

Planning & Development Committee
Wednesday, January 2, 2019 – 5:30 p.m.
1st Fl. Council Conference Room - City Hall
-Minutes-

Present: Chair, Councilor Valerie Gilman; Vice Chair, Councilor Jen Holmgren; Councilor Paul Lundberg (entered the meeting at 5:34 p.m.)

Absent: None.

Also Present: Councilor Steve LeBlanc (entered the meeting at 5:36 p.m.); Jim Destino; Joanne Senos; Gregg Cademartori; Vanessa Krawczyk

The meeting was called to order at 5:32 p.m.

1. *PP2018-011: Petition by National Grid to install approximately 100 ft. of concrete encased underground conduit from the intersection of Farrington Avenue to #3 Daventry Lane - to be conducted as a public hearing*

This public hearing is opened at 5:32 p.m.

Those speaking in favor:

Elizabeth Cardarelli, Distribution Design, representing National Grid (NG), explained that National Grid is requesting to install 2" to 3" concrete-encased conduits to run electricity to a new development of three homes with a transformer positioned on private property from a point beginning at the centerline of the intersection with Farrington Ave. & Daventry Lane for approximately 100' +/- in the public way to #3 Daventry Lane, she advised. She noted abutters were advised of the meeting.

Those speaking in opposition: None.

Communications: None.

Councilor Questions: None.

This public hearing is closed at 5:34 p.m.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Holmgren, seconded by Councilor Lundberg, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to permit National Grid to install 2" to 3" concrete-encased conduit from a point beginning approximately 425' northwest of the centerline of the intersection of Farrington Avenue and continuing approximately 100' +/- in a northwesterly direction to bring electrical service to #3 Daventry Lane together with such sustaining and protecting fixtures as said Company may deem necessary, in the public way as substantially at the points indicated on plan entitled, "National Grid" for "Proposed Installation of 2-3" concrete encased conduit and all appurtenances", dated October 22, 2018, Plan #26730201 with the following conditions:

1. Notification to the Department of Public Works 72 hours in advance of the proposed work. A construction schedule and resurfacing plan will be prepared by the applicant for review and acceptance by the Dept. of Public Works prior to construction.
2. In the absence of a detailed construction plan, the Dept. of Public Works requests: all proposed conduits and appurtenances shall be placed so as to cause minimum conflict with existing underground utility services.
3. All excavated trenches shall be patched flush with the surrounding asphalt using hot mix asphalt binder at the end of each work day to minimize pedestrian hazards. Asphalt shall be applied in two lifts of 2-inches totaling 4-inches.
4. All final paving shall be full width paving of affected area.

NOTE: At the request of the Applicant for SCP2018-005, -006 & -007, Chair, Councilor Gilman allowed for Agenda Item #4, SCP2018-007 to be taken up first and is reflected accordingly in the minutes.

4. *SCP2018-007: Gloucester Crossing Road #1 & #7, Map 262 Lots 13 & 37, GZO Secs. 1.5.3(c) "CCS" Special Permits" & (d) "Major Projects" and 5.7 "Major Projects" in the EB district (Cont'd from 12/05/18)*

Michele Harrison, Special Permit Project Manager, was present to represent Sam Park & Company, LLC, Samuel Park Manager; Gloucester Commons, LLC, Samuel Park owner, ("Applicant") and introduced Tim Power, Professional Civil Engineer with Land Strategies, LLC, and Sam Park, owner of Sam Park & Company, LLC, to review SCP2018-007, a Special Council Permit under Sec.'s 1.5.3(c) and 1.8.3 and as a Major Project under GZO Sec. 5.7. She conveyed the following information:

Before the Committee is the plan to complete Phase 2 through three Special Council Permit Applications for the Gloucester Crossing Shopping Center to tenant the few remaining spaces in existing retail buildings and to take advantage of the upcoming Fuller School property development -- the first of which is the modification of the Special Council Permit that created Gloucester Crossing.

It was noted land with infrastructure is available for an Assisted Living facility -- it is for sale, has been actively marketed but no one is coming forward. This project is now on the back burner and not part of the modification.

A color 11" x 17" plan of Gloucester Crossing #1 & #7 was shown to the Committee for orientation purposes (placed on file) which Ms. Harrison described in full, pointing out such retail establishments as Marshall's, Market Basket Supermarket, Ace Hardware, Petco and the areas under construction. As part of the Phase 2 modification, Building E which was supposed to be the siting of the hotel will now be only retail space. This modification was termed as downsizing due to a hotel generating more traffic, using more utilities and infrastructure than retail uses. In its place will now be a one-story building (previously planned as four stories) with a single tenant space accompanied by a drive-through facility. Building C will now have its end portion "lopped off" to create another drive-through facility for a coffee shop. There are also changes to the parking field which changes with traffic patterns for the drive throughs. Through meetings with the Planning Board there will be a better gateway entrance to the project with Gloucester Crossing Road -- with the development of the Fuller School the plan was revised for better pedestrian access. An entrance rendering was shown to the Committee (on file) by Ms. Harrison highlighting a proposal of two crosswalks which will lead to a resting and step area up to the retail areas with a sidewalk and entrance into Gloucester Crossing. There will be another sidewalk to lead to the coffee shop as well. There will be landscaping in all these areas, it was noted.

The landscaped roundabout in the middle of the roadway tends to see large trucks going over it, damaging the landscaping. Proposed will be a same diameter roundabout but its landscaping will be smaller. Decorative colored paving around it will be laid to protect the landscaping by visually encouraging vehicles to avoid it.

There is the "hockey stick" land piece intended to be transferred, in the original Community Host Agreement, owned by Gloucester Crossing to go from Mr. Park to the city to the FMUV, LLC. Once that process is completed it will go before the Planning Board as an "ANR" (Approval Not Required) to complete the transfer process.

There have been some previous modifications to Gloucester Crossing to date to the roundabout; to a formula for sign size; a second story on the main retail building that was removed to name a few. Those were determined as minor modifications by the Building Inspector and Planning Director. Eliminating the hotel and modifying a building and changes in the parking field were determined to be a major modification.

There is no further need for another 96 room hotel in the city as noted previously. By providing the additional retail space with the Special Permits for the drive-throughs there are tenants that are very close to signing their leases. When this project was approved in 2008 there were extreme economic conditions which affected what was going to go forward in the shopping center. It was noted Mr. Park "held on through those difficult times" and wanted to make a good shopping center with compatible tenants and be ready for when the economy improved, which it did precipitating the drive to complete Phase 2.

Sam Park, Sam Park & Co., LLC, advised critical mass is important for a shopping center of this type. Because of the additional retail space it allows for downsizing the project. The footprint is smaller than the planned hotel (noted as Building E). He proffered that his group has made a commitment to retain the property for an Assisted Living Residence even though they have had offers to sell the land. He noted they've invested \$3 million in the land in taxes and carrying costs. As long-term holders of the property, he highlighted they will continue to sit on this part of the project with a goal of finding a company to build an Assisted Living Residence. They have accommodated the suggestions (of the Planning Board) into the plans for Gloucester Crossing, a project now anchored by the upcoming Fuller School property development.

Councilor Lundberg noted the two sidewalks and entrance stairway acts as a gateway to the two projects so the increased population density will have easy access to the amenities of Gloucester Crossing. **Ms. Harrison** advised that thanks to the Planning Board these improvements have been made.

It was highlighted that infrastructure is all in place for the plans before the Committee: Stormwater management is installed and working which was designed for higher density. The impervious area is consistent, and there is still +/- 32% open space. Parking is compliant with the Zoning Ordinance. The hotel was planned for underground parking which would have changed the topography but will now be moot.

There will be cut-off light fixtures to keep light from spilling over to neighboring areas. There was a traffic study from 2007 which was updated (on file) with this application which speaks to the difference in demand from a hotel to the new retail spaces. The modifications don't significantly impact the traffic flow as the traffic changes are internal to the site, and therefore there is no impact Route 128.

Ms. Harrison reported that the Planning Board made a positive recommendation paying special attention to pedestrian access.

REVIEW OF GZO SEC. 1.8.3:

1. **Social, economic or community needs** are served by the proposal as Phase 1 of the shopping center has been built with consistent tenants; stores are busy who provide service, convenience, retail, employment and an increased tax base to the city. Phase 2 build-out benefits are consistent with the original Special Council Permit. The Planning Board noted in its recommendation that the full build out will create short-term construction with significant short-term building permit revenue estimated at \$100,000 (and later additional tax revenue) as well as long-term retail and management employment opportunities. Residents are asking for more stores, jobs, convenience and restaurants; Phase 2 will address those expressed needs.
2. **Traffic flow and safety** are adequately addressed as a very comprehensive Traffic Impact Study was completed, reviewed, and approved for the original permitting. The Planning Board made several recommendations to enhance pedestrian circulation and safety, and those recommendations have been incorporated to the modified plan sets including a second crosswalk and the gateway previously discussed. When the Applicant added the second sidewalk the Applicant's Traffic Engineer reviewed it and advised there was no negative impact having the second crosswalk. The original traffic plan was conservative and will continue to work for the completion of Phase 2.
3. **Municipal utilities** are determined to be adequate as the proposed changes from hotel use to increased retail use with utility demands less than originally approved. The project had been master planned to include future construction and all necessary infrastructure design. There was community benefit to installation of the original infrastructure such as a new sewer line on Staten St.; a new back-up generator for water pumps; improvement to electrical service; installation of a new gas line and replacement of an existing water line. The DPW Director and the Planning Board found the utilities were adequate to serve the proposed project.
4. **Neighborhood character and social structure** are appropriate for this modification as the removal of the hotel use takes away a four-story building, a height exception special permit, a special permit for distance between two buildings, and potentially increased traffic. Architecture has been designed to be consistent with the established style, materials and design for Phase 1 of Gloucester Crossing (shown on submitted renderings on file). No impact is anticipated on the neighborhood character or its social structure. Elevations were shown and it was noted there would be additional landscaping.
5. **The natural environment** impact was vetted extensively originally and mitigation was completed. There is nothing new to mitigate. Ken Whittaker, Conservation Agent for the city suggested a chain-link fence to contain blowing debris generated by retail establishments. However, the Applicant will instead add more landscaping around the perimeter to catch that debris. The original Order of Conditions requires regular trash pickup by hand from the wetlands and buffer areas on a regular basis, no less than quarterly during a year. Mr. Whittaker also talked about the enclosure and screening of dumpsters which is a requirement of the Health Department and is noted as an existing condition in the original special permit. There remains an outstanding Order of Conditions for the application for a Certificate of Compliance which will be done before the final Certificate of Occupancy for Phase 2 is sought from the Conservation Commission. There is a spill kit for contractors which were noted as something they bring with them to the site when working.

The Planning Board made two recommendations from their discussion on impacts to the natural environment: To use collected rainwater not city water for any irrigation system (there is no irrigation system) and that the applicant consider additional energy efficiency measures such as solar systems, electric vehicle charging infrastructure; alternative high energy HVAC systems. It was advised that Mr. Park will do what he can -- the buildings are constructed to the new Building Codes which provides the support for a solar system but is up to the tenants whether they want to employ that or not. Language for conditioning from the Applicant was that Mr. Park would encourage tenants to implement additional energy efficiency measures which include all those suggested by the Board. Mr. Park has noted he would provide preferred site locations and connection for electric vehicle chargers at no cost to the provider but the provider would have to pay for the permit. **Mr. Park** explained that they can dedicate an area for charging stations and gave an example of a provider such as Tesla to come in and build a charging station, meter it and maintain it. It was noted that Mr. Park is willing to meet with Susan Hogue of Town Green 2025 who can provide guidance on renewable energy as suggested through P&D Chair, Councilor Gilman.

The Health Department suggested use of a water tank for outside construction, but it is anticipated construction will be completed by mid-May. Any concern about water run-off has been dealt with through the site's stormwater management system in place. Waste removal complies with local, state, and federal requirements. Dumpsters will be screened (previously discussed). Large snow accumulation is taken off site. Bike racks are on site from Phase 1

construction and will be included in front of the new coffee shop for Phase 2. If CATA wants to provide a bus shelter Mr. Park will set an area aside for it.

In the original permitting, Mr. Park talked about a piece of open space on the side of Marshall's to create a park, in honor of Councilor John A. Foote if possible with added benches, and planted areas who was the Ward Councilor and advocate for the original application came forward. Trees were noted to already be planted.

6. **The potential fiscal impact** is positive with the Phase 2 completion which will increase the property's tax assessment (now over \$16 million), with customer satisfaction with more places to shop and dine with minimal impact on city services.

All of the conditions set out in the original Special Council Permits stay with this modification, **Ms. Harrison** pointed out. They are restating some of those conditions in the draft of suggested motions (on file), with some restated for emphasis.

Ms. Harrison conveyed that Zoning guidelines for the shopping center are satisfied and met as well as reviewed by the Planning Board. The modification removes the hotel and replaces it with a retail building. It changes the configuration of Building C to make a separate coffee shop drive through and changes the parking field moving some islands around. She requested that the P&D Committee approve the requested Special Council Permit.

Councilor Holmgren noted that the FMUV development is going to install a switchback ramp to accommodate people in wheelchairs or walkers and asked if that is something that can be done for the Phase 2 project. **Mr. Park** highlighted that there needs to be a certain distance for a handicap ramp and the walkway was designed as a properly graded ramp. He advised that switchbacks don't work as people don't want to go back and forth several times to reach their destination. The "step" walkway which is graded is designed to accommodate wheelchairs that is graded and works well for pedestrians on foot. They don't have the room (for a switchback ramp) -- it is hard to install between the grades, he explained, and would be difficult to build it on a 2-to-1 slope. **Councilor Gilman** noted that they're also thinking about pedestrians pushing baby carriages or a family riding their bikes. **Tim Power**, P.E., Land Strategies, LLC advised the number of switchbacks estimated at eight would be daunting to people. **Ms. Harrison** advised that the Planning Board "encouraged" another sidewalk but offered that it was redundant as at this time they don't know how much pedestrian traffic there will be. She noted the condition from the Planning Board is that after this is built, within 12 months Mr. Park will hire an independent traffic engineer to determine what the pedestrian patterns are and how many people use it. If there is evidence the second sidewalk is necessary it will be installed. **Mr. Park** noted the center of development is considered an area around the perimeter of Market Basket, the building with the liquor store and pizza restaurant and the roundabout is the real gateway to Gloucester Crossing.

Councilor Gilman confirmed there is a crosswalk and sidewalk at the roundabout with Mr. Park and Ms. Harrison. **Councilor Gilman** asked if there will be any pedestrian interactive warning lights that a pedestrian can utilize from Fuller property to Gloucester Crossing. **Ms. Harrison** advised that there aren't at this point saying that they need to see what kind of pedestrian traffic there will be. There are stop signs each way it was noted. **Councilor Gilman** asked what the reasoning was for the sidewalk and did that come after a conversation to make it closer to the coffee shop. **Gregg Cademartori**, Planning Director, advised that the initial application was undefined which gave the opportunity for the Planning Board to discuss that issue. **Mr. Park** suggested that a walkway on one side was his preference as it is a steep grade coming down from the back of the road. He advised that while he understood the basis for several Planning Board members call for a walkway on both sides, they can't know what the need for two walkways is at this time nor can they predict it.

Mr. Cademartori reviewed highlights of the Planning Board's (Board) review which focused on how to move between the two sites, but also modifications to the plans of how to move within the site, in particular the connection between Buildings D and E as well as reinforcing the pathways travelling from the Fuller site. There isn't necessarily 100% agreement with the proposed condition of "let's wait and see," defining a problem and then doing something about it. The Board rules and regulations have a standard which is building sidewalks on both sides of the street unless there is a very low density project that points to only one sidewalk. This, he pointed out, will be a densest part of the community. **Councilor Lundberg** noted they didn't do that with the original Gloucester Crossing permitting recommendations, that the Applicant needed a sidewalk on that side and asked why they're saying that now. **Mr. Cademartori** advised that they didn't have a proposal for a 200 unit housing facility at the Fuller School and also had a hotel that had a drive-through double entrance at that location. The pedestrian access wasn't focused as much at that time when there was the Fuller Elementary School -- there were a lot of things done to slow traffic and retain the school use of that property. The Board focused on an opportunity for as much synergy between the two sites as possible.

He expressed that when the Building Inspector and he reviewed the plans with the introduction of two drive-through facilities, the removal of the hotel and taking a look at how it relates to changes in the parking lot and traffic patterns on the site warranted a Major Modification. Most of the Board discussion centered on the high likelihood of folks entering the site at the initial intersection which brings you towards a pass-by lane for the two drive through facilities. There was a lot of focus talking about the pedestrian links between the two sites. From a recommendation and conditioning perspective there is a consideration of whether to remove those conditions that were met from the original permitting, what emerged from the Board's review and conditions possibly related with the Host Community Agreement. He further advised that the conditions that remain from the Board review is the second sidewalk -- whether there is to be a delay/assessment in the future or installation now. The accounting of the conditions satisfied in the original permit, and things associated with the Host Community Agreement were suggested as needing attention from the Council, the Administration and the Applicant by **Mr. Cademartori**. There is a real concern with satisfying the conditions although a lot were about construction sequencing, such as the kiosk, the parcel that needs to be transferred to the city and the timing surrounding those items, he noted.

Ms. Harrison reviewed some remaining issues from the Host Community Agreement memo to the Board (on file) noting it may not be relevant to the requested modification to the Special Council Permit:

There was a road maintenance agreement -- most of it has been moved by now as Mr. Park's obligation to provide maintenance of the two roads was for five years, and that term is done; the property hasn't been used for municipal use for a long time. She advised it should be reviewed separately between her and General Counsel as most is done.

Councilor Lundberg noted that the Administration is responsible for the enforcement of the conditions of the Special Permit and asked where the issues are that the city thinks is important and if that is necessary to focus on them. The entity that is responsible for making sure that the Special Council Permit conditions are complied with is the city, and asked if the city was telling the Council there are things that need to be addressed and should be made a part of the proceedings. The Council doesn't have anything at this time from the city saying this review should take place, he conveyed. There is a memo from the Applicant to the Planning Director only, he noted. It was determined by the Committee to ask the Mayor's Office, the Building Inspector and the Planning Division to advise the Committee what is at issue from the Community Host Agreement and yet to be complied with Special Council Permit. **Ms. Harrison** pointed out that any unmet conditions do not preclude the permit for the modifications from going forward. She suggested that one of the important conditions is the transfer of three parcels that are for the Fuller project which is underway and expect resolution by this time next month. There is a \$16,000 payment ongoing for a city ambulance. A kiosk will be installed near the Home Goods building which was noted on the Phase 2 plans.

Councilor Gilman asked the CAO and the Planning Director to review the conditions and the Community Host Agreement and see if there are any matters that needing modifying. **Jim Destino**, CAO, conveyed that if that is what the Council wishes the Administration can do that. He advised the Committee can condition the permits any way they want for these three new Special Council Permits, noting department heads have signed off on this project. **Ms. Harrison** asked that any possible review not slow down the permitting of these three Special Permits saying that there are tenants ready to move forward. **Councilor Lundberg** pointed out that the original permit has conditions that are 10 years in effect. He added that hadn't heard about any conditions that hadn't been complied with; all of the conditions still exist and apply. He conveyed he didn't want to undertake the Community Host Agreement issue either. **Councilor Holmgren** added her agreement to not undertake a review of the previous Special Council Permit conditions that may or may not have been met and of the Community Host Agreement on the Committee's part.

Councilor Gilman highlighted the condition for a kiosk to enumerate amenities in the city's downtown area and other areas of the city. **Mr. Park** assured the kiosk will be installed during Phase 2. **Councilor Gilman** advised the kiosk will indicate support of all local businesses. **Ms. Harrison** showed Sheet C100 of the modified plan set (on file) which noted the kiosk to be installed, highlighting Mr. Park's commitment.

Mr. Cademartori suggested it makes sense for him, Mr. Destino, General Counsel and Ms. Harrison to undertake a review of the Special Council Permit conditions and the Community Host Agreement to ensure that the issuance of the modification doesn't leave anything to complicate the process, and will commit to doing that prior to the next P&D Committee meeting.

Councilor Gilman advised she is optioning under the Zoning Ordinance to conduct a site visit prior to the next P&D Committee meeting of January 16 as the modification is large enough to warrant it. **Councilor Lundberg** noted they are considering three special permits without reviewed draft motions. It was discussed by the Committee that at the next P&D meeting it was anticipated they would have draft motions ready to put forward.

Mr. Cademartori confirmed most of the infrastructure is already on site and ready for connection. The Board's recommendation was around the coffee shop drive through and was reflected in the final layout. By making reference to the revised plan set is reflected, he pointed out.

In discussion with the Committee and the Applicant, **Councilor Gilman** noted the Applicant can promote that any business coming into the Shopping Center installation of solar panels and asked if other chain stores have been successful. The incoming tenants are inclined to try it, **Mr. Park** advised but that he couldn't confirm. **Councilor Gilman** recounted that vehicle electric chargers are something that the Applicant will set aside space for. They will seek purveyors like Tesla to see the willingness for that installation. The metering system would not be the Applicant's and would not profit from it, **Mr. Park** advised. **Councilor Gilman** noted that Ms. Harrison would work on the land transition issue which will go from Gloucester Crossing to the city, a \$10,000 agreement, and the FMUV has acquired the right to obtain that land. **Mr. Park** advised that Land Court has specific requirements and that it is now with the court. **Mr. Power** noted the final revisions are with the Land Court and once that is signed off they can present that plan to the Planning Board, anticipated this month. The ANR is first put in to the Planning Board and then Land Court, but in this case they went to the Land Court first which should make it easier for the city, confirming they are at the end of the Land Court process. **Councilor Gilman** offered that she wanted to see this matter resolved as quickly as possible so as to not hold up the FMUV project.

A Site Visit will take place on Thursday, Jan. 10 at 2:30 p.m. The P&D Committee and the Applicant will meet at the Petco store.

Councilor Lundberg noted that because there has been considerable conversation about the Assisted Living Facility, because Mr. Park has been unsuccessful to date in obtaining a company to build such a facility, he will raise this issue with the Mayor to learn if there can be an Ad Hoc Committee put together for a review and lay the groundwork so that if this can't be accomplished that there is a basis to remove it. **Councilors Gilman** and **Holmgren** offered their support. The city has to have the background to make an informed decision, **Councilor Lundberg** highlighted, but it isn't part of the permitting process before the Council now. **Mr. Park** advised they are prepared to sit on this property as long as the city thinks this is a good thing and made the commitment, but have waited 10 years.

This matter is continued to January 16, 2018.

2. *SCP2018-005: Gloucester Crossing Road #1 & #7, Map 262, Lots 13 & 37, GZO Secs. 1.5.3(g) "Drive-Through Facilities" (retail drive-through facility) and 5.17 "Special Regulations; Drive-Through Facility" in the EB district (Cont'd from 12/05/18)*

Michelle Harrison, Special Permit Project Manager, representing Sam Park & Company, LLC, Samuel Park Manager; Gloucester Commons, LLC, Samuel Park owner, ("Applicant") introduced Tim Power, Professional Engineer with Land Strategies, LLC, and Sam Park, owner of Sam Park & Company, LLC, made the following presentation:

Noting that the Planning Board treated the three Special Council Permits as "the Project," as they are all on the same site and go together, the applications were put forward separately, a bank drive-through facility had been originally permitted for the Gloucester Crossing Shopping Center. At that time there wasn't sufficient interest and so it was given up. Reorienting the Councilors to the site, the traffic pattern for the retail drive through, suggested to be a pharmacy, was highlighted for its entrance, exit and pass-through lane. This drive through and the one to follow in the next Special Council Permit aren't located at a busy street intersection, rather it is all enclosed by the site. A retail drive through falls under GZO Sec. 5.17.5 which requires three spaces in the queuing lane, but the retail drive through is designed for five spaces in the queuing so there is no overlap in the parking area. It features a very wide pass-by lane so that if a patron decides to not continue through on the drive-through lane there is a wide turning radius (17 ft. wide drive through lane), swings around the back of the building in order to exit in two ways. To distinguish the pass-through lane from the stacking lane there will be a white stripe with cross-hatching painted on the pavement. The Board paid a lot of attention regarding pedestrian access with pedestrian crossing signs. There is no order/pick up window as this is strictly a retail drive through. It is one pick-up window only facing Gloucester Crossing Road. There is plenty of room, and good pedestrian access between Building E and F. The traffic study which is required under the Zoning Ordinance advised the drive-through layout met all the requirements -- the queuing lanes are correct, as are the drive-through and pass-by lanes. As to conflict with other traffic, that has been minimized with the correct number of stacking lanes. As to the layout of outdoor service equipment, for this drive through there is no need for an order board. There is no flood lighting; all proposed lighting meets the city Ordinances. Landscaping will be consistent giving some protection to catch litter. Operation and Security -- there is

a management company for the entire project. Site patrols are conducted through the complex, and there are security cameras. The tenant is responsible for their own trash and maintaining their property. Hours of operation are anticipated to be 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. The standards under GZO 1.8.3 were touched upon briefly, and it was noted that the project is in harmony with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance with no adverse effects that outweigh the benefits to the city.

The Planning Board recommendation advised the Applicant met all the necessary criteria. There were no special conditions for this Special Permit. All the conditions for the Major Project follow.

Councilor Gilman noted that at the November 15 Planning Board meeting, there was a notation that the Board noted several conflicts with the proposed parallel parking area closest to the drive-through lane and the Applicant is comfortable with using those spaces for employees, and will accommodate that concern. **Mr. Cademartori** pointed out the location of employee parking on the south side of the property close to the drive-through lane to be reserved for employees only and will be marked, and that this would be a condition of the permit.

This matter is continued to January 16, 2019.

3. *SCP2018-006: Gloucester Crossing Road #1 & #7, Map 262 Lots 13 & 37, GZO Secs. 1.5.3(g) "Drive-Through Facilities" (coffee shop drive-through facility) and 5.17 "Special Regulations; Drive-Through Facility" in the EB district and 5.17 "Special Regulations; Drive-Through Facility" in the EB district (Cont'd from 12/05/18)*

Ms. Harrison, again representing Sam Park & Company, LLC, Samuel Park Manager; Gloucester Commons, LLC, Samuel Park owner, made the following brief presentation:

The drive-through facility at Building C-2 has been designed to serve primarily as a fast food café/coffee shop facility but can also be a service retail/bank drive-through facility. A coffee shop has been a consistent request by shoppers and commuters, and this application hopes to satisfy that demand. Regulations require a certain number of queuing spaces, which is five; in this case the Applicant is using 10 spaces so that there is no back up of cars into the parking area. There is a menu board early on, and further into the line orders are placed, then a vehicle goes around picking up their order. The drive through is designed to facilitate that flow. There is a pass-through lane modified to ensure that trucks can make deliveries which is usually done after closing. There are three ways to separate -- the pass-through lane and the drive-through lane which are delineated by striping and cross hatching. If there is noise generation, the drive through is facing Route 128 and so won't disturb the neighborhood. The six criteria under GZO Sec. 1.8.3 were briefly touched on and noted to be met.

Mr. Cademartori pointed out that the location customer cars were parallel parked and then back out that there wasn't enough turning radius in the bypass lane, and so the Applicant did accommodate the necessary change.

This matter is continued to January 16, 2018.

A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana C. Jorgensson

Clerk of Committees

DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:

- **Site map of #1 & #7 Gloucester Crossing Road for orientation purposes for the P&D Committee**