

**CITY OF GLOUCESTER  
PLANNING BOARD**

**December 21, 2017**

**6:00 P.M.**

**Kyrouz Auditorium 9 Dale Ave, Gloucester**

**Richard Noonan, Chair**

**MINUTES**

Members Present: Rick Noonan- Chair, Henry McCarl, Doug Cook, Jonathan Pratt, Shawn Henry, Jane Remsen Absent: Mary Black- Vice Chair  
Staff: Gregg Cademartori- Planning Director, Matt Coogan- Senior Planner, Jacquelyn Rose- Recording Secretary

Chair Rick Noonan opened the meeting at 6:03pm

**I. BUSINESS**

A. Approval of Outstanding Minutes of November 16, 2017

**Motion to Approve the November 16, 2017 minutes was made by Mr. McCarl, seconded by Mr. Henry and unanimously approved.**

B. Public Comment: None.

**II. CONSENT AGENDA**

Planning Board to consider the *Site Plan Review Application* submitted by 293 Jefferson Ave Realty Trust, to construct a new industrial building and associated site improvements at 1 Kondelin Road (Assessors Map 207 Lot 29).

Gateway Engineering representative John Judd explains to the board that he is proposing a 1300 sq ft industrial building. Mr. Judd continues that right now there is a machine shop and a Village Silversmith manufacturing space around the building, but there is not a lot of activity in terms of employees. Mr. Judd explains that is a proposed contract for an industrial building, with 10 units, and contractor base storage for local business men to operate out of. Mr. Judd shows the board that there is garage space, a mezzanine on the second level, and offices for each unit. Mr. Judd explains that this plan has been approved by the fire chief, but was asked to eliminate a space to allow more room for fire engines, and they have eliminated it and have submitted a plan to eliminate the space. Mr. Judd explains that they far exceed parking calculations.

Mr. Coogan asks Mr. Judd to clarify the septic system for the unit. Mr. Judd clarifies that this location was a suggested interim location for West Parish students, so there was an analysis done for the septic system and they have an 11000 sq ft leaching field which far exceeds what this building needs in terms of industrial flow. Mr. Judd continues that the Health Inspector was satisfied that they far exceeded the capacity for an additional industrial flow. Mr. Coogan asks Mr. Judd to explain what will be seen from Kondelin Road. Mr. Judd explains that you will see an industrial building with a single entrance that meets fire code, with stoops coming out of the mezzanine. Mr. Judd continues that the doors on the upper level do not get used and it is strictly for fire code. Contractors have stairs on the interior of the building to get to the upper level. Both the new and existing building will have a sprinkler system. Mr. Judd explains that looking at the building from Kondelin Road will be a single story building with an exterior door. Mr. Judd clarifies that the final building plan will be developed and submitted as part of the building process.

Mr. Noonan asks Mr. Judd if the Kondelin Road side will be at street level, and Mr. Judd replies that there is no sidewalk on that side, but that it would be at street level. Mr. Coogan explains that he met with Mr. Judd and the applicant to do a preliminary analysis and one thing that changed was the position of the building should shift to accommodate the setback. Mr. Judd explains that they kept the 20ft requirement, which is the local code, for the leaching field to the building, and the state requires 10ft. Mr. Judd explains that towards the back of the building there will be handicap accessible interior bathroom. Mr. Coogan asks Mr. Judd if there will be bathrooms on each floor. Mr. Judd answers that there will only be bathrooms on the lower level. Mr. Noonan asks Mr. Judd what the building height is on the parking lot side, and Mr. Judd answers that it will not exceed 40ft.

Mrs. Remsen asks Mr. Coogan if he has everything he needs to approve this plan. Mr. Coogan answers that Mr. Judd submitted a plan that includes everything, and they accepted it. Mr. Judd explains that they have nothing there now, but are planning on putting in shrubs and they are proposing trees in front of the building, and there will be lighting over each door. Mr. Coogan states that one plan shows bathrooms on the first and second floor. Mr. Judd clarifies that there is only going to be bathrooms on the first floor, and that must have been an error, and asks Mr. Coogan if there is a concern about having restrooms on the second floor, which Mr. Coogan answers no.

Mr. Coogan explains that they have a swept path analysis that shows that the fire truck can get in which satisfies the fire chief, but since these will be contractor based, will each bay offer storage and a place for a vehicle to park and/or stay overnight. Mr. Coogan continues that the aisle between the back and the parking is 24ft which complies for two way circulation, but it is right up to the building so if there are cars there and a fire truck needs to get through that then that firelane could be blocked. Mr. Judd explains that there would be no problem with requiring

firelane striping in front of the building to ensure that does not happen. Mr. Coogan suggests adding that to the plan.

**Motion to approve the *Site Plan Review Application* submitted by 293 Jefferson Ave Realty Trust, to construct a new industrial building and associated site improvements at 1 Kondelin Road (Assessors Map 207 Lot 29) was made by Mr. Cook, seconded by Mr. Pratt and unanimously approved.**

Planning Board to consider the *Approval Not Required Plan* submitted by Anita Wolovick, to adjust lot lines to eliminate a lot and reduce existing non-conformities at 7 & 9 Hillside Court (Assessors Map 156, Lots 21, 22).

Mr. Henry recuses himself. Mr. Noonan asks if anyone is here to represent this application, which no one is. Mrs. Remsen acknowledges that the owners names do not match the applicant, and that some of the abbuteres names on the map do not match the what is on the application. Mr. Coogan explains that these parcels were recently purchased so that could be why there are different names. Mr. Coogan explains that there is the original lot is being eliminated and there will be a new lot line. Mr. Coogan continues that one portion of land is being added to a different lot, and that this is a reconfiguration of three lots into two lots.

**Motion to approve the *Approval Not Required Plan* submitted by Anita Wolovick, to adjust lot lines to eliminate a lot and reduce existing non-conformities at 7 & 9 Hillside Court (Assessors Map 156, Lots 21, 22) was made by Mr. Cook, seconded by Mr. Pratt, and unanimously approved.**

Planning Board to consider the *Approval Not Required Plan* submitted by Jeremiah Nicasro and Lisa Leahy, to create one additional building lot at 36 Bennett Street (Assessors Map 115, Lot 56).

### **III. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

In accordance with MGL Chapter 40A, Section 9 and 11, and the City of Gloucester Zoning Ordinance, Sections 1.55, 1.8.3 and 5.20, The Planning Board will hold a public hearing to consider the application from Jeremiah Nicasro and Lisa Leahy, for a ***Pork Chop Lot Special Permit*** at 36 Bennett Street (Assessors Map 115, Lot 56). *Continued from December 7th meeting.*

**Motion to reopen a public hearing was made by Mr. McCarl, seconded by Mrs. Remsen and unanimously approved.**

Jeremiah Nicasastro, resident of 10 Tufts Lane, explains that he reached out to the surveyor in regards to the missing easement, and located the easement on the map. Mr. Nicasastro clarified that the Board needs clarification of where the easement is to ensure there is enough room to build a home.

Mr. Cademartori explains that an outstanding question was requiring that easement on the plan and that the Staff have received that plan containing the easement.

Mrs. Remsen explains that she saw the site and there is a steep drop off on Bennett St. Mr. Nicasastro explains that the drop off is behind the easement.

Mrs. Remsen asks if there is any safety issues with the access to the building, and Mr. Nicasastro answers that there is a small driveway there and that the building will go on the only flat land, which is between between the easement and the street. Mrs. Remsen comments that the ZBA did not want these lots subdivided, is it worth considering a condition that this lot would not be further subdivided.

Mr. Nicasastro answers that that is already the condition, and that the ZBA gave him another condition that he can only put a single family home there. Mr. Nicasastro clarifies that there is only one part of frontage for this 4.5acre lot so he cannot subdivide it. Mr. Noonan invites anyone to add any comments.

Tom Mannle, a direct abutter to the proposed pork chop lot, explains that the upper area is an old quarry, and that the utilities easement for his house runs directly through the lot that was approved by the ZBA. Mr. Mannle continues that there may be enough room to put a house roadside of the easement but it is not clear if the house would conform to what the ZBA approved. Mr. Mannle continues that he thinks there will be issues when building a structure because it will be built on top of fill.

**Motion to close public hearing is made by Mr. McCarl, seconded by Mr. Cook, and unanimously approved.**

**Motion to accept the application from Jeremiah Nicasastro and Lisa Leahy, for a *Pork Chop Lot Special Permit* at 36 Bennett Street (Assessors Map 115, Lot 56) was made by Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Pratt and unanimously approved.**

**Motion to accept the *Approval Not Required Plan* submitted by Jeremiah Nicasastro and Lisa Leahy, to create one additional building lot at 36 Bennett Street (Assessors Map 115, Lot 56) was made by Mr. McCarl, seconded by Mr. Cook, and unanimously approved.**

#### **IV. MAJOR PROJECT SPECIAL PERMIT REVIEW (start from 38:12)**

In accordance to the City of Gloucester Zoning Ordinance, Sections 5.27 and 5.7.4, Gloucester Planning Board to review the following application submitted by Fuller Mixed Use Ventures, LLC at:

School House Road #2, #3, and #4, Map 262, Lots 14 & 37, and Gloucester Crossing Road #7, Map 37, Lots 4 & 5, for a Special Permit under the Fuller Mixed Use Overlay District pursuant to GZO Sec. 5.29 (including Major Project GZO Section 5.7) and Secs. 5.29.10 and 5.11. Also reviewed by the Planning Board under GZO Section 5.8 Site Plan Review. *Continued from 10/19 Meeting*

Mr. Cademartori explains to the board that at the Boards last meeting we were still receiving initial presentation from the applicant. There are several CDM Smith staff members present to give the Board an overview. Robert Parsons, project manager and lead engineer at CDM Smith, explains to the board that he and the rest of the CDM Smith staff are here to report the status of their review. Mr. Parsons continues that the staff has reviewed documentations and the applicant has given them everything they need. Mr. Parsons explains that he met with the city and the applicant on November 29 to get background for the project and to discuss initial findings. Since that meeting, Mr. Parsons has received additional data upon request, and has developed a full list of questions and comments that have been identified. Mr. Parsons hands hard copies of the summary he and his staff have prepared. Mr. Parsons calls Scott Landgerem, senior project manager, landscape architect, and soil manager, up to the stand.

Mr. Landgerem explains to the board the property lines and where each proposed unit is located. Mr. Landgerem explains that there are many elements when looking at the sight plan and the site is over programmed which does not leave room for open spaces. This is a mixed use site plan, but since there are three distinct pieces, there is no mixed use between the buildings. Mr. Landgerem explains that the first plan was to create an overall layout which creates a sense of place. Mr. Landgerem continues that many of the comments were directed towards the design standard, and an important part of the design standard is public spaces. Mr. Landgerem continues that there are sidewalks that connect elements of the site, but they are minimalistic, and there is not a lot of pedestrian experience, and no dedicated bicycle experience here. Instead, it is a very automotive focused site. Mr. Landgerem explains that the sidewalks are five feet wide and most are backed up against parking areas. Mr. Landgerem continues that another comment is that the proposed 'Clubhouse' is fitness dedicated, and suggested if it could be shared with the major fitness group on site. Mr. Landgerem explains that there is not a lot of detail in terms of handicap access, there are some parking spaces, but there is not a full review yet. The last major comment was on the landscaping. Mr. Landgerem explains that there was not a lot of coordination with snow storage areas. Mr. Noonan asks what you might see in the 'Clubhouse'. Mr. Landgerem

answers that because the site is so tight, we could put the fitness part with the YMCA and have more open space on site. Mrs. Remsen asks if there could be less impervious surfaces. Mr. Landgerem explains that one of the design standards was to reduce the number of impervious surfaces because it is all pavement. Mrs. Remsen asks if we could request permeable pavement. Mr. Cademartori answers that he can look at that option. Mr. Landgerem explains that it can be used as parking areas though it may be a large site application, but permeable asphalt or concrete can be used as walkways or portions of parking spaces. Mr. McCarl suggests that gravel would not be adequate for walkways for handicap. Mrs. Remsen answers that permeable pavement looks the same as regular pavement, it just has holes in it for drainage. Mr. McCarl asks if someone could get stuck on it. Mrs. Remsen clarifies that there is not a big difference between permeable pavement and regular pavement.

Diane Meladotia, municipal water analyst, explains that the project is generally compliant with Massachusetts stormwater standards, but the applicant needs to further refine the drainage analysis to confirm it is going to work as intended. Ms. Meladotia explains that she is going to talk about the overall and general comments. Ms. Meladotia explains that all stormwater runoff at the site will go to an infiltration basin that is constructed as part of the early development. Ms. Meladotia continues that one main comment is that the calculations assume that the soils at the basin are not well draining, and they are based upon data from a previous analysis, but they do not have back up data. When they went to the site there was vegetation on the water which indicates that it is not well draining. The infiltration ring that is being used for calculations does not appear to be consistent with what is being observed at the field which needs to be resolved. Ms. Meladotia explains that the second comment is that the site qualifies as a land use with higher potential pollutant loads because it is going to have over 1,000 vehicle trips per day due to the YMCA and other uses, but the applicant acknowledged that they need to go back and revise their calculation for water quality volume at 1 inch vs .5 inch. Ms. Meladotia continues that the third comment was that the rainfall data that was used was based on technical data number 40, which was used in the 1960/70s. Last year NOAA updated the rainfall data in their Atlas 14, Volume 10 and they are higher. It is based on more current rainfall conditions, and Ms. Meladotia recommends the applicant use this so she can make sure it is going to function as it was designed it. Ms. Meladotia continues that the last overall comment is that there are several subsurface detention systems on site to convey peak flows, and in the comparison to the proposed elevations and she needs to confirm they are functioning as designed whether it be a backwater effect on the upstream drainage system in order to convey flows. Mr. Cademartori asks that from the modelling perspective to relative elevations of the different stormwater elements it makes sense but now you have to see on site if it makes sense with groundwater. Ms. Meladotia answers that in the model the pipes have inverse but the subsurface systems were based on elevation 0-3 feet high so they are not tied into the upstream inverse and downstream inverse which is what needs to be revised. Mr. Cademartori asks that CDM Smith used to use Cornell data set for rainfall, so is NOAA's data set being readily used now. Ms. Meladotia

answers that they were always using Cornell because it took into effect climate change, but now NOAA's has come out and they are very similar. Mr. Cademartori asks what the delta between what has been used and what is being used is. Ms. Meladotia answers that she has to check.

Dan Murphy, transportation engineer, explains that he worked together with a professional traffic operations engineer in performing the review of the circulation parking access and traffic analysis. Mr. Murphy explains that Grant Circle is going to experience an increase of more than 100 vehicles at peak hour. Mr. Murphy suggests that Grant Circle should be included in the traffic area. Mr. Murphy continues that he suggests proposing improvements to Blackburn Circle to mitigate high crash rates. The proponent used for general retail for the trip generation rates calculates that if there is a highly used area, the pad site, it should be considered as a coffee shop or a specific retail shop. Mr. Murphy continues that parking for the pad site would be across site drive, which would make patrons to cross through traffic, so it is suggested that there be some consideration to eliminate pedestrians and patrons having to walk through traffic to get to the pad site. Mr. Murphy continues that the Trip Generation Rates for the YMCA were based on ITE to increase rates based on 4-7 different projects in the 1990s and 2000s. Mr. Murphy explains that to be more accurate, if there are local uses that can be looked at including each use in the YMCA, it is preferable to get a data set to compare. Mr. Murphy continues that the site does not provide bus parking for YMCA events, so some consideration should be made for offsite or overflow parking. Mr. Murphy explains that there are numerous comments regarding lane control, peak hour factors, and queuing analysis, and they will be available to the traffic operations engineer. Mr. Murphy continues that it is suggested to look at mitigation to improve operations at the Gloucester Crossing Intersections. Mr. Murphy continues that Gloucester Crossing Road leaves 28 feet wide and Schoolhouse Road is approximately 30 feet wide so they should consider widening those roads so they are sufficient with all uses. Mr. Murphy explains that once concern was the site distance coming from 128 but they are meeting the minimum required site safety distances. Mr. Murphy continues that a sweat path analysis was completed it was accurate for a latter truck. Mr. Noonan asks Mr. Murphy to explain what the minimum standard is and what they would like to see. Mr. Murphy answers that he does not have the figures now he could review the minimum vs. the desired. Mr. Henry asks if there is no right turn in terms of the YMCA access point. Mr. Murphy answers that it would turn into two lanes. Mr. Henry asks Mr. Noonan if the access to Fuller School was closed off when proposing the shopping center at Gloucester Crossing. Mr. Murphy answers that it was open the last time they were there. Mrs. Remsen asks if they evaluated the sidewalks and crosswalks. Mr. Murphy answers yes, and that the sidewalks meet the general requirements and are in decent condition, but they could use some reconsideration. Mr. Cademartori asks if Mr. Murphy has a concern about parking spaces on the northern site. Mr. Murphy answers that it is more a short term but a concern is drivers coming in and out of the intersection. Mr. Henry asks in terms of parking around the YMCA, if there has been consideration for bus pickup and drop off area. Mr. Murphy answers that they did explore that and someone who they met with was investigating a site for

pickup and drop off. Mr. Henry asks if there is a standard spec size for that. Mr. Murphy answers that it depends on the demand. Mrs. Remsen asks if it would be typical in a site to have pedestrian paths linking the buildings and various functions. Mr. Pratt explains that the community does not exist yet. Mr. Murphy answers that there are 5 foot sidewalks which meet requirement, and there are many philosophies in placing sidewalks, and the proponent has put a number of sidewalks in so if you wanted to you can get from one point to the other via sidewalk. Mr. Coogan explains that there was conflict between pedestrian access and loading docks. Mr. Murphy explains that a concern they had was a pedestrian coming out of the shopping center and the loading dock being right to the side, which is not desirable. Mr. Henry asks what type of sizing would be desirable to make two roads bicycle friendly. Mr. Murphy answers that it can vary, and that if it were a Mass DOT project they would look for 5 feet bike lanes on either side. There were cases where the dimensions were different but require removal of medians, so it depends on the measurements of the road. Mr. Coogan addresses a comment about a connection between the site and Gloucester Crossing, perhaps a stairwell and sidewalks.

Mr. Landgerem explains that there is one walkway which is the main connection between two parts of the site, and there is a conflict of a loading dock. If you follow that, you come upon a dumpster for the residential lot that if you walk past you come upon a handicap accessible ramp system to get from one elevation to the other so it is 6-8 switchbacks to go from one side to another. Suggestion was to put adjacent a traditional set of stairs assuming there is a desired shared component so you would not have to do the setbacks. Mr. Pratt explains that his priority would be much more pedestrian friendly than bike friendly. Mr. Cademartori explains that aside from people living in this community, the other concern would be the YMCA use in particular. The YMCA employs many young adults who are not all drivers, so they would have to walk there which calls for better sidewalks.

Magdalena Lawson, wetland scientist, explains that her main comment is that the first Notice of Intent has to be filed since the 100 foot buffer zone is being altered, per the Gloucester Wetlands Ordinance. Ms. Lawson continues that the applicant is going to submit a Notice of Intent to the Gloucester Conservation Commission. Ms. Lawson continues that she needs to determine if the two isolated wetlands, A series and R series, are subject to flooding. Ms. Lawson explains that a Vernal Pool Study should be completed in the spring. Ms. Lawon continues that they should present an invasive species removal plan including what needs to be done each year to monitor it.

Mr. Parsons explains that the applicant submitted a sewer system study, which appeared to be correct and did not have any errors. Mr. Parsons continues that the level of detail sounded like they were considering an onsite wastewater pumping system, for which a design needs to be submitted to the City for a review. Mr. Parsons explains that there were initial discussions of an

onsite wastewater detention with off-peak discharge, which has been removed from consideration.

Peter Goudeau, applicant representative, explains that he is not going to comment on the feedback CDM Smith has given the Board because he has not yet gotten a chance to look at their review. Mr. Goudeau continues that it has been helpful to hear their comments, and that they understand that progress has been made. Mr. Goudeau explains that for open space, they need to make a point that the design meets standards for MAOD, meets ordinance, and that sidewalks connect every building on the plan and offsite locations. Mr. Goudeau continues that he is concerned that the study has not engaged carefully enough to ask the right questions. Mr. Goudeau explained that they have filed the Notice of Intent filed on December 20th. Mr. Goudeau continues the the sewer issue is understood, and that they presented an analysis on leaving the off site sewer system with what they thought would need to be replaced. They have been waiting on feedback from DPW and CDM Smith. Mr. Goudeau explains that he would appreciate an opportunity to reply fully to CDM Smith, and Mr. Noonan answers that he can have that at another meeting.

Mr. Cook asks what the expectation of development for this plan is. Mr. Cademartori asks which aspect of the plan, and that additional detail will be more specific than now. Mr. Cook clarifies expectation on development for pedestrian circulation, stair systems, and if there is another level of development of that kind of issue. Mr. Cademartori explains that they have been presented with comments from CDM Smith's review. Mr. Cook explains that he wants to see a stronger main corner happening between the buildings. Mrs. Remsen explains that what Mr. Cook is looking for is possibly in the plan but just difficult to see. Mrs. Remsen continues that we need a more detailed plan for pedestrian linkage. Mr. Goudeau clarifies that at the next presentation he will bring everything the Board highlighted. Mr. Henry explains that he would like to see more detailed pickup and dropoff plans. Mr. Henry continues that parking spaces will not suffice because parents will not use them to pick up and drop off their children at the YMCA because they want to be dropped off in front of the building.

Charles Wear, president of Meridian Associates, explains that he agrees with what Mr. Henry is saying. Mr. Wear continues that that a concept of drop off with additional parking to service the YMCA is not on the plans but is in development. Mr. Wear continues that there are details in plans about pedestrian concerns, not they are not prepared for this meeting. Mr. McCarl asks if there is some idea about when the Board needs to make a decision regarding this project. Mr. Cademartori explains that the two consultant teams need to get together. Mr. Parsons answers that CDM Smith is available to meet on January 3rd, and Mr. Goudeau agrees.

**Motion to continue to the next regular meeting on January 4, 2018 is made by Mr. Henry, seconded by Mr. Cook and unanimously approved.**

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

a. Review and Recommendation: Chapter 91 License Application - 43-51 Riverside Avenue  
Mr. Cademartori explains that this is a license plan for a small project that is under construction at the end of Riverside Ave. Mr. Cademartori continues that the Board already approved the subdivision plan associated with it. The Board can either remain silent or make a comment. Mrs. Remsen asks what this would be used for. Mr. Cademartori answers that as you go down to Riverside Ave you can see the new construction. It is a 5 lot subdivision that will have 2 families on each lot, with 10 units total. The area was formally tideland that had been previously filled in, and the lowland area was elevated. This is part of Chapter 91 because they are putting in a walkway, which will be considered as public access as well as a neighborhood amenity.

**Motion to approve Chapter 91 License Application - 43-51 Riverside Avenue was made by Mr. Cook, seconded by Mr. Pratt, and unanimously approved.**

- b. Review of Council Order: Informal Review and Recommendation Re: Coastal Development
- c. Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness Program Update  
Mr. Cademartori explains that in many ways the MVP work will also address concerns around coastal development. This will build on the work from 2015, which did not look at future predictions including increased precipitation, extreme heat, and other climate related variables. Mr. Cademartori explained that the City was granted \$20,000 and the funds will be utilized to partner with MAPC on this effort. Mr. Cademartori explains that there will be a core group that will meet and asked if Mr. Noonan and Mr. Henry would be the Planning Board designees for continuity. They agreed. A workshop will be conducted in April of this year.
- d. Review of Planning Board Annual Calendar and Submission Deadlines  
The Planning Board unanimously approved the 2018 Meeting Calendar.
- e. Endorsement of Modified Common Driveway Plan for 247-251 Magnolia Avenue  
Mr. Cademartori explained that the modifications have been reviewed and approved by the Engineering and Fire Departments, and will provide better fire access and circulation than the original plan. The construction will still be controlled by covenant.

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. McCarl, seconded by Mr. Pratt and unanimously approved.

## **VI. NEXT MEETING**

*Next regular meeting of the Planning Board January 4, 2018*

**Planning Board Members: *If you are unable to attend the next meeting please contact the Planning Office at (978)325-5235.***