. Scalise said this is a private project. Handicap spaces are not required.

Mr. Rasch said we only need to provide two handicap spaces.

Mr. Scalise said ultimately the Building Inspector has jurisdiction. He will weigh in and tell us where to put the handicap spaces that have been provided.

Ms. Nelson said the crosswalk will be put in if the Building Inspector wants it.

Mr. Hankin suggested a condition that a crosswalk with technical warning stripes be provided per code.

Chris Ryan from Manville Street asked who has jurisdiction over where the stop sign is installed.

Ms. Locke said the requirement is that stop sign be placed four feet in advance of a crosswalk. She said it is typical to have vehicles stop at the stop sign before the crosswalk then creep up to proceed out.

Ms. Nelson asked if there would be screening along the north east corner.

Mr. Rasch said native plants are proposed to be planted in that area. We will provide as much as we can for that corner. At this point there is no specific planting plan.

Mr. Rembold said the Board should require the submittal of a new landscaping plan with information about the plantings for the north east corner and the new parking configuration.

Ms. Nelson asked that an updated plan be provided. She said her primary interest is in the north east corner.

Ms. Nelson said the solid black fence around the dumpster is satisfactory.

Ms. Nelson said the applicant needs to provide an updated photo metric plan showing the entire site and providing information on the impact of headlights on adjacent properties across the railroad tracks.

Ms. Nelson said based on what has been received from the applicant and Mr. White it appears that the Water Quality Protection District requirements will be met.

Mr. Hankin asked if the house or houses to be demolished will be remediated for lead.

Mr. Rasch said yes.

Ms. Nelson said there has been extensive discussion of the landscaping and parking. It is clear the applicant is trying to strike the right balance. She said she feels the thinking is sound. Ms. Nelson said we are very close to approving the SPR. She asked that a revised landscaping plan, photometric plan, the off-site sketch and the letter from the Water Department be submitted to Mr. Rembold prior to the next meeting on October 18.

Mr. Rasch asked if it is possible to ask for approval of the SPR contingent on the items being received.

Mr. Rembold said he does not feel the Board is ready to approve the application until requested additional information is received.

Ms. Nelson agreed, she said we can do the recommendation to the Selectboard on the WQPD special permit.

Mr. Fick made a motion to send a positive recommendation to the Selectboard on the special permit for a mixed use development in the WQPD, Mr. Higa seconded, all in favor.

Ms. Goodman said the Board has done a lot of work and discussion but asked if you are going to wait until next week. She asked whether next week's discussion will be of what was revised and submitted or whether the entire project will be discussed again. She asked if the Board would give a partial approval.

Ms. Nelson said she is not comfortable with a partial decision. That is not how this Board proceeds. We will move forward with what has been done tonight to establish a record, and what still needed additional review. She asked that the applicant work with us as we are working with you.

Ms. Nelson said she had received a letter of support from Construct dated September 10, 2018.

The Board took a five minute break and resumed the meeting at 8:37 P.M.

910 MAIN STREET:

Tim Geller, Executive Director of the Community Development Corporation, was present with architect, Nick Elton and engineer Brent White. A revised plan was submitted to the Board. The revised plan was dated September 20, 2018. The date on the plan had not been updated.

Abutters were notified. Mr. Rembold asked that an overview of the project be given for the benefit of the abutters present at the meeting.

Mr. Elton began the presentation saying the parcel is a 7.88 acre site. Five acres of the site are wetland. 2.5 acres along the east end of the site will be developed with 49 housing units, 44 of which will be affordable housing and 5 units will be market rate units. The site slopes to the west. There are two egresses.

Mr. Elton said the units will be a mix of sizes in multiple buildings. The buildings have been designed along the natural topography of the site.

Mr. Rembold asked what is currently on the site.

Mr. Elton said currently there is a large, 6,000 square foot house that was originally a single family home. The house is in very poor condition. The house has many levels inside. It is not historic. The house sits approximately 8 feet above the street. The house will be removed.

Mr. Rembold said the zone requires 20% affordable housing. This project has 90% affordable housing. He said the Fire Chief had concerns about the configuration of the north parking lot for access by the ladder truck. His concerns have resulted in a second curb cut on the north end of the site to create a loop that will allow the fire truck to travel through the site. There will be modifications to the grades on the north east side of the property.

Mr. Rembold said the Town would like to add a sidewalk on the west side of Main Street as part of a planned project for this section of Route 7. Cutting the grade back to the property line will make a sidewalk possible in that location. The applicant wants to level the front as well.

Mr. Elton said there will be a vehicular pathway along the back. The revised plan shows Building C moved closer to the property line. Building C is now proposed to be 5 feet from the property line. The building is no closer than 30 feet from the street edge.

Mr. Geller said the Fire Chief would like to access the Building C from a ladder truck on the street.

Mr. Elton said Building E is also proposed to be moved closer to the property line. We are trying to save large trees in front of Building D. He said Building C is also proposed to be moved forward.

Mr. Hankin asked if the community space is being made bigger.

Mr. Elton said maybe a little, but not a lot bigger, but larger yards were created for the individual units as a result of the building being moved forward.

Mr. Rembold said the Fire Chief is concerned with backing the ladder truck out of the site on the south side of the property. A turn around was created that will allow a smaller fire truck and a garbage truck to turn around on site so they can drive out.

Mr. Elton said Building A was moved closer to the property line and tipped slightly to allow for the turn around.

Mr. Rembold asked how close Building A is to the front and south property lines.

Mr. Elton said the building would be 20 feet from the south property line and 25 feet from the front.

Mr. Rembold noted the side yard setback is 10 feet so the proposal is for the building to be twice as far from the property line as required.

Mr. Elton said there will be added vegetation along the south property line.

Mr. Rembold advised the Board that they are able to waive certain requirements if they find that by waiving the requirement it will improve the project. The front yard setback is 25 feet from the property line. If the Board determines that allowing the buildings to be closer to property line is a benefit to the project, they can waive the requirement. If they waive the 25 foot setback the buildings would still be at least 30 feet from the edge of the road.

Mr. White said there is a severe deviation from the front boundary. The right of way does not parallel the travel way.

Mr. Elton said requiring the 25 foot front yard setback would be a hardship.

Mr. Rembold said the Board would not be redefining the front yard setback just where it applies.

Ms. Nelson said the dimensional waivers should be on the plan to show what was done.

Mr. Rembold said there is reference to the B-2 zone on the plan but should refer to the Smart Growth Overlay District, SGOD.

Eileen Mooney expressed concern about the distance from a unit to the handicap parking space. The spaces should be more convenient. She said it is not about the location of the unit but rather the distance to the handicap parking space.

Ms. Nelson said she appreciated Mrs. Mooney's comment.

Mr. White said the handicap parking spaces are placed for easy access to the sidewalk paths.

Mrs. Mooney said when walking is difficult the distance is a problem.

Mr. Rembold said it would be preferable to locate the handicap parking closer to the building.

Mr. Fick said he also has questions about the handicap parking in relation to the units.

Mr. Elton said we had to make area available for the fire truck access. Parking spaces were lost in the reconfiguration. He said he could try to put a couple of spaces back but it could impact the copper beech trees.

Ms. Nelson asked if spaces 16 and 17 could be marked handicap spaces.

Mr. Elton said he could work at it.

John Broderick, the abutter to the south, asked if there were blind areas where the driveways enter Main Street.

Mr. Hankin said, based on our site visit, there did not appear to be sightline issues.

Mr. White said parking can be moved closer to the barrier free units.

There was additional discussion of handicap accessible parking spaces. Revisions will be made on an amended plan.

There was also discussion of the dimensional requirements. Ms. Nelson advised the applicant to look at 9.13.7 (6) when seeking a waiver to the dimensional requirements.

Mr. Rembold offered further clarification saying the mechanism for waiving the 7.2 requirement is found in 9.13.7(6). This section gives the Board the authority to waive the requirement.

Discussion continued regarding the elevations of each of the buildings. An additional waiver request will be for a four story tower feature at the north end of Building C. The maximum height allowed is 40 feet. The tower would be 42.1 feet at the mid-point of the hip.

Mr. Hankin asked if there would be any fire department issues with a 4 story plus building.

Mr. Rembold said he is unable to answer that question.

Mr. Elton said the ladder truck reaches 90 feet. He said he would speak with the Fire Chief tomorrow.

Mr. Broderick said he has lived in this area for 70 years. He said he received a letter 10 day ago to learn that he is getting 100 neighbors and an additional 70 cars. He said this project will make his house worthless. He asked if the project would be 35 feet higher than his property.

Mr. Elton said yes.

Mr. Hankin asked what the siding material would consist of.

Mr. Elton said the building would be sided with fiber cement panels, and lap siding that will look like clapboards, as well as some corrugated metal. Asphalt shingles will be used on the roof.

Mr. Elton discussed the landscaping. He said the south property line will be heavily vegetated at least 6 feet in height. He said the individual units will have patios and landscaped entrances. He said all the plants to be used have been identified in the schedule on the landscape plan page L-4.

Mr. Elton said we would be willing to work with the Town to put in street trees. He said that would be on your property not ours. He said ornamental trees will be used in contrast to the existing higher trees.

Mr. Hankin asked who will maintain the landscaping. He said there are a lot of plantings that would need to be maintained.

Ms. Nelson said the SGOD encourages plantings.

Mr. Elton said the CDC is interested in maintaining the landscape. He also pointed out that a covered bike area has been provided in the northwest corner.

Mr. White took over to discuss the storm water drainage as shown on page C-1 of the plans. He said the borings have not been done due to the rain. He said he plans to get the borings done next week. He said some of the test pits have been done. He said the soil varies throughout the site. It is sandy on the north side of the parcel and a varying soil combination on the south side.

Mr. White said the goal is to keep all drainage on the site. There will be a subsurface infiltration system with an overflow on the site into a stone drywell on the west side. He said a stone drywell will minimize disturbances on the site.

Mr. White said the plan is to tie into the Town's sewer and water connections. He said he in discussions with the DPW superintendent, Mr. VanDeusen, about having a grinder system prior to entering the sewer system.

Ms. Nelson asked if the reason approval has not been granted is because it is so early in the design.

Mr. White said that is correct. In addition, Mr. VanDeusen doesn't have a lot of infrastructure detail for that area. He said we will get more information from the Water Department and the Waste Water Treatment Department.

Mr. Pachano asked about the storm water drainage system.

Mr. White said catch basins allow surface water to enter the subsurface drainage systems through pipe that could overflow into the drywell and possibly into the Town's drainage system.

Ms. Nelson said we will want full specific details. She asked if an application has been submitted for the WQPD.

Mr. Geller said no.

Mr. White said we will submit an application in November as we go to the Selectboard on December 3.

Mr. Geller said he plans to submit final storm water plans by November 1 for the Planning Board meeting on November 8. He said the funding application deadlines for the 40R are critical. The Notice of Intent and the WQPD applications can lag behind.

Ms. Nelson said we meet next week on October 18 but you won't have the storm water calculations by then. It will be better to have a complete submission for the November 8 meeting.

Mr. Elton asked if we are in the ball park for the architectural part of the plan.

Ms. Nelson said in general we are comfortable with the architecture. We need a parking table and a letter from the Fire Department addressing a four story feature. Accessibility needs to be improved.

Mr. Fick said he thinks the waiver for the front yard setback improves the project.

Mr. Rembold encouraged the applicant to look at the potential impacts on properties around the site including lighting impacts, drainage, etc.

Mary Vogt, an abutter from 911 Main Street asked who purchased the property and how much was it purchased for.

Mr. Geller said the CDC purchased the property in June for \$400,000.

TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT:

Mr. Rembold said he would put the B-3 and R-1-B zoning on the agenda for next week. He said he received a variance application for Lake Avenue that will be on the agenda. The Board can look at the application to determine if a site visit is necessary. The application seems straight forward.

BOARD & COMMITTEE UPDATES/ISSUES & CONCERNS:

Mr. Rembold reminded the Board members who have not completed their Ethics training and Open Meeting Law acknowledgement to get it done and turned into the Town Clerk as soon as possible.

Mr. Rembold said next week's meeting will be held at the Fire Station at 7:00 P.M.

CITIZEN'S SPEAK TIME:

No one spoke.

Having concluded their business, Ms. Nelson adjourned without objection at 10:16 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Kimberly L. Shaw

Planning Board Secretary