

IPSWICH PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, January 28, 2016, 7:30 p.m.

Pursuant to a meeting notice posted by the Town Clerk and delivered to all Board members, a meeting of the Ipswich Planning Board was held on Thursday, January 28, 2016 in Room A, 2nd floor of Town Hall. Board members Heidi Paek, Jay Stanbury, Keith Anderson, Kathleen Milano and Cathy Chadwick and Associate member Carolyn Britt attended. Senior Planner, Ethan Parsons also attended.

Paek convened the meeting at 7:30 pm with a quorum present.

CITIZENS' QUERIES: None

Adopt Minutes from 12/10/2015

VOTE: Stanbury moved to approve the 12/10/2015 minutes, Milano seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

-Draft Minutes from 12/10/15

Request by Kodiak Machine (20 Hayward Street) for minor modifications to site plan approval and acceptance of as-built plan and sign off on issuance of certificate of occupancy.

Paek explained the history of the building and the project. The file was never closed on this project, they are currently operating on a temporary certificate of occupancy and the current conditions vary from the approved plan. The variations include a different paving pattern on the rear of the building at the loading area, the location of a dumpster and the installation of plant material.

Stanbury moved that this is a minor modification. Anderson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Anderson moved to approve the minor modification. Chadwick seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Anderson moved to authorize the Building Inspector to issue the certificate of occupancy. Milano seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- Email from Joanna Rousseau to E. Parsons, 1/5/16

New Public Hearing: Request by J&K Realty Trust for a special permit for a multifamily use and modification of a site plan approval for the addition to a mixed use building and related site development at 195 and 199 High Street (Assessor's Map 21, Lot 7A & 93), which is located in the Highway Business Zoning District and Water Supply Protection District, pursuant to but not limited to Sections V, X and XI.J, of the Zoning Bylaw.

Paek read the legal notice and opened the public hearing. Nancy McCann, Esq., attorney for the applicant, and Jim MacDowell the project engineer, and Rainer Koch, project architect, appeared before the Board. McCann explained they are looking to add 10 additional residential units to an existing building. The

project entails combining an adjacent lot recently purchased with the existing lot. Jim MacDowell discussed the site and the plans. Paek commented that the Board did get a report on the drainage on this site but needs more time to absorb its findings. Paek noted that the Board also received a letter from an abutter, Michael and Ann Nolan, who wanted to make sure the drainage was reviewed at length. Mr. Koch described the building design. Stanbury asked where the handicap accessible units would be located. They will likely be located on the first floor. Paek explained that the Nolans of 201 High Street expressed concerns about the impact on their property, the wetlands, stormwater management and vegetation. Paek explained these matters would be discussed at length throughout the process. Paek felt the landscaping could be more robust. She suggested a landscaping plan would be helpful and requested that the applicant use wood instead of vinyl fencing. Paek also suggested a site visit for Saturday, February 13th at 3:30PM. The Board and applicant agreed to the site visit.

Chadwick moved to continue the public hearing. Stanbury seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- *Memo from James MacDowell, Morin Engineering, to Ethan P., 1/10/16*
- *Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Clayton A. Morin, P.E., 12/31/15*
- *Architectural Design Drawings, prepared by Koch Architects, 1/15/16*
 - *Sheet 1: First/Ground Floor Plan*
 - *Sheet 2: Second and Third Floor Plan*
 - *Sheet 3: Building Elevations*
- *Site Development Permit Plan, prepared by Clayton A. Morin, P.E., 12/31/15*
 - *Sheet 1: Index Map*
 - *Sheet 2: Existing Conditions Plan*
 - *Sheet 3: Site Layout Plan*
 - *Sheet 4: Site Grading & Utility Plan*
 - *Sheet 5: Site Landscaping Plan*
 - *Sheet 6: Stormwater Details*
 - *Sheet 7: Site Details*
- *Special Permit Application, filed with Town Clerk 1/4/16*
- *Site Plan Review Application, filed with Town Clerk 1/4/16*

Continued Public Hearing: Request by Thomas Flynn for a special permit for a proposed multifamily dwelling at 10 and 12 Market Street (Assessor's Map 42A, Lots 178 & 179), located in the Central Business and Floodplain District, pursuant to Sections II, V, IX.D and XI.J of the Zoning Bylaw.

Paek explained where this project stood at this point. The Housing Partnership supported this project at their last meeting. The Board had raised concerns about the deck that extended to number 12 Market Street. She noted that this could be addressed with a possible easement or merging the lots. Ken Savoie, architect for the applicant, appeared before the Board. He explained that the owner would prefer to record an easement.

Parsons read the draft decision. Paek suggested that the condition requiring an easement should not be time limited and should run with the property.

Milano moved to close the public hearing. Anderson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Stanbury moved to approve the special permit as discussed. Milano seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- *Draft decision for Planning Board consideration*
- *Memo from E. Parsons and H. Paek to Ipswich Housing Partnership, dated 1/15/16*

Continued Public Hearing: Request by True North Ale Company, LLC and Ipswich Junction, LLC for special permits and site plan review for an office building, enclosed manufacturing in a proposed building, storage building and related site development at 114-116 County Road (Assessor's Map 54A, Lot 8), located in the Highway Business District, pursuant to Sections V, X and XI.J of the Zoning Bylaw.

Peter Pommersheim, Meridian Associates, appeared before the Board to discuss where the project stood at this point. He explained that traffic would be discussed at length tonight. The propane filling station would need to be relocated per the Conservation Commission and the new location was explained. Sam Gregorio, traffic engineer for The Engineering Corp., appeared before the Board to discuss the traffic flow of the property and vicinity described in the January 15, 2016 Traffic Impact Analysis. The traffic analysis will also be sent to MA DOT and their comments should be received in the next few weeks. The traffic study was explained at length. Paek asked when the peak usage is expected to occur. It was explained that the peak is expected to occur on Saturday at midday. Britt asked about the backup at the driveway intersection exiting the site. It was explained the driveway itself is rated "F" but this is not atypical of any commercial driveway at peak hour that ends in a stop sign. Chadwick wanted to know if there were any new crosswalks proposed across County Road. It was confirmed none were proposed or warranted due to the proximity to the crosswalk at the signalized intersection in front of Powderhouse Village. Milano asked if a left hand turn lane would be added to County Road and it was confirmed this decision would be up to MA DOT.

Gary Rogers and Jake Rogers appeared before the Board as the True North Ale Company representatives to discuss the special permit application for the proposed brewery and distillery building and use. They discussed the project and why they would like to create this brewery. Some issues came up at past meetings, and they wanted to address these concerns. They feel there will be little impact on town services. They have spent time with the Water and Wastewater Manager, Vicki Halmen, and she feels the brewery will not have an adverse effect on the water system. For traffic, they will not be adding significant vehicle trips at peak hours. Tastings would occur in the off hours. They are also trying to fit in with the surroundings and feel the architecture reflects this. Also, they noted the odors compare to a commercial bakery and disperse very rapidly. Paek wanted to know how many employees they anticipate hiring. They stated that initially there would be themselves plus an additional full time employee. They would like to have a total of 4 employees by the end of the first year of operation. Eventually there would be 4 full time and 4-part time and they don't all overlap. Paek wanted the applicants to be aware of the tasting requirements and know those requirements as they proceed. Anderson requested to see what the brewery looks like from the Southgate neighborhood. He would also like to see where the aroma would be blowing, where the wind directions may send it. Paek also discussed the signage and how the brewery would like to place a logo on the silo. This was discussed at length. Stanbury worried it would set a precedent. While he said he didn't have a problem with the design he wasn't sure it was appropriate for Ipswich. The sign bylaw was discussed at length and whether the logo on a silo counted as a free standing sign. The Board asked Parsons to write a draft special permit decision for the next meeting. The distillery is also tied to this building and is a subject of the special permit. Matt Perry, owner of Turkey Shore Distilleries, appeared before the Board. He said he has been on Hayward Street since 2010. Perry said the only aroma from the fabricating process would be a molasses-type smell but it wouldn't leave the building.

Ben Malarkey, 58 Central Street: Stated that his living area is level with the Ipswich Ale Brewery in town and he does not have a problem with the smell, noting it is sweet and light.

Milano moved to continue the public hearing. Chadwick seconded. The motion passed unanimously

Documents:

- *Memo from Meridian Associates to Planning Board, dated 1/22/16*
- *Architectural drawings, prepared by Lincoln Architects and Martins Design Construction, received 1/25/16*
 - *Perspective Views of Brewery/Distillery building and site*
 - *Perspective Views of Medical/Office building and site*
 - *County Road- Conceptual Medical/Office Building*
 - *County Road Elevations*
- *Traffic Impact Assessment, prepared by The Engineering Corp, 1/15/16*
- *114 & 116 County Road Truck Turning Movements, prepared 1/19/16 by Meridian Associates and TEC (Two sheets)*
- *Stormwater Analysis and Calculations, prepared by Meridian Associates, 11/16/15, revised 1/20/16*
- *Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Meridian Associates, 11/16/15, revised 12/15/15 and 1/20/16*
- *Permit Site Development Plan, prepared by Meridian Associates, Inc., 11/16/15, revised 12/3/15 and 1/20/16*
 - *Sheet 1: Cover Sheet*
 - *Sheet 2: Record Conditions/Demolition Plan*
 - *Sheet 3: Site Layout Plan*
 - *Sheet 4: Site Grading Plan*
 - *Sheet 5: Site Utility Plan*
 - *Sheet 6: Landscaping Plan*
 - *Sheet 7: Site Details*

Continued Public Hearing: Request by New England Biolabs, Inc. for a modification of site plan approvals and a Great Estates Preservation District special permit, as modified, for the proposed installation of a 40-space parking area at 240 County Road (Assessor's Map 63, Lot 7), which is located in the Rural Residence A zoning district, pursuant to *Section X* and *XI.J*, of the Zoning Bylaw

Chadwick recused herself from this hearing as she is an abutter. Charlie Wear, Meridian Associates, appeared before the Board. Wear noted that the trees selected as a buffer on the eastern side of the parking area are deer tolerant. Don Greenough, attorney for New England Biolabs, Inc., appeared before the Board and Paek explained that the Board would consider the draft decision tonight. Paek requested that the decision note that the deferred parking area would not be constructed. Britt stated that the decision should restrict illumination to certain hours and limit construction to certain days and hours.

Barbara Markiewicz, 37 Fellows Road: Stated that it is important the Board consider that Fellows Road is a rural residential road. The distance from her house to the parking lot is 260 feet, which may be acceptable for requirements but is not compatible with her neighborhood. She has concerns about the trees providing adequate screening and noted the parking lot will still be viewable from her house. Also, snow removal would be a disruption to her neighborhood. She also has concerns about the carriage road that heads directly towards her property and the water that would be directed towards her property. The plan must include provisions that direct the runoff away from her house. Wear explained where the storm water would run off, and indicated it would not be towards any abutters' property.

Cathy Chadwick, 27 Fellows Road: Asked the Board to require a maintenance plan for the trees and requested that they be planted early in the spring before the construction begins so they can get a good start. Paek explained there is a condition on the plantings. Chadwick said that initially the lot was

considered for summer parking. She wondered if this had changed. Paek explained that the summer parking only statement was retracted and this would be more of a full time lot.

Parsons read the draft decision. He noted that on page 2 in the first paragraph, the deferred lot sentence could be stricken entirely. The Board agreed to strike it. Paek would like the mention of the waiver allowing less than 10% interior landscaping to read differently. She would like it to read “driveway and parking areas are designed with due regard with the topography and circulation patterns of the property and are sufficiently landscaped around the perimeter”. Paek would also like it mentioned that the applicant has proposed to preserve 2 copper birch trees. Employees would be encouraged to park on the east end of the lot instead of the west end. It was recommended that the decision include a condition that the lights would be shut off from 8PM until 6AM except for special events. The Board asked Parsons to include the typical construction day and time restrictions. Also, the Board asked that the decision note that plantings would be pruned to have dense lower branches and provide optimal screening. They would be replaced if they fail to grow and thrive.

Anderson moved to close the public hearing. Stanbury seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Stanbury moved to approve the major modification as discussed. Anderson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Documents:

- Draft decision for Planning Board consideration

General Business

In the upcoming year Paek will continue as the Chair and Stanbury will continue as the Vice Chair. The Board agreed to continue to authorize the Planning Director and Board Chair to sign plans and decisions on the Board’s behalf.

Discuss Community Development Plan: The Board agreed that the public needs to be involved in this project. A survey would be sent out to the public. The Board thought that participants would prefer to take a survey than attend a meeting but eventually there would be meetings. Chadwick felt that if the survey was done first, it may be a good opportunity to invite participants to commit to attending a brainstorming session at a future date. Britt felt it was important to revisit the vision statement because it could have changed over the years. Paek agreed to work on a survey tailored to shaping the vision statement.

Adopt Minutes from 1/20/16

Anderson moved to approve the 1/20/16 minutes as discussed. Milano seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment: Anderson moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:06 and Chadwick seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Dionne

The Board approved these minutes on March 24, 2016