



Halifax Planning Board Meeting Minutes August 18, 2016

A meeting of the Halifax Planning Board was held on Thursday, August 18, 2016, at 6:30 p.m. at the Halifax Town Hall, Meeting Room #1, 499 Plymouth Street, Halifax, Massachusetts.

Members Present: Gordon Andrews, Chairman
Larry Belcher, Vice-chairman
Karlis Skulte, member
Jonathan Soroko, member
Absent: Mark Millias

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. and the agenda was read into the record by Gordon Andrews

MOTION: Larry Belcher to accept the agenda as read
SECOND: Jonathan Soroko AIF

Appointments:

6:30 p.m. - Form A, Richard Seggelin, Palmer Mill Rd.

Mr. Seggelin present:

Members discussed that this is straight forward Form A, however the applicant will need a Special Permit to create the "estate lot" (per Zoning 167-16) in order for it to be buildable lot. A formal application will need to be submitted, as a public hearing is required and abutters notified. The board can sign as a Form A, but will need the Special Permit for the use of the lot.

Applicant and board members went over the procedures of the special permit and what may be required of other boards in order to build on the lot.

Motion to approve and endorse Form A for 116 Palmer Mill Rd, Mr. Richard Seggelin, Map 84, lot 6A and 13A Book 41877, pg. 281, book 20332, pg. 348

MOTION: Larry Belcher
SECOND: Jonathan Soroko AIF

6:45 p.m. - Site Plan Review: 894 Plymouth St.

Petitioner: Paul Reed, present: 894 Plymouth St.

Mr. Reed would like to put up a steel commercial building. Webby Engineering is doing the drainage and septic. He plans to have 4 units and possibly have overhead doors on the rear of the building.

Mr. Andrews asked if there will be floor drains. Mr. Reed advised that there will not be any vehicles parked. Mr. Skulte asked if he will you need any relief from Zoning, building location, open space, area, fully compliant. Mr. Reed did not believe he would. It will basically be a unit for him, (alarm company) maybe an insurance office.

Mr. Skulte asked if there would be any fencing around the property. Mr. Reed advised he would like to keep it open, but would like to keep the trees in the back as a buffer. He had not talked to any of the abutters.

Mr. Andrews asked about the parking regulation, as it is determined by the use of the building. Mr. Reed advised that they set it up with Handicap parking. As far as the regulations go, you have to have space for employees. It has been designed for 24 spaces. 59% of the lot will remain green, and it is based on 1 space for every 175 sq. ft. of gross floor area or retail/whole sale space. There will be only one entrance in front. (back exits on rear of building)

Mr. Skulte asked about the zoning requirements for the actual uses of each unit. Mr. Andrews advised that would be reviewed by the Zoning Officer. It was advised that signage will be on the building. Trash pick-up will be in the back, with a concrete pad for the dumpster. A fence (stockade) will enclose the dumpster. Board would like to wait until next meeting to see if any comments or concerns come back from other Town Departments.

Continue to Sept. 1, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.

7:15 p.m. Site Plan Review: Solar Array project – 241 Franklin Street

Applicant: Coneco/Bowker LLC. - Michael McGonigle: Dave Harrington.

Planning to propose a 2.3 megawatt solar facility on approx.. 61 acres, frontage on Franklin St. Has been to Conservation, hearing closed and Order of Conditions issued.

(no comments were returned at this time from other Town Departments)

Approximately 50% of area is wetlands, need to clear 10 acres. 15' wide gravel access drive, brook crossing, no street lighting or building structures, no parking or sanitary facilities. Once constructed it will be monitored on line and maybe monthly visual inspections, and it will be gated. Overhead wires, 3 phase lines, until (bend) then turn into underground primary lines into the site. Storm water management analysis completed.

Negotiated with abutter for a visual screen (on plan and accepted by DiBona family).

Will have a landscaper go into trim back any overgrowth, maybe every couple weeks during growing season.

There will be fencing around the array with gated access, adjacent to the 50' wetland buffer, and a chain link security fence.

Mr. Skulte asked why there will be two gated areas. Mr. McGonigle advised that the abutter, Mr. Dibona was concerned with dirt bikes and ATV's were able to access the back area. Front end needs to be open for National Grid, utility poles.

In summary, there is no lighting, noise pollution, traffic study. Relatively flat site, detention basins, plenty of control for run off. There may be a light over the (electrical)panel. No street lights, or security lighting, a gravel road for access, very little impervious material.

Mr. Harrington spoke about the flood plain, corresponds to elevation 40 on the USGS maps. Designed the bridge to be higher than 40 to stay out of the flood plain. (100 yr.) Zone A. Slight elevation of the road to 43, in order to form swales on the sides.

Mr. Skulte asked about compensatory storage. Mr. Harrington advised of the compensatory storage and the double wetland replication. It will abut the existing wetland line. Swales to detention basin and infiltration basins. Water quality storage. Bridge across the stream will be stone block walls and structural plate bridge. (gravity block walls with geo grid to connect) Existing stream bed with remain intact. The crossing is 30 feet, the actual stream is about 15 feet.

Mr. Skulte asked about the Order of Conditions and if there were any special conditions. Mr. McGonigle advised just the tree line, will be 200 foot visual screen.

Abutter - Mike DiBona: He would like the gate as close to the road as they can get it. They don't want people out there.

Mr. McGonigle advised that National Grid needs unimpeded access to their poles. So the gate will get as close to the road as allowable.

Mr. Belcher asked about access for the fire Dept. Advised that the Fire Dept. would have access to the Knox Box for any emergency.

Motion to accept the site plan for 241 Franklin Street with the condition to follow the Conservation order for a 200 foot visual screen along the abutting property line where the access drive extends to within 10' of the Developer's southerly property line that abuts the DiBona property. A white Spruce tree or equivalent species approximately 8' high 5' foot wide to be installed on the developer's property in two alternating rows on 10' centers. Additionally the gate will be installed beyond the point as to not limit the access of the utility owned equipment or owner safety power disconnects. The developer will also provide access keys to the Knox Box to the Fire Department in the event of an emergency.

Abutter - Bob DiBona: We had specifically asked for Norway Spruce planting as opposed to the recommended. We have Norway spruce and would like it to match.

Mr. McGonigle: Whatever the cost if it doesn't increase the cost, we don't care.

Mr. DiBona: I would feel better that that is what we're going to get so it will all blend, and match.

Mr. McGonigle: It was based on installation and costs.

Mr. Harrington: Equivalent to the white spruce, we will be reasonable, if it's 5% increase, we won't worry about that.

MOTION: Larry Belcher

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

AIF

Discussion: Warren Bush; Sherwood Drive.

Directly behind hydrant is cable and electrical lines. On other side is the main. The hydrant can't be moved closer to main. Keith at Water Department wants it (hydrant) where it is currently located. Need to move the sidewalk. Can keep width of the sidewalk, but the grass strip will be narrower. The sidewalk will have gently curve around hydrant. Modification to sidewalk plan (drawing) submitted. No vote needed.

Site Plan Review: 314 Plymouth St. R&J LLC, Country Club LLC.

Present: Ed Brennan, Atty., and Rebecca Baptista, Silva Engineering. Representing the applicant John Peck. Was here a month ago and reviewed extensively the proposed project. Some comments and questions by board. Mr. Silva submitted a revised the site plan and sent out to (Boards) Review Engineer. Review engineer commented and we have responded and is there further comment back by our Engineer today.

(secretary) No, we just received her (Ms. Baptista) information today.

Mr. Brennan requested to submit a new revised latest site plan and walk thru the questions and comments. (response comments submitted)

First comment is a zoning issue, and should be taken up with the Zoning Board to see if they need a variance to have buildings on one lot as opposed to individual lots. Mr. Andrews advised that there is a by law where the Planning board can waive some of the requirements of a site plan, and have done that in the past. Mr. Brennan submitted plan under the definition of Multifamily, 3 or more units on at least 10 acres and continuance frontage. They will be adding to the site to create the required acres.

The multifamily site will be conveyed a portion of the larger piece over to this site to have the 16+ acres. Mr. Skulte: Are you physically creating a lot for that? The golf course will be on that lot. Mr. Brennan: The golf course will be on its own lot. Mr. Skulte: A portion of the golf course will be on that lot. Mr. Brennan: Yes, but, we need single ownership of the multifamily development, so the extent that the golf course uses any of this land, it would just be addressed through easements. So that addresses peer review comment #1 Showing the perimeter of the lot and we addressed #2.

Number 3 goes away for the same reason, because we're adding the additional acreage, so the hundred feet is met. 3B is a 30 foot vegetated buffer, when we left ZBA, I asked if a landscaped area would satisfy that buffer, but we haven't gotten that answer yet. We have the 30 feet, we can't leave it in its natural state, but its intended to be graded and landscaped in that particular area. So if this board can waive that, I would ask for that waiver, to the extent, if we have to address that at Zoning Board, I will do so.

Mr. Andrews ask to go over that again. The bylaw says a 30 foot buffer that abuts the property line of multifamily, should be left in a natural state. Their intent is to grade and landscape that area. Mr. Skulte asked about arborvitae along the edge. No details as of this time, Ms. Baptista advised that Amory raised issue with the structure of a retaining wall. Mr. Brennan also stated that if that falls in the definition of a structure they will have to take that up with the Zoning Board. Believes that area is currently an open area, and leaving it natural would be as is, but visually, landscaping would be better.

Mr. Belcher: I think the grass or whatever isn't the issue, it's the retaining wall that they are bringing up as an issue. I think landscaped is going to look better than 3 foot tall grass.

Ms. Baptista also advised with the retaining wall there will be a fence, and considering the height.

Mr. Skulte: Is there a fence propose along the rear of those residential properties?

Ms. Baptista: not as of yet. I was just thinking the safety of the wall requirement.

Mr. Brennan: Maybe near the retaining wall, but there isn't any fencing around the other areas of the units. That was comment 3B. Comment 4 addresses fire Detection systems, we know we have to design the buildings according to whatever the code is. The actual architectural drawings have not yet been prepared, we have elevations, but have not gone into the interior until we have the permits. But will still have to comply with all state building codes.

The section about the water main looped, we had it looped and took it out. I understand the board can waive that.

Mr. Andrews: Not us, the water department.

Mr. Belcher: He already did all that. We have that in comments. Waiting water plans will need to be reviewed by engineer of hydraulic study. Did not require looped system (7/20/16).

Mr. Skulte: Is someone preparing the hydrologic study of the water system or hydraulic analysis? Is the intent that someone will be preparing some sort of analysis to satisfy that.

Mr. Brennan: We'll have to do whatever the water department as for us. We'll have to apply for hook up, so until they have everything they want and need. I'm sure they not give us the permit. Whatever they need we'll have to address.

There was a question about how trash will be handled, there will be a private contractor, individual roll outs.

There was a question about lighting, we've added a light post.

Ms. Baptista: Because there are two on each, we'll do a driveway lantern on each side. They are close enough, by the time you get all the way around the entire street will be lite.

Mr. Brennan: comment #8 addresses easements: Apparently there is an easement across the property now, which will be shown. We won't need any other easements for the benefit of this property.

Ms. Baptista: There is an existing drain line from Shelby Plaza that we will need to continue the easement.

Mr. Brennan: There is a By law that does say that the board can consider site plan review the privacy of the various units and how it might affect the residents. I would just suggest that, the comments seem to be geared towards the relationship between condos/units and the golf course, this is going to be marketed to golfers, so I think most golfers like to overlook golf course. I don't think the proximity of tees or greens would affect the marketability of the units. I understand it's in your bylaws and the review engineer commented on it, but it's an issue that takes care of itself.

Next comment is the alignment between the driveway and the Stop & Shop entrance. It is set up that way because of the infrastructure already in place. There is an offset between the center lines (about 2 feet) and

is within tolerable traffic alignment. We are asking to keep it where it is and avoid the relocation of some of the infrastructure.

Ms. Baptista: the traffic generator is straight across.

Mr. Andrews: We're also looking at traffic from all the other commercial business from that side.

Mr. Peck: Every one of the lots there will have access to the red light. People coming from West Bridgewater down they will make a right turn into the lot near the bank, but to come out they have to come out at the red light. The same thing, with the two lots on the other side, people will have to come into at the red light, but they will be able to exit at the other end with a right turn only, but all those lots, are going to have (inaudible) that driveway there.

Mr. Skulte: So this new driveway will be used by all those commercial lots that are being created?

Mr. Peck: All those commercial lots. About 6 or 7 curb cuts out there.

Mr. Skulte: So if that's the case, won't there be more traffic going thru this driveway?

Mr. Brennan: If you take the traffic generated other than, part of the condos, yes. Taking it in from the others but, you're eliminating the other curb cuts so your avoiding one, and probably more significant safety issue and putting it thru the intersection into the offset. Will probably be better than what is out there now.

Mr. Andrews: so the offset coming out of Stop & Shop is about 10 feet off of that?

Ms. Baptista: Yes, Still a very manageable curve.

Mr. Belcher: You couldn't align it without moving the telephone pole anyway.

Ms. Baptista: All of it. (all three)

Mr. Brennan: Whole transformer and the stop light.

Discussion continued regarding the curve and alignment of the street to the Stop & Shop entrance.

Mr. Brennan: comment # 2 has been corrected and now on plan. Sidewalk, vertical curbing rather than cape cod berm.

Ms. Baptista: Inside the project it is cape cod berm, at the corner there is vertical along the radius.

Sidewalk will have vertical, where ever there is no sidewalk, it will be cape cod berm.

Mr. Brennan: Next comment is with the parking area and entrance, 9, 10, 11 & 12. We've placed that building as far off as we can, we have 25' no touch, so trying to accommodate on the other side. Suggesting to stop the sidewalk at the beginning of the first driveway. So the sidewalk doesn't interfere with the distance we need in order to park a car in front of the garages. Short discontinuance of the sidewalk, then each of the units will still have a sidewalk right up to the unit.

Ms. Baptista: Comment that we don't provide full separation for infiltration in the first basin. We are going to eliminate it, there won't be a separation issue with the first basin. that all together. The calculations were rerun, and there was no significant impact on what the (inaudible) are still met. The second basin, going to raise the bottom, so it provides a full separation. With such and elevation change, we have no problem accommodating the elevation. Numbers were rerun, and still provide one for peak rate and volume reduction.

Mr. Skulte: when you say you eliminate it, the first one, your saying you got rid of detention basin?

Ms. Baptista: No, I ran the calculation, I took out the component that said (infiltrate) So it's just going to be a detention basin. Connection from catch basin to catch basin is in your regulations and engineers don't recommend it, your regulations allow three, he is not recommending it, we would like to keep it. Issues with a septic tank too close to the water line, we moved the tank away from it. Moved to the side of the building.

Also had a comment about the water line location up the driveway, we got a little too close to the bank property, so we pushed it so it's 5 feet to the property line. slightly underneath the roadway, it will be up to the developers issue to replace and fix and maintain. Also moved the guard rails for enough room to access the water main underneath. The Board of Health issue, will get once we have permits in place.

Briefly discussed the water flow coming off the bank and the Alger's property. A lot of field work and Silva Engineering is continuing to work with the Alger's.

Mr. Brennan ended.

Mr. Skulte: To go back to the intersection one more time, what do you anticipate to modify for to the signal? Will the modifications include any additional lights or poles that will be installed in order to face the traffic leaving the site and maybe ultimately additional traffic from those commercial properties?

Ms. Baptista: I hadn't thought about that one way, I don't have an answer to that, we will have to consult with a traffic Engineer. We will have lights on the other side, there are no lights facing (the project)

Mr. Skulte: Will you be getting a traffic engineer on board to review everything to make sure it is MUTCD and designed safely and compliant?

Ms. Baptista: Probably the same people that did Stop & Shop. Yes we will secure a traffic engineer.

Mr. Andrews: That would be my concern too, the lineup of that. If there was any way we could alleviate some of that line up.

Ms. Baptista: we are trying to save all the lighting that is already in place. We have the room if you do need us to move it, physically no other issue to shift the alignment over. Really just a preference not, to move 5 feet, then you are going to have to redo the whole intersection.

Mr. Soroko: We don't want the possibility of a head on collision. Ms. Baptista: We don't.

Mr. Belcher: Maybe all the way down where the other curb cut is.

Ms. Baptista: Perhaps something can be done when the other driveways are added, instead. Can we do a residential component at this point, when we come back to you for the commercial aspects, we'll relook at this and perhaps be enough to warrant relocation the entire intersection.

Mr. Andrews: The component you're using for the road is 24'.

Ms. Baptista: Yes

Mr. Skulte: I would like to see what the peer review engineer says in response to these. Is there any chance you can engage a traffic engineer to provide some initial recommendation to us prior to completing this process?

Mr. Brennan: He's raised the issue, I guess, certainly an offset is not ideal, no, we all agree with that. Whether or not this one creates a significant safety hazard, maybe we could have a traffic engineer to look at that for us, and say what are the consequences of the 10 foot offset? They are making an assumption; they may be bad, but not really bad. Maybe just adjust do some timing and signalization.

Mr. Skulte: Maybe a letter of either support or their lack of and why they believe this is safe.

Briefly discussed when they are going to see Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Brennan advised they are waiting for Planning board input, and decisions. Planning Board can advised Zoning that we are looking at a few issues. They discussed the retaining wall and possible screening to hide it a little. They will provide commentaries from a traffic engineer, with the offsets of S&S entrance and new driveway.

Mr. Andrews: We will postpone to the next meeting.

Secretary advised we need a new extension (30 days) (signed by Mr. Brennan)

Continue hearing to September 1 at 6:45 p.m.

Meeting Minutes:

Motion to approve meeting minutes from August 4, 2016

MOTION: Larry Belcher

SECOND: Jonathan Soroko

AIF

Correspondence:

Board of Selectman memo: If any interest in Town buying property at 61 Summit St.
Board has no interest.

Adjourn:

Motion to adjourn meeting.

MOTION: Larry Belcher

SECOND: Jonathan Soroko

AIF

It was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Approved: _____

Terri Renaud
Planning Board Secretary

