

GREAT BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD

DATE: December 8, 2016
TIME: 6:00 P.M.
FOR: Regular Meeting
PLACE: Large Meeting Room
PRESENT: Brandee Nelson, Chair; Malcolm Fick; Jonathan Hankin; Jack Musgrove;
Jeremy Higa
Chris Rembold, Town Planner

Ms. Nelson called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. Mr. Higa had not yet arrived.

FORM A'S:

There were no Form A's submitted.

MINUTES: NOVEMBER 9, 2016 & NOVEMBER 16, 2016

Mr. Hankin made a motion to approve the minutes of November 9, 2016 as amended, Mr. Musgrove seconded, all in favor.

Mr. Hankin made a motion to approve the minutes of November 16, 2016 as written, Mr. Musgrove seconded, all in favor.

SPECIAL PERMIT & SITE PLAN REVIEW: 34-42 BRIDGE STREET

Michael Charles from Benchmark Developers and their Engineers Larry Boudreau and Kyle Ahearn from Chazen were present to discuss the applications for 34-42 Bridge Street. Mr. Charles began the presentation saying the building on Bridge Street that was the former site of a laundry cleaning business will be removed to build a new building that will be the new home of the Co-Op Market. The market will be on the lower level of the building that will provide retail space on Bridge Street and two floors of housing.

Mr. Charles said there will another building in the back portion of the parcel that will have an underground garage and condominiums. This building will be built after the Bridge Street building and parking have been completed. When the Bridge Street building is done the building that currently houses the Co-Op will be taken down to provide parking for the new Co-Op use.

Mr. Higa arrived at 6:04 P.M.

Mr. Charles said the Co-Op will remain open during the construction of the new building. He said an access road along the ball field will provide temporary access to the site. The storage building behind the current Co-Op will be taken down to provide temporary parking. Discussions with the Park Commission have led to us working with them to activate a border between the two sites.

Mr. Charles said the building site will be fenced off while the Bridge Street building is torn down and new building is constructed. Parking will be provided behind the existing Co-Op.

Mr. Hankin asked where the staging area for the construction project will be.

Mr. Charles said it will be in the back part of the site along the John Dewey Academy property.

Mr. Musgrove asked where access for the Phase 2 part of the project would be. He asked if it would be from the ball park into the parking garage.

Mr. Charles said it would be through the site on the main access road. He said there will be an 18 inch wall-terrace between the properties and a 6 foot wall between the ball field and the new parking garage.

Mr. Hankin asked if bleachers would be built into the bank

Mr. Charles said there is a conceptual design but the details have not been worked out. He said there is a plan to provide restrooms for the ball field but the plans still have a ways to go.

Brian Cohan, an applicant, said he had sent letters to Mr. Rembold regarding the discussions with the Parks Commission.

Mr. Hankin asked about the access road along the ball field.

Mr. Cohan said it is about 75 feet between home plate and the property line.

Mr. Hankin asked how far from the first base line to the driveway.

Larry Boudreau from Chazen said it would be 35 feet.

Mr. Charles said there will need to be a guardrail. The road will be constructed as a real road. He said the ball field will not need to be moved.

Mr. Boudreau said a chain link fence will need to be installed. The back stop will have to be replaced. Handicap spaces will be provided for the ball field at the south end of the driveway, which will remain when construction is finished.

Ms. Nelson said all the details should be worked out and brought back. She asked that more detail be provided about the phasing.

Ms. Nelson said there are 73 parking spaces in the temporary parking area. When the parking is moved to the location of the existing Co-Op building the parking will become more complicated. She asked if the parking will be functional during construction.

Mr. Charles said yes. He said the parking will be provided two areas in the back part of the project.

Mr. Rembold asked for more discussion about the phasing after the new Co-Op location opens and the permanent parking is done. He asked how Phase 2 would be built with people crossing that main access road.

Mr. Charles said the access road along the boundary will be still be used.

Mr. Rembold if it would be a two-way road.

Mr. Charles said yes. He said there is plenty of room for it and it makes sense to leave it.

Ms. Nelson asked about building 2.

Mr. Charles said it will be a stand alone building. He said he is not sure when it will be done.

Mr. Musgrove asked if the ball park would be left unusable.

Mr. Charles said no. It is part of our agreement that anything we tear down we will replace, such as the back stop. We are going to try to provide public restrooms. We are not sure what our budget will allow but we will work through it. We will not interrupt the baseball season.

Mr. Musgrove asked if there is a commitment to build Phase 2.

Mr. Charles said we are totally committed to the project. He did say that the market will drive building the condominiums.

Mr. Charles said building 2 has been moved slightly from the last plan the Board looked at. He said there is a slight reconfiguration to move it off of the easement for the drainage pipe that crosses the property from Main Street.

Ms. Nelson asked why building 2 is not located on Bridge Street.

Mr. Charles said the parking for the Co-Op needs to be in that location. Part of the reason is to get the delivery trucks off of Bridge Street. The plan as shown will allow the trucks to enter the property and back into the loading area.

Mr. Cohan said it is important for the parking to be located at the same grade and next to the Co-Op. Putting the building in the front would also block the view of the Co-Op customers sitting outside in the terrace area. With the Parks Commission working with us we will create a place to sit by designing a retaining wall or walls. The wall will be a spot for people to go and provide an opportunity to communicate with the park.

Ms. Nelson asked why the Co-Op couldn't be at the Bridge Street level.

Mr. Cohan said everyone has that reaction. Having them at street level does not work with the location of the parking. Parking for a grocery store needs to be at the same level as the entrance.

Since the parking lot is lower than the street level, the grocery cannot be at street level. It just doesn't work.

Mr. Musgrove asked if there is just one elevator in the building.

Mr. Charles said yes.

Mr. Cohan said the Co-Op market does not want windows in their space so they are happy to be at the sub-grade level. He said the location is positive for all. The market does not need elevator access and does not want to lose the floor space an elevator would take up.

Mr. Hankin said he want to make a disclaimer that Mr. Charles and Mr. Cohan have listed the condos with Berkshire Property Agents where he is an independent contractor. As he is not an owner, he has no financial benefit.

Mr. Hankin said he has communicated his concerns to Mr. Charles and Mr. Cohan about ADA accessibility. He said three quarters of the building, 37,000 square feet, will accommodate 22 residential units as well as retail and office space. He said these portions of the building are not accessible on site from the handicapped parking spaces. As currently designed, to gain handicapped access, one has to leave the property, climb 14' in elevation on a town sidewalk to access three quarters of the building. There is one on street handicapped space shown at the west end of the building, which the town would have to agree to provide, but which would not be usable overnight for six months of the year due to overnight parking ban for snow removal. He asked how this works when ADA and the State Code require access be from within the site.

Mr. Charles said there is a split sidewalk that follows the grade. He said that is not our sidewalk. Ours is on our property and it is level; it does not follow the grade of the street. We will need to apply for a variance as there is a 14 foot slope from the parking lot to the entrance of the building.

Mr. Cohan said the building will have a zero lot line. If the building were to be set back we could stay on our own property and design our own sidewalk.

Ms. Nelson said if the sidewalk is a Town sidewalk it is not required to meet ADA requirements. She asked why the elevator can't be moved.

Mr. Charles said the elevator can't be moved because it would be in the Co-Op space. He said it will work in the proposed location.

Ms. Nelson said it is the sense of the Board that it will not be allowed.

Mr. Hankin said the ADA calls for no more than 200 feet from the accessible parking space to the accessible entrance. As proposed the parking spaces in the lot are close to 350 feet.

Mr. Cohan said we are not proposing to build something that is not ADA compliant.

Ms. Nelson said access needs to be compliant as well.

Mr. Musgrove said there are only 4 handicap spaces for the residents and the Co-Op.

Mr. Hankin said there is a grade restriction too.

Mr. Boudreau said the grade does not exceed 2% for the Co-Op.

Mr. Charles asked if the Board wanted handicap spaces within the distance of the elevator.

Mr. Hankin said there is 37,000 square feet of building not accessible from the parking lot.

Mr. Charles said they have designed to the site. The parking is compliant with zoning.

Mr. Hankin said the handicap spaces are accessible to the Co-Op but not the rest of the building.

Ms. Nelson said we need more information on the elevator in the east corner. If there is information to show why it can't be in that location the discussion would go away.

Mr. Hankin said that is his main concern. He said he hopes this will be a successful project.

Ms. Nelson asked if there is a concept rendering of the view toward Memorial Field.

Mr. Charles said not yet.

Mr. Hankin said he would like to see something to reinforce the street wall at the parking area. It should be an architectural element to say this is where the street ends.

The discussion shifted to the building materials.

Mr. Hankin asked what materials would be used on the exterior of the building.

Mr. Charles said corrugated metal would be used on the transitional part of the building. There would be brick and metal panels.

Mr. Musgrove said that from his reading of the plan that the height of the building is proposed to be 39.5 feet.

Mr. Hankin said there are height issues.

Mr. Charles said the building is 39.5 feet on the Co-Op side. He said it is always challenging with a sloping site.

Ms. Nelson asked where the heating and cooling units will be located.

Mr. Charles said they will be on the roof and they will be screened.

Ms. Nelson asked that the heights be provided on the plan. She said it should be shown on the plan.

Mr. Rembold said there is a parapet roof structure that is not included in the height.

Mr. Hankin said it doesn't seem out of scale because of the slope.

Ms. Nelson agreed but said they may need a variance for the height.

Mr. Hankin said the backside of the building will be brick on the first floor then corrugated metal above.

Ms. Nelson said overall the material seems reasonable and complementary.

Mr. Musgrove said he thinks that the design goes with the downtown.

Mr. Fick agreed.

Mr. Musgrove asked where the water on the site will go.

Mr. Boudreau said more information on the drainage will be shown on the next set of plans.

Kyle Ahearn from Chazen discussed the drainage as shown on the submitted plans.

Ms. Nelson asked if there is any drainage improvement proposed as part of the Bridge Street project.

Mr. Rembold said not at this time.

Ms. Nelson said there is a lot of fill proposed, 6-8 feet of fill. It is a big earth work project.

Mr. Charles said a lot of the fill is associated with the demolition of the building.

Ms. Nelson said the complexity of the phasing would require fill to be brought in along the access way to the John Dewey Academy School.

Mr. Charles said the access is currently owned by the school but we are buying it and we will provide easements as required.

Mr. Rembold asked about Phase 1 building drainage, specifically the sewer drainage.

Mr. Ahearn said the exact location has not yet been determined but it will go into existing drainage structures.

Ms. Nelson asked what the interim solution will be for what isn't built.

Mr. Ahearn said that will have to be looked at.

Mr. Rembold there needs to be information provided for the infiltration chambers in the parking lot, the retaining wall along the east boundary and the drainage for the proposed roadway along the east boundary.

Ms. Nelson asked if there is a conflict with the driveway and the existing drainage pipe.

Mr. Rembold said when you come back with the plans please show how the driveway in the field and the parking in the field will be drained and how the existing drainage is incorporated in the field.

Mr. Boudreau said a profile will be shown of the wall.

Ms. Nelson said we also would like to have a photometric lighting plan submitted.

Mr. Boudreau asked how high the light poles can be.

Mr. Rembold said there is guidance in the zoning bylaw.

Ms. Nelson asked how the waste from the site would be managed and how mail delivery would be handled.

Mr. Charles said there will a dumpster in the back. Mail will be delivered in the lobby.

Ms. Nelson asked if the lobby would be secured.

Mr. Charles said it has not been determined how it will be secured.

Ms. Nelson said she know there are two Elm trees that will have to be removed. She asked that it be considered to putting something similar back into the project.

Mr. Charles said there has been discussion of trying to save the trees. At this point there is no decision but we understand the request.

Mr. Rembold asked how the building footprint for building 2 has been changed.

Mr. Charles said the footprint is a little smaller that the original proposal. The parking configuration has not changed. Their garage will be at grade with the ball field but it will not connect to the ball field.

Ms. Nelson asked that the changes be shown on the next set of plans.

Ms. Nelson said when the lighting is considered please go with LED lighting at 3500° K or less. When you prepare the storm water plans please provide ownership and maintenance plan agreements. She asked the Board if there were any additional comments for guidance.

Mr. Rembold suggested to the applicant that if they are not able to attend the next meeting on December 22 that a letter requesting a continuation of the public hearing should be sent to the Selectboard. He said there is still a lot of work to be done by this Board. Mr. Rembold asked that revised plans be sent to him to forward to the Board at least a week before the next meeting.

The discussion of the special permit and site plan review was continued to the January 12, 2017 meeting.

SITE PLAN REVIEW: 15 CONE AVENUE

Michael Spratt was present to discuss the Site Plan Review application to construct an additional single family dwelling unit at 15 Cone Avenue.

The Board had conducted a site visit on August 26. The primary concern was the close proximity of the proposed driveway to the existing house.

Mr. Spratt said he has obtained an easement from the neighbor. Approximately 6-8 feet of land of their property will be obtained. The pines along that strip will be moved.

Mr. Rembold said the driveway will straddle the property line.

Mr. Spratt said yes. He said the hydrangeas will be moved to provide screening.

Ms. Nelson asked if the site is served by Town water and sewer.

Mr. Spratt said yes.

Mr. Hankin said the driveway was his only concern. The revised plan seems fine.

Mr. Rembold said the lot is plenty big enough to accommodate the second dwelling. Section 8.1 allows for the second dwelling unit. There is an existing driveway for the existing house. There is no conflict.

Ms. Nelson said the house site is the highest point on the property. She advised the applicant to work with the contractor to make sure the runoff from the new house site does not go toward the neighbor. Have the drainage directed to the back.

Mr. Spratt agreed.

Mr. Musgrove read through the Site Plan Review criteria.

Mr. Musgrove made a motion to approve SPR, Mr. Hankin seconded, all in favor.

SOLAR ENERGY ZONING:

The Board began their discussion of the draft bylaw for solar energy zoning. There was a brief discussion of trying to get the zoning on the warrant for a Special Town Meeting scheduled for January 26.

Mr. Rembold said the Selectboard would have to decide if the zoning item could be included. He said a public hearing would have to be held.

Ms. Nelson said she is concerned that there is not enough time to get it all done.

Mr. Rembold went through the definitions.

Mr. Musgrove suggested a footnote to allow by the Planning Board if the acreage allows.

Mr. Hankin said an agricultural exemption is allowed if there are 5 acres or more of land. The same could be allowed for a solar exemption.

Mr. Fick said he attended a Co-Op Power presentation promoting small scale residential uses of 4,000 square foot that would power 4-5 homes providing 25 kilowatts. 25kw is the maximum for getting into the grid without additional costs. National Grid considers this a small array.

The Board discussed and agreed to change the definitions for the sizes of projects.

Ms. Nelson said the visual impact of the utility pole arrangement where the interconnection is made should be considered.

It was determined that the zoning amendment is not ready for the Special Town meeting in January. Mr. Rembold will send a clean copy of the draft to the Planning Board and Agricultural Commission for further review.

Ms. Nelson suggested and the Board agreed to table the 40R zoning discussion to the December 22 meeting.

TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT:

Mr. Rembold said the time line for the Smart Growth zoning would require a public hearing to be scheduled for late January. The details will be finalized at the next meeting.

CITIZEN'S SPEAK TIME: No one spoke.

Having concluded their business, Ms. Nelson adjourned without objection at 9:22 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Kimberly L. Shaw
Planning Board Secretary

**TOWN CLERK
GREAT BARRINGTON**

DEC 23 2016 AM8:43

MATERIALS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING:

1. Site Plan Review application of Michael Spratt for 15 Cone Ave.
2. Special Permit and Site Plan Review application of Benchmark Development for 34-42 Bridge Street including:
 - a. Narrative/Project Description
 - b. Site Plans including Utility Plans, prepared by Chazen Engineering
 - c. Phasing Plan – Phase 1, prepared by Chazen Engineering
 - d. Elevation views, dated October 21, 2016 , prepared by Gruskin Architecutre & Design
 - e. Renderings, dated October 12, 2016, prepared by Gruskin Architecutre & Design
 - f. Copy of letter of request for Water Quality Zone II permit
 - g. Copy of letter of request for Loading Space Waiver
3. Draft 40R zoning bylaw dated 12/5/16
4. Draft solar zoning bylaw dated 12/5/16