

The regular meeting of the Planning Board convened at 6:30 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Ajemian and Mr. Hall

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Delonno, ECD Director

AS-BUILT-RESIDENCE INN HOTEL-PLEASANT STREET

As- built plan received from SEA along with accompanying letter dated 10/13/16-RE: The work on this project was done in accordance with the site plans prepared by Silva Engineering associates, latest revision date April 1, 2015 and the Conditions of approval issued by the Planning board dated February 19, 2015. The work was found to be in substantial compliance with the design plans with only minor deviations or omissions as follows:

- Riprap at the pipe outlet entering the sediment forebay was missing. The stone was being added today or tomorrow.
- One light pole was not yet installed although the base has been constructed. That fixture will be in place within a few days.

Email received from Azu Etoniru, Town Engineer indication that the certification letter requires the Engineer's seal and the approval requires the site topographic as-built plan to be signed and stamped by a registered land surveyor with wet ink.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall, it was unanimously voted to approve the as-built plan and a member will sign upon Town Engineer ok.

SIGN BYLAW

Mr. Delonno had emailed a copy of the draft sign bylaw to the members and asked them if they had any feedback. Mr. Delonno said he did a lot of research on electronic bill boards and message signs. He found that everything points to low levels of illumination and testing measurements to insure adherence to those standards. The luminance meters are fairly inexpensive and can be used at any distance or at any angle as long as the sign fills the field of vision. He put in standards for bill boards. He cleaned up some of the language to make it more consistent; he shrunk down the definitions and grouped them together wherever possible. Mr. Delonno said there were liberal standards on some things and stringent things on others; he cleaned that up a bit by making it more even handed. He had a question about allowing signs for non-conforming uses; theoretically, any sign change would alter a pre-existing use and require going back to the ZBA. It was noted that issue came up with Estabrook and Chamberlain Insurance when they wanted a bigger sign. Mr. Delonno commented that if was a maintenance issue, it should be exempt and any new sign that is not made conforming should go to the ZBA.

Mr. Driscoll asked where are bill boards allowed? Mr. Delonno said only along Route 24 and 495.

Mr. Ajemian questioned the process; Mr. Delonno said when the board is comfortable with it, he can introduce it to the Town Manager.

Mr. Ajemian suggested that due to the fact that the members are just seeing this that it be put on the agenda for November 7th at 8:30.

CLAREMONT PARKING LOT PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing convened at 7:00 pm.

Public hearing ad that appeared in the Enterprise on 10/3 and 10/10 read into the record. The green cards were submitted.

Email to Mr. Delonno from Azu Etoniru dated 10/17/16 read into the record:

"As we discussed this morning, I have reviewed the site plan for the proposed surface parking lot composed of seven (7) sheets dated September 9, 2016 and prepared by Farland Corp for Claremont Companies with regard to the above subject location. The parking lot is not proposed as an integral part of another principal use! While I do not have any specific problem with the proposed use, it is fraught with potential regulatory complication under the zoning criteria for site use activities within the zoning district for the locus relative to minimum land space requirement. I think your idea of incorporating the use into the existing hotel development by combining the lots under a "FORM A" plan application and filing a site plan modification for the hotel could very well cure the zoning issues for the instant parking lot site plan as a "stand alone" project; especially in light of the fact that the sole access to and from the proposed parking lot is through the existing driveway that serves the hotel. The Planning Board should also evaluate the proposed parking lot use in light of the overall master plan for the development of the lands owned within the locus by Claremont Properties. I believe the master plan was prepared by Silva Engineering Associates.

The site is located in a Zone II Aquifer Protection District; therefore, the required stormwater runoff treatment volume should be based on one (1) inch precipitation applied over the parking area. The existing drainage system for the hotel and the drainage system within the layout of Pleasant Street in front of the proposed parking lot should be properly characterized: only the rim elevations of the structures are shown on the plan. The respective invert elevations of the existing structures should be documented as part of the existing system evaluation. The respective rates of runoff under the post development condition for the 10, 25, and 100 year storm events do not conform to the Planning Board's rules and regulations as they respectively exceed ninety (90) percent of the corresponding rates of runoff under the pre-development conditions. Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information".

The applicant has filed a Notice of Intent with the conservation Commission seeking permission to remove, fill, dredge or alter an area subject to protection under the Wetlands Protection Act.

Stevie Carvalho, Senior Project Manager for Farland Corp. explained the project. It consists of the demolition of the two dwellings on the properties on the south side of Pleasant Street for the construction of a 60 lot parking lot to be used for the new Residence Inn that is almost completed. Drainage is basically overland flow to a curb break which has a 1' wide stone diaphragm and then goes into a bio retention area and then overflows into an adjacent wetland area. They will be providing parking lot lighting which doesn't seem to affect the adjoining properties or roadway. Mr. Carvalho stated that he received the comments from Mr. Etoniru this afternoon and hasn't had time to address his issues. He said he spoke with Mr. Carney about the Form A and that is something that they will look into. This is in reference to the fact that if the lots were combined with the hotel, no special permit would be required and could be addressed by a modification of the Residence Inn Site plan. The lot by itself doesn't conform. (5 acres with 200' of frontage) They will look into the drainage; not sure the one who prepared it was aware of the 90% reduction, he said.

Mr. Ajemian questioned why they wanted to do a parking lot here as the parking was sufficient when the Residence Inn as approved? Mr. Carvalho stated that the parking is sufficient now; they looked at a lot of uses on this site such as housing, retail and they felt that this was the best use for the site.. They also realized that the hotel parking is shared with the office so having more parking for the hotel would be better for everybody. Mr. Ajemian questioned if there was a need for it now? Mr. Carvalho stated that they are ok the way they are now; however, they would prefer to have more; a convenience factor for the hotel and guests.

Mr. Sullivan questioned if they were going to have any kind of buffer or landscaping. Mr. Carvalho said there is some shrubbery in the bio retention area; not shown on the plan but the profile view. Mr. Sullivan mentioned that the zoning was changed to allow the hotel to have a shorter set back to give them more parking; he suggested that this needed more buffering and landscaping to make it more visually appealing. Mr. Driscoll referred to Section K1 where the use is allowed by special permit as a principal use. Mr. Delonno noted that he was fortunate enough to have a tour of the hotel. In the front there is a lobby area, an area for outdoor seating to dine, an outdoor activity in a court yard; there is a barbeque pit with an area for grilling; so, they have made accommodations to have passive and active activity space. He suggested that if the Board felt they wanted more of a vegetated buffer, to tell the applicant and he should be able to accommodate that. Mr. Sullivan question whether or not they have thought about using some kind of impervious product rather than asphalt? Mr., Carvahlo said he hadn't discussed that with his client.

Mr. Delonno noted that Claremont didn't own these private properties when the master plan was put together and didn't have the opportunity to combine the properties when the hotel came before us. Mr. Carvalho said they probably will form A it and combine with the hotel to address that issue, but they would like to review it first.

Mr. Driscoll asked if there were houses directly across the street from the proposed parking lot. He was told no; Claremont owns the property across the street; no lights from the parking lot will shine into a home. Mr. Etoniru noted that you don't want too much screening for security reasons. Mr. Driscoll suggested that they just do something that is esthetically pleasing.

Mr. Sullivan noted that there was a stream between those two houses and Mr. Etoniru advised him that it was an intermittent stream, not a perennial stream.

Mr. Driscoll commented that there appears to be three issues at this point: clear up how they are going to address the issue....combine the property with the hotel or add land to it to meet the 5 acre requirement.; Then we have the drainage issue that Azu mentioned in his report about the pre and post and the landscaping/buffering on Pleasant Street.

Bill Maltby-2083 Pleasant Street-said that he was across the street from the second house and was concerned about the buffer between the road and the parking lot. He said the neighbors were originally told that when the houses were raised, it would become a park or maybe go back to the wild. He said he was disappointed to hear that it will be developed....but inevitable, he said.

Mr. Driscoll made a suggestion to Stevie Carvahlo to possibly use lights that would be more residential looking, rather than big industrial as used elsewhere on Claremont properties....perhaps post and lantern. Mr. Carvahlo said they could certainly look into that.

On a motion by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Hall, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to November 21, 2016 at 6:30 pm

The meeting was adjourned at 7:36 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED:_____