

Final

**STERLING PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

September 12, 2012 – Rm. 202 Butterick Bldg.

Present: Ronald Pichierri – Chairman, ANR Agent
Kenneth Williams – Clerk
Charles Hajdu
Lucinda Oates – Administrative Assistant

Absent: John Santoro
Michael Radzicki – Vice Chairman, MRPC Rep

Chairman Pichierri calls the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

ANR's

There were no ANR's

First Order of Business

Minutes

Motion: Charles Hajdu

Second: Ron Pichierri

Motion made to approve August 29, 2012 minutes with corrections, all in favor, motion carried.

DISCUSSIONS/REPORTS/FYI

“How do I” questions, were requested by the Town Administrator at the staff board meeting to develop a Citizens Handbook, as recommended by the Government Study Committee. As a first step, each board is asked to develop a one page list of FAQ's. FAQ's are requested by October 30.

ZBA

No update since the Planning Board's last meeting of August 29, 2012.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Government Study Committee has made the following recommendation to the Town:

We recommend that the Earth Removal Board be eliminated and its responsibilities transferred to the Planning Board, with the Building Inspector, acting in his role of Zoning Enforcement Officer, to be charged with enforcement.

A joint meeting with the Earth Removal Board, Planning Board and Board of Selectmen will be held on October 17, 2012.

Sterling Planning Board Minutes, September 12, 2012

If the Earth Removal Board did reorganize, the current members of the Earth Removal Board who participate would be lost, along with their expertise and the Planning Board thought was that nothing would be gained by the reorganization of the committee.

Chairman Pichierri read from the Planning Board minutes of May 9, 2012: *The 2009 Government Study Committee has released their report. This report is available for the Board's review. Also received, was an email with a revised organizational chart to be inserted into the report and an email from a concerned citizen, criticizing the committee's work, stating that the revision to the report is cause for suspicion. Radzicki served on this committee and speaks to the criticism, stating that the need to add a revised organizational chart was due to a typo, not to anything else.*

Ken Williams added that the paragraph read from the minutes was all that was reported that evening concerning the Government Study from the May ninth minutes. Ken Williams stated that the Planning Board did discuss this matter on May 9th and that the board did not want to have anything to do with the reorganization. Chairman Pichierri and member Charles Hajdu agreed with Ken Williams' recollection of the meeting regarding the reorganization.

Chairman Pichierri will attend the October 17th meeting and present the Planning Board discussion.

Laddawn Plant Expansion Continuation

Patrick McCarty, McCarty Engineering; Randy Kinnear, Laddawn; Mike Thayer, Vantage Builders; Scott Miller, Haley & Ward

The applicant was apprised of the lack of total board members present at tonight's meeting, but with the need to expedite the project; their consensus was to move forward. With three board members present the vote would require a total of three affirmative votes for the project.

Scott Miller, Haley & Ward, completed a review of the site plan for the Laddawn Plant Expansion proposed at 2 Northeast Boulevard. The plans were prepared by McCarty Engineering, Inc. and are dated August 17, 2012.

The following comments were offered after review by Haley and Ward:

1) The drawings should note that all disturbed areas will be loamed and seeded. A seed specification and application notes should be provided. A similar note should require temporary protection of the soils if the work is completed outside of the normal growing season.

McCarty response: There is a note on sheet two, to loam and seed all disturbed areas, McCarty will add a note, in the note section about temporary stabilization, if it is outside of the growing season.

2) *The proposed trees and shrubbery should be labeled on the plans with a specification of the type and size.*

McCarty response: Trees to all be two and one half inch caliber minimum evergreens, so that they will be green all year long, and a note will be put on the drawing to that effect, there is no shrubbery proposed at this time, with landscaping stone used to allow for infiltration.

3) *An elevation of the proposed expansion, with colors and wall treatment, should be provided.*

McCarty response: This is a pre-engineered building and the addition will be the same type of construction. The new building size is 100 feet wide and 320 feet deep, approximately 32,000 square feet. There will be three tunnels instead of four and the updated drawing will reflect this change.

4) *The proposed use is located within the water resource protection district. The applicant should confirm the following conditions relative to the proposed use:*

a) Conformance with 4.6.4 (d), toxic or hazardous materials.

McCarty response: There are no toxic materials on site, we have submitted concurrently to the BOH relative to Section 4.6.4, and also submitted to ConCom, therefore going through both processes at the same time.

b) No discharge of industrial waste or cooling water.

McCarty response: A note will be added to the updated plan.

c) The proposed wastewater discharge will be less than 440 gallons per acre per day.

McCarty response: In round numbers use is 270 gallons per acre and a note will be added to the updated plan.

5) *Drainage calculations should be provided to support the proposed storm water management system with specific attention give in to the requirements within a water resource protection district.*

Note: Haley and Ward did not see the drainage reports and a copy was given to Scott Miller at the meeting.

6) *The parking load should be provided for the entire site to include existing and proposed uses. The proposed building expansion will consume the remaining land otherwise reserved for any future parking expansion.*

McCarty response: Randy Kinnera will provide a breakdown of the areas of the existing building, they feel that the parking lot site is sufficient for their needs, and actually there

Final

are a few additional spaces. McCarty will provide the calculations and will be replacing the thirty parking spaces that they lost and adding seventeen new parking spaces which is required.

Randy Kinnera added that the company is not anticipating a change in use, they have been in operation since the 1980's, and he understands that there is a calculation, 1 space per 2,000 square feet. The company is a twenty-four/seven operation, and with the fifteen minute window change in shifts, that parking lot on the existing right side is fifty percent full at any given time.

If in the future, the building is converted to office space the side trucking port would become a parking area.

McCarty added as a side note this is strictly a warehouse and no additional employees will be added to the work force. Fifty percent of the parking lot will be empty on any given day. A variance is requested from the BOH for two and half percent impervious area above the allowed 50%, so any green space left on the plan would not be allowed.

Ken Williams asked if there would be sufficient parking spaces as required by the bylaw. McCarty responded that he did not know that answer without doing the math. Randy Kinnear added that as a redevelopment, he was under the impression that the Planning Board would not be looking at the existing development, but concentrate on the addition. Since this is coming up tonight, he will get an accurate reflection of warehouse versus manufacturing, versus office, for those calculations.

McCarty stated that they will complete the calculations and provide them at the next scheduled meeting.

7) The location of the existing and proposed septic systems should be noted.

McCarty response: There are two septic systems; one is at the front of the existing addition and one in the front of the original building. Ken Williams suggested that the septic systems be shown on the plans. McCarty said he will add the septic plans to the site plans with the location of the tank, and provide the location of the tank cover.

8) The location of the existing and proposed domestic water and fire sprinkler lines should be shown. Existing utilities should be relocated from under the proposed structure, if applicable.

McCarty response: Utilities come in from the street at the corner, and McCarty will draw a line showing the underground utilities along with the location of the transformer on the plan.

9) The location of the existing and proposed electric service should be shown.

See above, answer number eight.

Final

10) *Loading zones should be shown together with a calculation of the loading requirements.*

McCarty response: There are eight loading dock doors and there are no calculations necessary.

11) *Existing and proposed exterior lighting should be shown.*

McCarty response: There will be wall packs and these will be shown on the elevation plans that will be submitted at the next meeting.

12) *The appropriate number of handicapped accessible parking spaces should be noted on the plans with appropriate signage. The accessible route from the spaces to the building interior should be clearly defined.*

McCarty response: The handicap spaces are located at the end of the front walkway and the labels will be added to the plan.

13) *The fire protection capacity of the water distribution system should be evaluated prior to occupancy approval. This evaluation should include the following components*

- a) *Fire flow demand based upon proposed construction and NFPA standards. It should be noted if the structure will include fire sprinklers and the applicable code.*

Kinnear response: There are interacting sprinklers in the existing west building right now, that riser, the GPM, the residual, and the static vertical loop in that area suffice for the system in the existing building, but if a new flow on the hydrants is needed they can provide them. It was noted that the information is usually included on the building permit application.

Kinnear stated the flow designs were not included because in many towns the municipalities do want the design engineer to complete the fire flow capacity with the town completing the design and putting their own gauges on the flow. Chairman Pichierri said that input would be necessary. McCarty said that this will be coordinated with the DPW or the fire department.

- b) *Fire flow capacity to the site through the connection to the distribution system at Northeast Boulevard Capacity should be based upon hydrant flow tests conducted by the applicant or otherwise available from the Town.*

See response to question 13, Section a.

- c) *Projected fire flow capacity within the proposed site.*

See response to question 13, Section a.

14) *The nearest hydrant(s) serving the site should be shown on the drawings.*

McCarty response: A site visit will be conducted so that they can locate the hydrants and add them to the plan.

15) *The proposed construction of enclosed fork truck tunnels will create three interior courtyards between the existing structure and the proposed warehouse. Access to these areas for firefighting and emergency response should be presented.*

McCarty response: Each enclosed fork truck tunnel has a door into the courtyard.

In regards to Conservation Commission, Laddawn has a meeting scheduled for September 18, and has already filed the Notice of Intent, submitted to DEP and has received the DEP file number back, there were no comments related to the NOI. An email was received from ConCom, Matt Marro, who completed a quick review of the plan and said that everything looked good.

Ken Williams reminded Laddawn that the comments received from the Conservation Commission and a required recorded Order of Conditions from ConCom are needed before a decision can be rendered.

Input is requested from the various boards in town on the proposed project, with all comments submitted to the Planning Board. Chairman Pichierri directed the Administrative Assistant to email all boards on the distribution list for either “comments”, or “no comment” in response to the email. This email will be sent out tomorrow (13th) with response received by Monday the 17th. All boards that respond will be forwarded to McCarty and those boards that do not respond will be the responsibility of Laddawn to get comments.

Updated plans will be sent PDF to both the Planning Board’s email and to Scott Miller, Haley and Ward.

McCarty said that unless Scott Miller has comments on the drainage calculations, McCarty will not be submitting revised calculations. Chairman Pichierri suggested to Scott Miller if he did find any issues to contact McCarty and to notify Lucinda.

Ken Williams suggested that a site visit would be a good idea. Sunday, September 16 @ 8:00am at the Laddawn site was agreed upon. Patrick McCarty will be at the site on Sunday, and it was left open as to whether the board would need to go inside the building.

McCarty wanted the board to realize that Laddawn was hopeful that the project could get in the ground this year, hoping to wrap up the ConCom process next week, the BOH the

Final

following week, so if there is anything else that is needed to be provided, please contact McCarty.

Depending on the input received from the various boards, and the BOH meeting not scheduled until the day after the Planning Board meeting, the decision would have to be contingent on the outcome of the BOH recommendations.

Kinnear asked if the Planning Board received favorable comments from all other boards, could the vote be taken contingent on receiving the BOH variance and feedback on the 27th. Chairman Pichierri agreed with Kinnear.

There were no further questions relevant to the project from the board.

Continuation of Laddawn Plant Expansion review was scheduled for September 26th @ 8:00 pm.

Party for outgoing Administrative Assistant

Scott Miller will be the keynote speaker, with an educational format, with the tentative dates October 22, 24, 29 or 30th. There will be further discussion at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT REPORT

Updated member's phone numbers were completed.

It was decided to remove member's home phone numbers on the town web site, instead to direct people to contact the Planning Board office, either by email or phone.

Request for payment letter sent to Corrinne Builders, Inc. was read by Chairman Pichierri for late payment on professional services provided by Haley and Ward, in the amount of \$3,518.36.

Board of Selectman liaison for the Planning Board, Brian Patacchiola, was emailed the board's agenda and invited to the meeting. Patacchiola replied, via email, that the Planning Board meeting coincides with the Select Board meetings and he would not be able to attend. Chairman Pichierri suggested that he could possibly attend when there are five Wednesdays in the month and Patacchiola would be free that evening.

MAIL

Miscellaneous mail was reviewed.

NOTICES FROM OTHER TOWNS

Notices from other Towns were made available for review and were passed on to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Final

INVOICES

The board members signed payroll.

Motion: Ken Williams

Second: Charles Hajdu

Motion made to adjourn meeting, there was no discussion, all in favor, meeting closed at 9:03 pm.

The next regularly scheduled Planning Board Meeting is, September 26, 2012 at 7:00 PM.

APPROVED BY:
