

APPROVED

AMESBURY PLANNING BOARD

March 14, 2016

Amesbury City Hall Auditorium,
62 Friend Street, Amesbury, MA 01913

Meeting called to order at 7:03 PM

Present: Scott Mandeville, Robert Laplante, Karen Solstad, David Frick, Lars Johannessen.

Absent: Ted Semesnyi, Lori Krebs.

Also Present: Nipun Jain, City Planner, Barbara Foley, recording secretary

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

28 Lake Attitash Road- Special Permit Application

Representative: Paul Gagliardi, attorney, and John Paulson, Atlantic Engineering.

Applicants: George and Kelly Norwood

Nipun Jain: The applicant's representative requested continuation to the next meeting on April 11, 2016.

Motion was made by Lars Johannessen to continue the hearing to April 11. Motion was seconded by Robert Laplante. AIF.

103-107 Macy Street – Amesbury Chevrolet Site Plan Review - Response to peer review.

Representative: W. C. Cammett Engineering - copy to Stantec

Nipun Jain: The applicant has requested to have this hearing rescheduled to March 28.

Motion to continue the hearing to March 28 by Lars Johannessen, seconded by Robert Laplante. AIF.

47 ½ - 57 Kimball Road, Definitive Subdivision Plan Approval w/ 3 Special Permits:

(Cluster Residential, Common Access Driveway, and Water Resource Protection District)

Applicant: BC Realty Trust and Phil Parry, Esquire. Waiting for request to continue public hearing.

David Frick: Neither the applicant nor their representative is present. Stantec has reviewed the submittal and responded. The applicant has had Stantec's response since October. We have not received a response from the applicant nor have we received a request to continue.

Michelle DiMascio, 15 Acadia Kimball Road, abutter: This project started last April 2015. We are almost up to a year already. How long do we have to wait for resolution? Can PLB move them along?

Nipun Jain: We have requested the applicants to respond to the comments. There are no timelines. If the board gets no response from the applicant, the PLB can determine that the application is incomplete, that criteria has not been met, and can deny the application.

Michelle DiMascio: We are well past the time where they submit a reasonable plan and move forward instead of multiple postponements. We'd like to see this moved along or if they don't step forward soon with responses, then the application can be denied.

Nipun Jain: If PLB denies the application, then they cannot come back for two years.

Motion by Robert Laplante to ask Nipun Jain to send a letter to the developer asking for a formal update within 15 days from the current date (March 14), second by Lars Johannessen. AIF.

77 Elm Street- David Martin- Site plan and 2 Special Permits Application

Applicant: David Martin Representative: Nick Cracknell

Nick Cracknell, 13 Picard Street, Amesbury: With me tonight is Jeff Dierks, traffic engineer, along with Brian Couture from Horsley-Witten. We have no issues with any of the comments from your peer reviewer. We simply want to go over the few issues where we are at a crossroads.

Brian Couture, Horsley-Witten Group on peer review / modifications. Discussed parking on Fruit Place extension. Dumpster has been relocated. We will submit revised packets of information once we make requested alterations to the original plans. Retaining wall design has been redesigned. Auto turn information will be submitted. Access drive is within acceptable standards. Drainage in roadway, pipe sizing will be sufficient. We will provide that information to Stantec and City. We got review comments from the Town Engineer and ConCom and we will be addressing those comments as well.

Jeff Dierks, Vanasse and Associates with traffic design: We have responded to all Stantec comments and there are no issues outstanding. We will be submitting a supplemental information packet. Discussed traffic findings. Stantec would like to see traffic engineer test his findings, if possible. We looked at the possible need for a traffic signal. It may qualify for one due to occasional volumes during day. But there is nothing else outstanding in the Stantec review.

Nick Cracknell: It looks like we would need three variances for this project: off street parking, which range...depending on whether there is a restaurant there or not, and if the ground floor is retail space plus two floors of office space, we'd need 73 parking spaces. If there was a restaurant on the ground floor and two floors of office space, we'd need 97 spaces. The other two variances that we'd need are for (1) insufficient open space, and (2) maximum lot coverage, parking in front yard set back.

Nipun Jain: The parking lot parcel is zoned CBD (Central Business District) and the parcel on which the existing building sets is IC (Industrial/Commercial Zone). In both those districts you can use the special permit that allows the board for existing nonconforming building to be granted a waiver from the setback requirements and other dimensional controls. In the CBD the intent is that there will be urban scale developments so setbacks in the traditional fashion do not work. You can request those waivers from the PLB. You may have to amend the application. As far as the waiver from supplemental information in regards to hazardous materials, ENF, depends on the intended use.

Nick Cracknell: We will file for the variance for off street parking with the ZBA and request to amend the application for Special Permit.

Nipun Jain reviewed applicant's response.

Robert Laplante: What kind of justification are we going to require for these waivers?

Nipun Jain: One reason is because you can't meet it because you don't want to meet it. Or there are specific reasons what they are. If the peer review consultant recognizes/recommends that in spite of regulations there are other standard practices in the field that are recognized by other professionals and it's okay.

Nick Cracknell: We will be submitting supplemental information and revised plans.

Richard Sandler, 79 Elm Street: Will we be able to look at the revised plans in time for the April 11th meeting?

Motion by Lars Johannessen to continue to April 11th, second by Scott Mandeville. AIF

ADMINISTRATIVE:

36 Haverhill Rd. Amesbury Heights

Nipun Jain: There were two primary engineering items to be discussed – one was the sign off for the retaining wall and the other was the change to the detention basin.

Sean McReynolds: Construction has been moving along. Retaining wall was over 4' in height which required a structural engineer reviewed plan sent to Stantec. They had five comments, three have been addressed.

David Frick: The report from Stantec states that none of the five comments were addressed.

Sean McReynolds: We followed up with Stantec where they said items 2, 3 & 4 have been addressed. Items #1 and #5 are outstanding. We agree to submit a location plan to address #1 and #5 will be addressed this week. We are also here tonight to discuss the detention basin on our abutter's property. He has asked us to adjust or move the detention basin. VHB has provided options.

Conor Nagle – VHB: The basin is at the bottom of the emergency access driveway. It was originally placed there because the building owned by the abutting property was going to be removed. Now it is not. We propose to push it back. No change otherwise. It was suggested that we look into the installation of a guard rail.

Nipun Jain: A guardrail is not necessary. The construction detail will be changed and the board determines that it is minor or major.

David Frick: So we are being asked to make that determination.

Scott Mandeville: It doesn't seem to me that it is much of a change. The road has stayed the same, most of the parts of the discharge have stayed the same, Item #1 and #4 deserve a little more to be addressed.

David Frick: We need a response from Stantec to act on this.

Nipun Jain: If I told the proponent that if I could get a memo from Stantec that says we are satisfied with the design changes based on an engineering review.

David Frick: That's all we're looking for.

Motion by Robert Laplante to have the applicant work with Stantec to resolve the outstanding issues and continue this to the April 28th Planning Board meeting, second by Lars Johannessen. AIF.

Motion by Scott Mandeville to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m., second by Lars Johannessen. AIF.