

**Salisbury Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, January 8, 2014 7:30 p.m.**

PB Members Present: Robert Straubel (RS), Berenice McLaughlin (BHM), Brendan Burke (BB), Lou Masiello (LM), and Trudi Holder (TH)

PB Members Absent: Don Egan

Also Present: Leah Hill, Asst. Planner, Lisa Pearson, Planning Director and Lori Robertson, Planning Secretary

Time: 7:44 p.m.

Chairman Straubel called the meeting to order at 7:44 p.m. in the Colchester Room, Salisbury Town Hall. **RS** announced, per the Open Meeting Law, that this meeting was being recorded and broadcast live via www.sctvmc.org/index.

a. Signing of Plans/Permits: N/a

7:30 PM Public Hearings

- a. Cont SPR-44 Railroad Avenue-Michael Larkin, Tr. 44 Railroad Avenue Realty Trust:- RS** stated the applicant requested a continuance to the next meeting.

LM motions to continue the hearing until January 22, 2014 at 7:30 p.m.

TH Seconds – vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous.

b. SPR-17 Elm Street-Salisbury Public Library

RS stated the Building Inspector has determined this is a major site plan. **RS** also read from Section 300-109 of the Bylaw.

LP addressed the board. We have tonight the 50% design plan. We plan to be out to bid shortly. We would like to be starting construction in the spring. The current library is not ADA acceptable, there are code and size issues. The site contains 31 parking spaces.

RS noted that Joe Serwatka sent a letter dated January 5, 2014 with many comments. I would like to go over his concerns individually.

Eric Waldon (EW), CDW Consultants, civil engineer for the project.

Sheet C1.0, Existing Conditions

The plan apparently does not depict property lines. Note 2 states that “it is not the intent of this plan to establish property lines or deed lines on the ground. Property lines and deed lines shown are not to be used to determine limit of ownership”. It is fairly apparent, from the submitted assessor’s letter, that the town owns the subject parcel, as well as the “fire house yard”. There is, however, a private parcel with dwelling and garage with an address of 16 Bridge Road. Proposed work is shown up to the “approximate deed line” for this parcel shown on the plan. The board may want to condition the approval to require that all property lines staked prior to construction.

Too many of the drain and sewer structures are labeled as “inaccessible”. Some of the invert information obtained from opening the structure is necessary to check for possible conflicts with proposed utility connections. The board may want the engineer/surveyor to make reasonable efforts to obtain this information. The size and material of the existing watermain in Bridge Road should be shown on the plan. **EW** stated it is based on record deed information. There is just not enough information. **RS** stated I don’t think its an unreasonable request to have a survey done to figure out where the line is especially next to the abutter. **LP** stated we surveyed it and we feel comfortable that the line is where it should be. **RS** asked if they are comfortable taking out the word approximate? **LP** stated no. **LM** stated I think its reasonable to have a survey done.

Sheet C1.1, Demolition Plan

The plan notes “protect 15” VC drain pipe”. In my discussions with the DPW Director, it is his preference to have this line removed and replaced. This should be noted on the plan. **EW** stated we are waiting for the DPW Director to get back to us.

Sheet C1.2, Layout & Materials Plan

The DPW may prefer bricks pavers instead of “stamped concrete” crosswalks. The architect should review this issue with the DPW Director.

EW stated we have met with the DPW Director and we are in the process of updating that detail.

A new “no left turn” sign is depicted at the driveway off of Elm Street. This should probably be a “no right turn” sign. The architect should review this.

EW stated it should say “no right turn”.

A trash enclosure does not appear to be depicted on the site. The first floor plans show a recycle room at the northwest corner of the proposed building. The architect should address whether a trash enclosure will be required for the site.

RS stated there will be no dumpsters on site. Trash will be removed from the site daily.

A concrete tank with submersible pump is depicted behind the proposed library, but no description of its purpose is provided. The architect should address why this tank is shown.

EW stated we decided to remove the rain water recycling system.

The proposed driveway off of School Street is labeled as one-way in, but it is 24’ wide, which could allow for two-way traffic. In order to discourage two-way use, the board may want the architect to reduce the driveway width, which may allow for an additional parking space in the site.

EW stated we did not put do not enter signs on either side of the entrance. **LP** stated I think that the size is required by Fire Department.

There appear to be existing parking spaces along the north side of School Street that will be affected by the proposed driveway. The board may want the architect to address how the parking spaces may have to be reconfigured due to the driveway.

LP stated our concern was people trying to cross 3 lanes of traffic. If they come out on Elm Street they would go in the flow of traffic. **LM** asked about a sign on Route 1 – north. **RS** stated I have a concern with the parking. When people back out and maybe decide to head south in the parking lot only to find they can’t go out that way and then they have to do a three point turn. I think it would be advisable to angle the spaces. The only issue maybe losing some spaces. **LP** stated the only issue is if you come out onto School Street, it would be angled the wrong way. **RS** asked you would only be able to park on the east side of the parking lot. **LP** stated that is why we decided not to do the angle parking.

It appears that existing sidewalk and curbing are being modified in School Street adjacent to the “fire house yard”. This work should be included in the “demolition plan”. Also, existing signs should be shown to be relocated. **EW** stated the survey was incorrect because they modified the intersection and removed part of the curbing. There is a bump out that doesn’t exist anymore when they made it 3 lanes.

Sheet C1.3, Grading & Drainage Plan

Proposed grading, as indicated by the 100 foot contour, is depicted between the proposed Elm Street driveway and TBM-2. This will likely mean that the section of concrete sidewalk that was saved in this area will have to be removed and replaced. The architect should review this. **EW** stated we are showing it to remain as is and maybe we need to detail it out more.

The proposed 99 foot contour at the Elm Street driveway does not appear to tie into an existing contour. The architect should review this. **EW** stated its just a missing segment of a contour line.

It appears that a pump chamber is proposed to convey runoff to infiltration field #2. Pumping stormwater should be avoided if at all possible. The architect should discuss why this feature is absolutely necessary. **RS** stated you are doing away with that because you are not using the graywater recycling.

As mentioned previously, the existing 15” VC pipe should be removed and replaced with a plastic pipe. This work should be shown on the plan. **RS** stated they are going to scope that and make a determination.

Proposed 2:1 slope grading is shown within 2 feet of the existing garage off Bridge Road, up to the “approximate deed line”. As mentioned previously, this property line should be verified and staked in the field prior to construction. The board may also want the architect to verify that the proposed grading will not adversely affect the existing garage. **RS** stated there is 6’ of

horizontal surface that is 2:1 slope. **EW** stated it's a small grass area. I could do a detailed drainage analysis. That is not going to produce much runoff. We could put down some matting. **LP** stated we will make sure we meet with the abutter and make sure there isn't a problem.

As designed, the top of stone associated with infiltration field #2 is about 98.0 feet. Proposed grading at one corner is just above elevation 97 feet. The architect will need to review this. **EW** stated this plan we have it next to 15" drain. We already dealt with that.

Typically, inspection ports or manholes are utilized on underground infiltration basins for maintenance/inspection. None of these features are shown on the plan. The architect/engineer should review this. **EW** stated we can add inspection of manholes.

An existing drainpipe associated with "inv. C" is shown at the catchbasin off Bridge Road. The depth and extent of this pipe should be verified as it may affect the proposed water/sewer/gas services proposed to come through this area. **EW** stated its similar to the other comment.

Sheet C1.4, Utility Layout Plan

An errant rectangle and square appear to be shown in the main parking lot. The architect should review this. **EW** stated not sure why it is there.

Proposed water and sewer connections are shown into Bridge Road. There is no way to check for potential conflicts at this time as all of the drain and sewer manholes in Bridge Road are labeled "inaccessible". This information should be obtained so that a proper analysis can be made of any potential conflicts. **LP** stated with all these utility layout plans we will make sure the plans reflect the proper information. We will confirm that with Don Levesque.

The size of the existing watermain in Bridge Road should be provided. The plan should also depict whether a tapping sleeve/valve are proposed for the 6" fire service. The DPW may require a sewer manhole in Bridge Road for the proposed sewer connection. The architect/engineer should review this with DPW. Complete slope and invert information should be provided for the 6" sewer service once additional data has been obtained. **EW** stated we will work with Don Levesque.

Sheets C1.5 & 6, Construction Details

The bituminous concrete pavement detail depicts a total of 3.5 inches of pavement. The DPW may be in favor of a minimum 4" pavement section. The architect should review this with the DPW. **EW** stated this has already been addressed.

The design groundwater elevation of 94.0 feet appears incorrect given the soil evaluations by Cammett Engineering in 2011. This will be discussed in more detail in the drainage review section below. A construction entrance detail is provided, but a location is not depicted on the plans.

Sheet L2.0, Planting Plan

The board should be aware that note 14 states "no permanent irrigation is planned and temporary irrigation for plant establishment shall not exceed 18 months after installation".

The board may want the architect to address where snow storage will be accommodated in the proposed planting plan.

EW stated the best place to put the snow is in the space between School Street and the parking

Stormwater Management Report

With all due respect to the design engineer, I do not agree with many of the design methodologies/assumptions, for the following reasons: The pre-development watershed utilizes the entire 2.5 acre town parcel, sixty percent of which has no proposed work. Typically, the existing analysis will look at areas where work is actually proposed, and leave out areas that are untouched. In my opinion the existing analysis should extend to about where the existing 15" VC drainpipe crosses the site. The pre-development watershed is lumped into one subcatchment, rather than dividing it along natural drainage lines that flow in different directions. As can be seen on the existing conditions plan, much of the existing impervious area (i.e. pavement, library) flows to the existing drainage system in Elm Street. The area between the existing library and School Street tends to flow to School Street. Finally, the grass area on the east side of the existing library appears to flow to the low spot surrounding the existing catchbasin adjacent to Bridge Road. Based on this, there appear to be three existing subcatchments associated with the site, in my opinion. The pre-development watershed has been assigned a time of concentration of 6 minutes by direct entry. This means that no analysis was performed to determine a time of concentration based on sheet flow, concentrated flow and channel flow, as would be typical. The direct entry time of 6 minutes might be suitable if the entire analysis were paved. The engineer should review this. The pre and post development watershed maps pick a design point at the intersection of Bridge Road and School Street, for some reason. As mentioned above, there appear to be three distinct runoff patterns from the existing site. Each area would typically be associated with a design point. The post-development subcatchment P-1a lumps 2 acres of the site into one subcatchment even though 75 percent of the area is untouched. Further, the subcatchment includes runoff that flows to School Street, runoff to Elm Street, and runoff to Bridge Road, but appears to combine them into one design point. Finally, the direct entry time of concentration of 6 minutes does not appear suitable for anything but the pavement runoff, which accounts for only 20 percent of the area.

The engineer has used a time of concentration of 0.0 minutes for subcatchment P-1b, but a time of 6 minutes for P-1c. Both areas are entirely impervious. A Tc of 0.0 would typically be associated with a pond. It is likely not suitable for pavement flow. In either case, there

needs to be some consistency in the analysis. The engineer has assumed seasonal high groundwater at elevation 94.0 feet, for some reason. The 2011 soil evaluator testing by Cammett Engineering indicate seasonal high groundwater at about 95.25 feet, 93.3 feet, and 95.0 feet in test pits 11-01, 11-02 and 11-03, respectively. All of these test pits are within about 50 feet of infiltration field #2, though none are directly in it as required. No soil testing has been provided within infiltration field #1, the larger of the two, as required. I would recommend that the required on-site soil evaluations be conducted before the design can be finalized. In my discussion with the DPW Director, it was discussed that an overflow device should be employed in the overall design of the underground infiltration systems so that if they failed, there would be a hydraulic connection to a closed drainage system. Without this overflow device, the main parking area especially would become one big puddle when it rained. It would appear that the best place to provide a connection for infiltration field #1 would be to proposed catchbasin 3 (via a manhole). Infiltration field #2 could be tied into the new 15" drainpipe adjacent to it at a proposed manhole also. Components of this project can be considered to be "redevelopment" relative to the Stormwater Policy standards. This allows the redevelopment portions of the site to be held to a less strict standard, generally referred to as "maximum feasible compliance". The portion of the site that would benefit from this status is the area of the existing library and existing pavement. With that in mind, the engineer has proposed a catchbasin "water quality structure (WQS)" at CB3 shown on the plan, or the proposed driveway off of Elm Street. This 6-10 thousand dollar structure may not be required if one were to consider the "redevelopment" status of this portion of the site. Typically the introduction of a deep sump catchbasin alone would qualify as "maximum feasible compliance", especially where there was no catchbasin at all in the existing condition. Even if redevelopment is not considered, it may be possible to eliminate this water quality structure at this location based on the cumulative TSS removal for the site. The board may want the engineer to consider whether a cost-saving opportunity is available. The main parking area runoff is treated by two deep sump catchbasins, two water quality structures, and an infiltration field. Because the subsurface soils likely consist of sands/loamy sands, and the engineer has chosen to use an infiltration field rather than a typical closed detention system, 44% pre-treatment of runoff is required. This necessitates adding the water quality structure(s) to accomplish the pre-treatment, at approximately 6-10 thousand dollars apiece, as mentioned above. It would appear that significant cost savings could be realized by proposing one water quality unit instead of two. Catchbasins 1 and 2 could be piped into a single WQS, and then into the field. Alternatively, the engineer could consider performing a cost analysis using treatment devices such as a Stormtech Isolator Row that may cost less and require much less maintenance by Town personnel. Finally, the engineer could propose a closed underground detention system, without infiltration, thereby eliminating the need for 44 percent treatment. The engineer may want the engineer to review these issues to provide the Town with a cost-effective solution, with the least maintenance requirements. **EW** stated he would like to see the site broken down into more than one watershed. My examination of the site is anything that flows to Elm Street goes into the drainage system and the drainage system and goes into the corner. As it flows to the north it enters the drainage system. Drainage system carries it to the corner. The water from the south enters Bridge Street. **LP** stated we will have this resolved before construction. **EW** stated the plans that Joe looked at didn't have an overflow for the infiltration system.

Lighting Plan

The e-mailed lighting plan does not propose any lighting at the two driveways. The board may want the architect to comment on whether existing street lights will illuminate these areas. **LP** stated I believe the street lights are sufficient.

LH stated I referenced all the reviews that we have received at this point and they need to be addressed. I just want to remind everyone that this is the village center zone and you must find that the project, 300-82.7

- a. Achieve greater consistency with the Village Center District development standards and design guidelines in Section 300-28.8 below as applicable;
- b. Improve convenience and safety of vehicular and pedestrian movement within the site and egressing from it, such as by the location of driveway openings in relation to traffic and/or adjacent streets and placement, height and size of signage;
- c. Provide greater compatibility of buildings, lighting and signs by virtue of their location, arrangement, size and design;
- d. Increase protection for adjacent or neighboring properties against noise, glare, odor, lighting, unsightliness or other objectionable features; and
- e. Reduce the visual intrusion of parking areas viewed by public ways or abutting premises.

LM asked if there are any changes after this draft decision is approved can it still be changed? **LP** stated yes.

LP stated there will be a meeting with Joe Serwatka, Don Levesque and the engineers from the Library to go over the issues.

No abutters spoke.

LM motion to close the public hearing for the SPR for the Town of Salisbury 17 Elm Street-Public Library
TH Seconds – Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous.

LM motions to approve the site plan draft decision dated January 8, 2014 for the applicant Town of Salisbury, 17 Elm Street.

BHM Seconds – Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous.

Old Business:

1. **Old Business**
2. **Other Business**
3. **Correspondence**
 - a. **Minutes from December 11, 2013.**

TH motions to accept and sign the minutes from December 11, 2013

BHM Seconds – Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous.

4. **Reports of Committees**
5. **Adjournment**

LM motions to adjourn at 8:35 pm

BHM Seconds – Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous.

Chairman

Date