

**AMESBURY PLANNING BOARD
AMESBURY CITY HALL AUDITORIUM
MONDAY, MARCH 25, 2013 @ 7: 00 P.M.**

Meeting is called to order at 7: 08 P.M.

PRESENT: Chair Howard Dalton, Stephen Dunford, Ted Semesnyei, Ara Sanentz, Karen Solstad, David Dragons, David Frick

ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Nipun Jain, City Planner, Paul Bibaud, Recording Secretary.

Motion by Stephen Dunford to take the Site Plan Review for the DPW facility out of order as there were many in the audience interested in the proposal, second by David Dragonas. Five in favor, David Frick opposed, Ted Semesnyei not present at time of vote.

Chairman Dalton announced that the sign application for Smart Auto, 41 Hillside Avenue and 241 & 243 Main Street, Cumberland Farms pre-application are continued to the next meeting.

MINUTES:

Motion by Howard Dalton to approve February 11, 2013 minutes, seconded by Karen Solstad. Four in favor, Ted Semesnyei not present at time of vote.

Motion by Howard Dalton to approve February 25, 2013 minutes, seconded by Karen Solstad. Five in favor, Ted Semesnyei not present at time of vote.

Motion by Howard Dalton to approve March 11, 2013 minutes, seconded by Karen Solstad. Four in favor.

November 26, 2012, December 17, 2012, and January 14, 2013 continued to April 8 meeting.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Site Plan Review – 39 South Hunt Road – (DPW Facility)

This is for the proposed 12,000 square foot addition for maintenance and pre-engineered steel vehicle storage building at 39 South Hunt Road, as shown on a plan by Parr Engineering dated Feb. 25, 2013.

David Potter, Parr Corporation, Senior Project Engineer responsible for site design. Also with me tonight is Mike Rongione, project manager at Parr, head structural engineer. Not here tonight are H.A.T. Architects who prepared the building design. ASC, another firm that designed the sand and salt shed, and also involved R.W. Sullivan, who did the mechanical, electrical and plumbing design, as well as the lighting plans included in the submission made a few weeks ago. Finally, Pam Shadley, landscape architect, responsible for plantings on the plan.

The existing condition: there is a 14, 400 square foot building. DPW currently operates within that building. There is a 34 space parking area to the east, currently in use, with a curb cut on the

southeast corner of the property which provides access to South Hunt Road. Existing topography is generally flat until the northern portion of property, where it drops off steeply down to a wetland which is located along the northern border of the site. We submitted to Conservation Commission and we are scheduled to meet with Conservation Commission on April 1. The proposed design includes construction of a 12,000 square foot addition to the existing building at the northeast corner of the building. This addition includes maintenance base and vehicle storage for DPW equipment. Additionally on the north, there is a smaller building proposed as a truck lot facility. The only other building on the site is the salt shed, shown at the northeast corner of the property, oriented 45 degrees to the existing building. This is the most practical and effective site for this shed for loading/unloading.

The DPW portion of the site will be accessed through the existing parking area at the northeast corner of the existing parking area. The visitor parking area will be separate. Other spaces are located in the back on the west portion of the property, making for a total 49 parking spaces, which is the minimum required by the Amesbury Zoning Ordinance. There are bins located in the north end that will contain DPW gravel, stone, etc. There is a proposed canopy over these to keep them dry. The canopy extends beyond the bins to provide additional dry storage area for miscellaneous DPW equipment that can't be stored outside. The dumpsters are in an enclosure with a fence. There is room for two dumpsters. We have existing water and sanitary sewer services to the existing building. There will be minor upgrades to serve the facility, upgrade to domestic water service to serve the new building, and new sanitary sewer service to accommodate the new addition to the building. The storm water system is designed in accordance with the MassDEP storm water handbook. There are excellent soils onsite that are very permeable. We did a full GEOTECH program to review the ability of the soil to hold up the building as well as to handle storm water improvements. Taking advantage of that, we've designed infiltration basins, one in the northern portion and one in the western portion of the property. They're designed to reduce any potential increase in storm water generated by the new addition. The majority of the work is outside that 100 foot buffer zone. Light fixtures proposed to light the building area. The new ones will be LED for more efficiency. Some lights will be on the building, some will be light poles in the DPW yard, due to the width being too much to illuminate from the building lights alone. The fixtures light only on the property with minimal spillage, if any, off the property. Screening and security: there will be fencing around the entire property. There will be a fence separating the public side from the employee work areas. A fence covers the entire perimeter of the property. For screening, we have landscape plantings proposed along west and east property lines, including some existing pine trees. Plantings will fill the gaps between pine trees. During construction, erosion controls will be hay bales and silt fencing according to erosion control guidelines. Bins will be constructed of precast concrete blocks sitting on the asphalt and the salt shed will be made of timber, 3840 square foot structure with a roof of metal. Runoff flows away from these structures. There are drains in the truck wash facility and they will run through the sanitary sewer, by the building code, but first through an oil-water separator before it discharges out to the sanitary sewers. A guardrail will separate where employees enter and where the public should go. There will be a gate for employees to drive through, with signage stating EMPLOYEES ONLY. No fueling station is proposed and no changes to the existing office spaces. Abutters should see no impact with lighting or noise. The closest edge of the building will be about 160 feet from the edge of South Hunt Road.

Karen Solstad noted that there are no elevations listed going down to a neighboring house and no abutter properties / buildings listed on the drawings. She suggests that those be made clear on

plans for the next meeting. So I'd like to see property boundaries, elevations and neighboring buildings. **Ted Semesnyei** asked about construction timeframes. Construction period is beginning in the summer, hopefully complete by January, 2014. **Stephen Dunford** asked how does the board proceed without the Conservation Commission having not met yet? **Howard Dalton** explained that it will be continued to April 8, days after the Conservation Commission meeting on April 1.

Motion by Stephen Dunford to extend the hearing to April 8, seconded by Ara Sanentz. Vote was unanimous.

PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE:

20 Cedar and 4 Poplar Streets – (Matt Assia, Chinburg Properties)

Eric Chinburg, Chinburg Builders, out of Newmarket, N.H. We wish to discuss our goals for 20 Cedar Street, a two story building formerly Chatham Furniture Co. We've met with Nipun and others on this several times. We want to discuss our goals for the redevelopment. We have redeveloped 8 or 9 old mill buildings and have about 500 apartments in mills and over a half million square feet of commercial space in our mill communities. Some are all commercial mills, some all residential, and some are mixed. We redevelop properties, then manage properties and own them. We wish to create approximately 45 apartments. Market rate, high end, nice apartments within the existing structure and preserve the architectural structure, create landscape border around the mill, remove out of character late model outbuildings, like a long shed and a loading dock on the Poplar Street side that we would propose removing. We'd create a sidewalk connection along both Poplar and Cedar. Parking has historically been on Poplar side, we'd create a state of the art porous pavement parking area there. We're here to introduce ourselves, get feedback on the general concept and gain better understanding of your process for approvals. I'm here with Matt Assia, Chinburg Builders employee, director of our real estate and asset management, and Wayne Morrill, engineer from Jones and Beach, who will talk more about specifics. Also, my wife Jen is present, who handles all marketing and website activity.

Wayne Morrill, Jones and Beach Engineers: We plan on taking away 3 sections that are not part of the original mill building: a shed, which is a cinderblock building off to the side, a loading dock area that actually goes into the town right of way, and an entry way which is on the north side of the building. We met with Conservation Commission at their last hearing, and return to them at their April 1 meeting, to talk about design for the porous pavement section. We hope to engage BSC as the design reviewer. The site itself is two parcels: the east side of Poplar Street is the parking lot for the old Chatham Furniture. Some is paved surface, some is gravel surface. The soils suggest it would support porous pavement. We would add a curbing along Poplar Street, which borders the building, and add a sidewalk, helping pedestrians go from the building to parking lots. The 45 apartments will border either side of a corridor. We target 1.5 parking spaces per unit. Parking lot lighting using existing neighborhood lighting is also planned. More information will be forthcoming. Everything is preliminary right now. There will be some mechanicals on the roof. We'll do a high efficiency white roof. If there are roof units, they will be screened out of sight lines. Condensing units can be put in landscaped areas around the building, made possible due to it being only a two story building. Trash removal is yet to be determined, probably private dumpsters. The building will be ADA accessible. The main entrance is being decided between two possibilities. We normally do a common room area, a fitness room, and bicycle storage area.

Abutter **Charlie Coles:** I live directly across the street. I am very much in favor of this, and the

other neighbors are in favor. We're excited about it.
The board will next meet with them when they return with their plans.

SPECIAL PERMIT- wetland and floodplain

60 Pleasant Valley Road (Corey)

The board has closed the public hearing on this. The board now needs to vote.

Motion by Stephen Dunford to approve the Wetland & Floodplain Special Permit, seconded by Ara Sanentz. Vote was unanimous from the seated board members eligible to vote.

Site Plan Review- 17-19 School Street- Fire Station

Public hearing closed on 2-25. Review of canopy, signage and landscaping.

Motion by Stephen Dunford to approve the Site Plan Review for 17-19 School Street Fire Station, seconded by David Dragonas. Vote was six members in favor, David Frick abstains.

PUBLIC HEARING:

The chairman opens the public hearing and the legal notice is read into the record.

Site Plan Review / (2) Special Permits- 95 Haverhill Road (Shaheen)

A Site Plan Review, Warehousing / Distribution Special Permit and Water Resource Protection District Special Permit request has been submitted by Shaheen Brothers for a proposed addition of a 14,400 square foot addition for a new freezer to the existing facility, including the construction of a new parking area, storm water management system, and associated grading.

Fred Ford, Cammett Engineering: We have been here previously with a pre-application for the proposed building addition. The proposed addition is going off the west side of the building, 80 feet by 180 feet, for the 14,400 square foot addition which will house a new freezer.

The location of the addition will impact some of existing parking. We propose an extension of the driveway on the east side of the building to add parking elsewhere to make up for what is lost. There will be a total of 66 parking spaces on the site. The fire department has asked for fire access around the back of the building. There will be a gravel access drive for fire access. We've met with Conservation Commission about all the wetland and buffer zone impacts. Part of the addition is near a finger of wetlands within their 25 foot no disturb zone and 50 foot no build zone. To mitigate that, we propose to enhance the existing land area around the addition. The majority is currently mowed lawn area. Conservation Commission has had BSC Group review that with us and we've come to an understanding as to what sort of mitigation will enhance the environment so we don't impact the wetlands. This mitigation plan will include additional wetland plantings in the drainage swale. The lawn area within the 50 foot buffer zone will be upgraded with wetland plants, shrubs and herbaceous plants to allow that area to come back to a more natural state. Additional screening of trees and shrubs will be planted including white pine 8 feet on center along the existing tree line making the area more dense. Below the white pines we will be planting river birch and red maple. The entire west side of the facility will be a more natural environment. Storm water run off from the proposed parking area will be discharged into a sediment fore bay which will then run down through a grass channel and discharge into an infiltration basin. The runoff from the new addition will be pitched to a gutter along the westerly side with a downspout on the back corner and then that will be directed through a vegetated swale down into the infiltration basin. That infiltration basin provides not only peak runoff

mitigation but will provide groundwater recharge. Since we're in a water resource protection district we have to balance that so that we're not impacting the watershed resource areas. That will have an overflow discharge structure which will, under high storm events, discharge storm water to the east and into another wetlands system that goes to the north. All our runoff from our new impervious area is all being mitigated through that infiltration basin going north off the site. With this addition, in the pre-application discussion, the Planning Board wanted information on truck traffic, etc. The Shaheen trucks load up every day to distribute product. Monday through Friday, there is generally 8 to 11 trucks per day and run anywhere from 5 A.M. to 6:30 A.M. That is there current operation schedule and is not proposed to change. Trucks return by 4:30 to 5:00 P.M. on the same day. Inbound trucks bringing products into the facility average 8 to 11 trucks per day, with Wednesday being 16 trucks a day, with receiving hours being 6 A.M. to 3 P.M. Monday through Friday. No new staff is being added.

David Dragonas asks if there will be any difference in traffic from the current status.

Fred Ford there will be no difference in traffic flow.

Stephen Dunford had question in regards to infiltration basin. Has it been passed by the Conservation Commission?

Fred Ford we had our initial meeting with the Conservation Commission on March 4. They have had BSC Group review our application and they who have made comments on our storm water design. We have addressed those comments and sent revised documents to them. We are going back to Conservation on April 1st.

Stephen Dunford I would be more comfortable to hear what the Conservation Commission has to say before we take a vote.

Howard Dalton this is just the initial public hearing.

Karen Solstad the access for fire trucks is it elevated and is it gravel? And then you have gutter downspout on the new building going a grass swale to a culvert. The emergency access will have to be plowed in the winter to keep it open. Will that impact the grass swale?

Fred Ford where the gravel drive is elevated that swale will be the low point. Any run off will follow that same channel.

Karen Solstad I didn't see any elevations in the packet. How high is the addition?

Fred Ford 28 feet high.

Karen Solstad is that the same height as the rest of the building?

Fred Ford shows the elevations.

Karen Solstad are there any mechanicals on the roof?

Fred Ford those will be located on the existing building.

Karen Solstad will the compressors be loud?

Fred Ford I need to get more information on that for you. We will bring in the decibel numbers for the next meeting.

Ara Sanantz what type of roof will be on the extension and is there consideration to make the main building roof and this roof white.

Fred Ford there will be no changes to the existing roof.

Ara Sanantz to make it energy efficient

Fred Ford that is not in the program at this point.

Ted Semesnyei there will be additions to this building but there will be a number of improvements to the grounds to improve the storm water management. Will there be a net decrease in stormwater run off as a whole.

Fred Ford there will be a net decrease because we can't increase run off leaving the site. There

will be a slight decrease. This infiltration basin will provide recharge of the ground water.

David Frick how does the water currently run?

Fred Ford where this addition is proposed is all mowed grass so the run off heads away from the building into the swale and runs down to the north end of the property. Same thing on the other side, you have a slope that drops down into Shea Concrete but the majority of this area flows to the back and there is another swale out here.

Anthony Iannuccillo, owns property at 90 Haverhill Road which is directly across from Shaheen property which has 26 – 27 acres, we pay taxes on them and we are not a 61A. I heard Mr. Ford say that this board is familiar with what is now set forth to the board. I know that and I mentioned it when I was here without initiation some time in December when you had pre application conferences. I mentioned at that time that none of the abutters were noticed, none of the people that had an interest, none of the citizens of the community were noticed and I raised the issue. I won't repeat it here but I will repeat it at the end of my discussion. There are certain problems that I see with this project. This is not a simple ordinary project as I see it. I don't know if the members of this board consider it a complex project a major project but to me is what we have. We have before the board tonight three applications. Conservation commission has already had two. As I read Mr. Ford's report, Cammett engineering 107 pages – difficult to absorb everything but I'm a better reader than I am a listener. That together with all the plans and maps I've had an opportunity to look at has led me to conclude this is not a simple ordinary project this is a project that requires an environmental impact report and statement. All of the areas that we're talking about here impact the environment. They have according to Mr. Ford's last report that I have seen 7 acres of this 23 acre parcel is impervious. They have 62,345 foot concrete block building there now. They propose a 14,400 square foot addition plus a 6,200 square foot addition on top of that. That will come. That will make another application that would make 6 applications. Then they are talking about another possible application for the solar system. That makes 7 applications. Simple project? Of course not. Any reasonable person will tell you and me this is a complicated complex project. Complicated and complex because the present operation operates 24 hours every day except Sunday during the day time. They function with trucks, refrigerator trucks,...all diesel as far as I know... I don't know how many they have, I haven't counted them. The reports that we have are silent in that particular respect. I don't know what sort of building they will be putting up. Is it going to be cement block building? A wood frame? I don't know, the report doesn't show that. They are going to have additional large vehicle trucks that are going to come in and out of that area. The deliveries now are made with large trucks. They are not semi trucks, they are large trailer trucks. They are all diesel operating. The system that I see leaves out in this report many important details. This is a corporate applicant. The applicant is a corporation.

Howard Dalton: Suggests that Mr. Iannuccillo puts his concerns and findings in a written letter to Planning Board so they can be provided to the applicant and the engineer so that they can be addressed at a meeting.

Mr. Iannuccillo I haven't seen any deeds although the plan I've examined says that the deed was December 1986 then there is a subsequent deed in 1987.

Howard Dalton if you put it down, we can give it to the proper people to examine for us and we

can respond to you but to state facts like trucks and numbers...no one has a chance to rebut or to actually look up the numbers and give you a proper response so I suggest that you put it in writing in a bullet form and let us respond to you in a proper manner.

Mr. Iannuccillo what I've said to this board comes off the information that I've read that this applicant has submitted. Everything that I've told this board should already be in front of this board. I'm not making things up. This board is a special board and you are concerned with many things that affect the daily lives of every one in the community.

There are catch basins on this property and Mr. Ford says that this new project is not going to be using this catch basin...why, they are already there.

Howard Dalton please put it in writing so that I can give it to Mr. Ford and he can respond to me and then we'll know exactly what he says. But for you to say "Mr. Ford told me" ... we're completely out of the loop.

Mr. Iannuccillo you we're here me Dalton. Mr. Ford said that at the pre conference hearing that I attended. I wasn't invited. Mr. Sanentz was the acting chairman, Mr. Dragonas said something to me and I thanked the board for being to gracious to hear me. I had not invitation but this board is already familiar according to what Mr. Ford said today with what you have, what this project is all about and I'm trying to say to you that you don't have enough information here. Why is it that this report, which is well prepared, that is over 100 pages, leaves out an awful lot of detail.

Stephen Dunford we need you to write down the details that you think are missing. You commented on the number of trucks. But Mr. Ford has already said that it will be the same amount of vehicles that are going to be used. You say there is going to be more traffic. We need you to write down in bullet form will there be more trucks?

Mr. Iannuccillo I understand

Stephen Dunford we can not act upon...

Mr. Iannuccillo I have no problem with what you say. All I'm trying to do is clarify what is presently before this board. All I'm suggesting is that you don't have everything.

Howard Dalton this is the beginning of the public hearing and we may go 5 or 6 meetings with consultants so please put it in writing

Motion by Ara Sanentz to continue the public hearing for 95 Haverhill Road to April 22. The board requests that Mr. Iannuccillo submit his written comments to the Planning Board office by April 14, second by David Dragonas. Vote was 5 in favor.

Stephen Dunford may be absent from April 22 meeting. He urges Mr. Iannuccillo to submit his written comments by April 14.

Mr. Iannuccillo if I'm not able to comply with the suggestion, because I know where I am after you take action on this, I have 60 days after that. All I'm suggesting is that you afford me, not as

much as the applicant has had with all the pre-conference hearings they've have had but at least a two month delay.

Stephen Dunford I think you could do this in one evening.

Mr. Iannuccillo I may not be able to comply with that date.

Ara Sanentz do your best and turn your comments into the planning office. You have three weeks.

Howard Dalton you were going to give them all to us tonight, you should be able to write them down.

Mr. Iannuccillo I have to lay the foundation.. I have a problem with the time that has been imposed on me.

Howard Dalton we ask applicants to sign plans in three weeks so

Note: Members Sanentz, Dragonas and Frick will not be in attendance at the April 8 meeting.

David Frick this goes back to the fact that we don't have a full board at the first meeting of the month. We need to find a solution to that. Can we change that meeting to the 9th? We'll have the same issue with the DPW on the 8th.

Howard Dalton let's just go the the 22nd for this and do some research to see what we can do.

Karen Solstad are we going to have a peer review for this for stormwater management?

Nipun Jain the stormwater report has been reviewed by BSC for the con com and there is a review memo that has been produced for the con com to which the applicant has responded. That information was submitted to us today.

Fred Ford is there any more information we can provide. We will be submitting information regarding the mechanical and the noise.

Karen Solstad the question you had raised (Mr. Iannuccillo) was water run off across Route 110.

Mr. Iannuccillo no doubt about it. You have seven acre impervious area across the street; hot top, cement, all over the place. Rainwater coming down goes into the catch basin, catch basin drains into Haverhill road – Haverhill road has two pipes coming across, two pipes are coming from that catch basin. You'll notice that Mr. Ford and everything I've read so far has not mentioned this catch basin, has not mentioned that I'm getting water, contaminated water because that's what the environmental people say. Rain water coming off an impervious system, building, ground of 7 acres and they are adding more. Contaminated water. This property was always known as the great swamp. They built these buildings after 1986...the information you

have is outdated.

Howard Dalton that's why we want you to write everything down so we can ask the applicant to verify the drainage calculations.

Mr. Iannuccillo I don't know why you haven't. You have the right to hire consultants and have the applicant pay for it because you need it to do your work.

Stephen Dunford we have closed this subject and have continued it to April 22.

Peter Shaheen I would like to ask your consideration that on the 22nd we could try to summarize this and close it only because if we go too deep into the season we won't be able to start construction this year. I'll be happy to answer any questions Mr. Iannuccillo has.

Stephen Dunford I will not be at the meeting on the 22nd so I will write down some questions that paraphrase Mr. Iannuccillo's concerns.

Motion to adjourn by Stephen Dunford, seconded by David Dragonas. All in favor.

Meeting is adjourned at 9: 15 P.M.