

Leicester Planning Board Meeting Minutes
June 03, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jason Grimshaw, David Wright, Debra Friedman, Sharon Nist, Adam Menard

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS: Kathleen Wilson

MEMBERS ABSENT:

IN ATTENDANCE: Michelle Buck, Town Planner; Barbara Knox, Board Secretary

MEETING DATE: June 03, 2014

MEETING TIME: 7:00 pm

AGENDA:

7:00PM Town Planner Report/General Board Discussion:

- A. Open Space Plan Update
- B. Subdivision Regulations Amendments
- C. Miscellaneous Project Updates

7:30PM Public Application:

Site Plan Review Continued; Central Mass Crane

Mr. Grimshaw called the meeting to order at 7:00PM

Town Planner Report/General Board Discussion

A. Open Space Plan Update

It's been difficult getting a quorum for a meeting. Ms. Buck recently sent around, to the members, several different dates for a possible meeting and there was no agreement on a meeting date. It also has been difficult getting information from the Parks & Recreation Commission regarding the Town Parks. She's attended several of Parks & Recreation Commission meetings hoping to get the information needed for the plan, but Commission members have not provided the information requested. She will be meeting with the Parks and Rec secretary hoping to get the majority of information needed from her.

B. Subdivision Regulations Amendments

This item is tabled to next meeting.

C. Miscellaneous Project Updates

Committee Appointments

An email was received from the Assistant Town Administrator, Kristen Gaza reminding Boards and Committees to reappoint members to the following committees:

- Capital Improvement Committee – Sharon Nist
- CMRPC – Adam Menard
- Economic Development Committee – Jason Grimshaw

MOTION: Ms. Friedman moved to recommend appointment as representatives of the Planning Board: Sharon Nist to Capital Improvement Committee; Adam Menard to CMRPC and Jason Grimshaw to Economic Development Committee.

SECONDED: Mr. Wright – Discussion: None

VOTE: All in Favor

Miscellaneous updates

- Leicester will be applying to get designated as an economic target area. The Town Administrator will be the lead person on that and it's a joint application with Auburn. They will be using CMRPC to assist with the application process, because this requires a lot of demographic information.
- There have been several meetings with the representatives from another medical marijuana company that was interested in having a cultivation facility in the same building that another company was looking at, located at the corner of Clark Street and Route 56. Ms. Buck thought it was moving forward but it appears there was a license issued for a childcare facility next door and the State won't issue a license. It's not clear if the license was being used; it was just issued in January of this year.
- A new updated Zoning Map has been ordered from CMRPC reflecting the most recent zoning changes made last fall.
- There are a couple of subdivisions close to expiring. 1) Grandview Estates will expire in couple of weeks; 2) Oakridge Estates will need to be re-evaluated on the surety amount.

Vacation request

Ms. Buck is requesting the week of June 23 -27 for vacation.

MOTION: Ms. Nist moved to approve Ms. Buck's vacation request

SECONDED: Mr. Menard – Discussion: None

VOTE: All in Favor

General Board Discussion

- Mr. Grimshaw inquired about any new prospects on the property next to St. Joseph's Church on Main Street. Ms. Buck said no, she has heard nothing on that property. She also has not heard any progress on 1603 -1605 Main Street approved site plan project.
- Ms. Buck informed the Board that the new owner of Staffordshire, Wayne Richards, is trying to resurrect a 1972 Variance to build additional units. The Building Inspector denied a building permit, because it was based on a use variance from 1972. The owner appealed the building inspector's opinion to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The ZBA continued their hearing in order to get an updated opinion from Attorney Cove. His initial opinion is that the permit has been abandoned.
- Parker Street ANR: the court held a hearing on this in April and decision should be received soon. If the judge agrees with the property owner, the town may appeal again.
- The Planning Office received an extensive public records request regarding the Auburn Street Solar Farm project. It was requested from a construction union representative. Construction has started on this project and the request is for copies of everything and anything related to this project.
- Sweet Escapes Ice Cream Shop located at the bottom of Old Main Street, owner is Chris Sullivan, has been visited by the building inspector on two separate occasions and failed the inspection on both visits.

Public Application

Site Plan Review Continued. Central Mass Crane

Jeff Howland, JH Engineering Group made the presentation. Mr. Howland said revised plans were submitted to the Planning Office late last week. Comments from Quinn Engineering were received today, noting a few minor concerns that needed to be done. Ninety five percent of Quinn's comments have been addressed, with only a few minor items, which Mr. Howland reviewed.

From the last meeting until now, the plan in general has not changed. The significant items added were the handicapped spaces. They revised the grading in the front to accommodate for the handicapped spot. The two stop signs were added at each end, as requested by the Board.

Ms. Friedman asked why the handicapped spot was so far away from the door access. Mr. Howland said because of the grade surface. It is roughly at 5% and in order to make that space itself that can't be any greater than 2%, it makes it very difficult to grade in there. The entrance is roughly at 5% and they needed to get the grades to work within that area.

This project was before Conservation and they had no issues. The public hearing was closed on May 21st and the Commission is in process of issuing the Order of Conditions. Mr. Howland said he spoke with JoAnn Schold regarding a few minor questions. One question was how they came up with the fees and the second was to make sure they had a wetland scientist who will oversee the wetland replication area.

The biggest change from the previous plan was the change from having two sediment basins, to having two rain gardens that will be in the same location and have the same footprint. Ms. Nist asked what a rain garden was. Mr. Howland explained that it was a small depression with a layer of material with a mixture of compost sand and organic soil. It gets placed about 2 feet deep and planted with plants that allow for the nutrients to be removed. The plants on the bottom are will be plants adaptable in saturated soil and then there are plants planted around the top as part of the stormwater treatment process.

Ms. Nist asked about the maintenance of the rain garden. Mr. Howland said there is an operation and maintenance plan where the sediment would be removed on a yearly basis. His concern was with the replication area more then the rain gardens, because the rain gardens have a lot of plantings. The bottom is pretty intense with vegetation and will be continuously monitored. Rain gardens are fairly non-maintenance and only need to be checked periodically to make sure the weeds are controlled. The overall plan has not changed and, as they've made changes to conform to landscaping regulations.

Quinn Engineering comments reviewed:

Comment #3 referred to the photometric plan, which is still being worked on and will be submitted when finished.

Comment #9 referred to the location of the district lines. There was a typo, R2 vs R1, it showed being correct on the locus plan, but incorrect in the plan set. Mr. Howland will make that change.

Comment #16; a copy of the architectural footprint of the current building Mr. Daige owns on Route 56, was submitted to Quinn Engineering showing a slight difference, in terms of the width and length. The current building is 90 x 90 and the new one will be 120 x 120, but will have the same building material.

Comment #19 referred to documentation not being received from the sewer district. Mr. Howland will contact the sewer district and get the final letter.

Comment #26 referred to the capacity of the roof drains. He submitted a narrative to Quinn Engineering and will contact them to confirm the drainage plan. Currently there will be three downspouts on each side of the building. The building will be pitched in the middle and each will go in opposite directions, easterly and westerly. There will be three downspouts in those locations that will go down into a header system that comes out eventually discharging into one of the rain gardens. Mr. Howland noted the narrative pointed out the information showing that there was adequate capacity. He will confirm with Quinn Engineering if they want him to do this his way or as in the hydraulic narrative.

Mr. Wright said it is not a hydraulic issue; all Mr. Quinn needed was a recalculation on the runoff coming from the roof. It's a roof drain issue, not a hydraulic issue. The capacity of the roof drains themselves, the downspouts, was not provided. Mr. Howland said that was why he wanted to first confirm that with Quinn Engineering before making any changes.

Comment #30 referred to the information of the Stormceptor unit not being provided. Mr. Howland will provide that information.

Comment #32 referred to the rain gardens. Mr. Howland explained that there are two separate rain gardens, separated by something like a shallow bench. They were modeled separately because they were different elevations. So the bench in the middle got complicated trying to calculate them as one because they really act independent. He wanted to discuss this with Quinn first before making any changes. If push comes to shove, he will put something in the middle to block flow going in either direction.

Comment #38 referred to storage below the outlet invert. Mr. Howland felt this concern had been address, but will just need to show it to Mr. Quinn in the computations.

Comment #45 referred to sight distances. They forgot to add the sight distances on Stafford Street, but did add it on the plan for Route 56. Mr. Howland felt there was sufficient sight distance entering and exiting on both side on Stafford Street; he just needed to show that on the plan. He said there was over 300 feet of sight distance at that entrance.

Comment #51 referred to adding an outlet to allow the stored runoff to drain. Mr. Howland said he had it on the original plan, but from Mr. Quinn's previous comment, he removed it. He will discuss with Mr. Quinn on whether he wants that added back on again.

Comment #52 referred to the Stormwater Hydrology Report. Mr. Howland explained he revised the computations before actually revising the tabular, which he will do when there's a final plan.

Ms. Nist asked regarding both sites, does Mr. Daige plan on maintaining both sites? Mr. Howland said yes. The current problem Mr. Daige is experiencing in his current building is space problems with trying having both businesses in one building. He has run out of room and has to separate the two.

Ms. Friedman asked if there was a list of waivers available.

Mr. Howland said there was a total of 4 waivers, but he wasn't sure on one. There are two waivers under the Zoning Bylaw, which is to reduce the landscape buffer from 50 feet to 20 feet between the non-residential and residential and 100 feet to 50 feet between the zoning lines. Also under the Zoning Bylaw, and he wasn't sure whether he needed this one, is to allow parking in the front yard setback, but they are now considering Route 56 as the frontage, so he wasn't sure if they still needed a waiver from the Bylaw. Ms. Friedman and Mr. Wright both felt they didn't need the waiver. Ms. Buck felt they should leave that request in their written request, because when she writes the decision, she will include an explanation of this issue.

Mr. Howland continued. Under the site plan rules and regulations, they need a waiver from Section 2b, on the Locus Plan from 200 scale vs. 100 scale. They are requesting a waiver to go from 100 to 200.

Under the Stormwater Regulations, they need a waiver from the requirement to meet the recharge upon reaching the soil at the height of groundwater vs. not being able to meet the offset to groundwater through the Stormwater management regulations. The site is entirely encompassed in hydraulic soil.

Ms. Buck asked if Quinn Engineering commented on that waiver. Mr. Howland said Quinn Engineering were the ones who requested they submit this waiver request. Ms. Buck asked which Comment number that referred. Mr. Howland said in the initial letter, it was number 31.

Ms. Buck asked if the revised waiver request was included. Mr. Howland said yes. He also included a traffic generation summary. He did it as a separate document. Mr. Wright said there was somewhat of a traffic study done based on the intersection. Mr. Howland said yes, it was based on the current staffing and current projections on when vehicles leave, etc.

Ms. Nist asked roughly how far away the traffic light from the site entrance was. Mr. Howland said roughly 80 to 90 feet. Ms. Nist asked how long are the trucks. Mr. Howland guessed 30 feet. Ms. Nist said her concern was with a truck coming north and trying to make a left into the site. How much traffic will it back up? Mr. Howland said some of the smaller cranes may come in off Stafford Street to avoid the traffic.

Mr. Wright added that was the reason he wanted a traffic report because of the cranes coming back to the site in the afternoon. His main concern was with the cranes coming in from the south and turning in off of 56 and that the entrance way is only 70 feet from the intersection. Mr. Howland suggested maybe having the cranes from the south, using the Stafford Street entrance.

Mr. Wright asked what the radius was on Route 56. Mr. Howland said both drives are 30 feet. He discussed this with the fire department about the radius and they were okay with it. They assumed the cranes would need the same radius and it's the bigger than what he has now.

Ms. Friedman suggested it may be easier to have the entrance off of Stafford Street and the exit off of Route 56. Mr. Howland was okay with that, but noted Mr. Daige not wanting to have the cranes going in off Stafford Street when there is an emergency, because the cranes have to leave the site sometimes at 3:30AM; he wanted to stay away from the residents and didn't want cranes coming out that way. Ms. Friedman said coming out that way in the morning, they will hit a lot more traffic.

Mr. Grimshaw asked for any further comments or concerns; hearing none, asked for a motion to continue.

MOTION: Ms. Nist moved to continue the Site Plan Review for Central Mass Crane to Tuesday, July 1st at 7:30PM.

SECONDED: Mr. Wright – Discussion: None

VOTE: All in Favor

Mr. Grimshaw noted he may not be at this meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Wright moved to adjourn meeting

SECONDED: Ms. Nist – Discussion: None

VOTE: All in Favor

Meeting adjourned at 7:50PM

Respectfully submitted:

Barbara Knox

Barbara Knox

Documents included in mailing packet:

- Agenda
- Memo from Ms. Buck to the Board dated May 27, 2014

Documents submitted at meeting:

- Comment letter from Quinn Engineering dated June 3, 2014