



Members Present: Donald Hawkins, Chair; Jason Janvrin, Vice Chair; Roger Frazee, Michael Lowry, Francis Chase, Aboul Khan, Ex-Officio; Tom Morgan, Town Planner; Barbara Kravitz, Secretary; Steve Zalewski, Building Inspector; Rick Friberg, Peer Review Engineer, TEC; Members Absent: Ivan Eaton III, Sue Foote, Alternate; David Baxter; Alternate, Paula Wood, Alternate,

Hawkins opened the meeting at 6:33M.

#### MINUTES OF AUGUST 5, 2014

Hawkins asked about an address blank on page 8. Kravitz said to remove the blank. On page 21 the motion to approve Case #2014-14 Harborside Restaurant Group should be amended to add that live music would be allowed from 5 PM to 10PM provided the Selectmen issue an entertainment license.

<b>MOTION:</b>	Hawkins	<p>to accept the Minutes of August 5, 2014, amended as follows: to modify and restate the motion made on August 5, 2014 with respect to Case #2014-14 Harborside Restaurant Group, Castaways Restaurant, 209 Ocean Boulevard by adding (xvi) below:</p> <p>to approve Case #2014-14 – Harborside Restaurant Group, LLC for a change of hours to 7AM to 1AM inside the restaurant for Castaways Restaurant at 209 Ocean Boulevard, Tax Map 26, Lot 91, with the following stipulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) the deck will be closed to everyone at 11 PM;</li><li>(ii) all outdoor music will be turned off at 10 PM;</li><li>(iii) fire pits will be turned off and that area vacated at 11 PM;</li><li>(iv) there will be no hard piping for the fire pits and the hard piping will be removed from the plans;</li><li>(iv) removable gas fire pits are approved subject to the hours stated above;</li><li>(v) the awning sign will not be lighted from the rear;</li><li>(vi) no amplified music outside on the decks and no music at all after 10PM;</li><li>(vii) the maximum number of seats (285) to be notated on the plan;</li><li>(viii) no wood burning fire pits;</li><li>(xi) the easement depicted on the submitted plan to be removed;</li><li>(xii) the revised plan to be submitted to the Planning Board within 30 days;</li><li>(xiii) the conditions of approval to be listed on the plan;</li></ul>
----------------	---------	--



		<p>(xiv) all outstanding invoices from the Town are paid;          (xv) the final plan to meet the requirements of the Town Planner, and .          (xvi) to allow live music on the deck only Thursday through Sunday from 5PM to 9PM subject to receiving an entertainment license issued by the Board of Selectmen.</p>
<b>SECOND:</b>	Khan	<p><b>Approved: In favor: Hawkins, Janvrin, Eaton, Frazee, Khan, Lowry;</b>  <b>Abstained: Chase</b></p>

**SECURITY REDUCTIONS, EXTENSIONS, ROADWAYS**

**Case #2013-28 – Marshall Way, Rushmore, Rocks Road subdivision;**

Attending: Richard Green, Green & Company

Hawkins referenced the security reduction request letter from Green & Company, and would table this as there was no signoff from department heads. He noted that recently the Board had discussed not releasing security until a project was complete. Green said the request was written so that the Planning Board would ask the department heads for their signoff. The road had been paved since the letter was submitted. The letter of credit was tying up the construction loan as they did not have the money to pay the subcontractors. Green said that Altus Engineer Jim Kerivan had inspected the construction. Hawkins said the Board had used a signoff form for years; it was up to the Applicant to take the form to the department heads for their respective approval signatures. The Board generally did not consider releasing security without having feedback from the department heads that they are in agreement. Green said his letter was nearly a month old and he was instructed by the DPW Manager that the department heads would not go out to inspect unless the Planning Board directed them to do so. be asked for their signatures.

Hawkins said Green should get the appropriate form from the Secretary, take it to the department heads for their signatures, and return it to the Planning Board office to be placed on the Agenda. He noted that the Greens had used that procedure for previous projects. The Planning Board would not consider releasing security unless the department heads were satisfied. Green said he would do that, and asked if they could be on the next Agenda. Hawkins said if the signed form was in the office on time, it could go on the September 2 work session agenda. Kravitz noted that Michael Green had picked up that document; she be contacted for help.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Hawkins opened the Public Hearings at 7:35PM.



## NEW CASES

**Case #2013-19 – Proposal by US Foods to renovate the Poland Springs warehouse at 100 Ledge Road (Tax Map 6, Lot 1), to construct a loading dock on the building's east side, and to construct a truck maintenance & fueling facility for the maintenance, washing & fueling of the company's truck fleet;**

Attending: Alex Raines, Vice President Corporate Real Estate, John Glenn, President of the Boston Division, Anna Fernandez, Director of Environmental p  
Appearing for the Applicant: Tim Gibblns, architect, VP Design, Dan Frigge, Director of Civil Engineering, David Bye]]], project leader, ESI

Hawkins recalled that Case #2013-19 US Foods was given a conceptual approval with the requirement of returning to the Board with a detailed lot plan for the usual full review. Raines introduced the US Foods and ESI individuals in attendance, noting that the Seabrook facility will become the new home for Glynn's group now located in Peabody, MA. Fernandez would speak to the Planning Board's main concern, the installation of the fueling area.

Raines introduced the power point presentation describing US Foods and what they are bringing to Seabrook. The Company is the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest distributor of food service and related products in the United States. They serve restaurants, military facilities, colleges, and schools on a wholesale basis – anywhere food is prepared outside the home. They are not open to the public; US Foods offers 350,000 products and have 250,000 customers. There are 24,000 employees nationwide; revenues exceed \$21 billion. US Foods functions in 27 states, out of 62 distribution centers. , and each facility operates individually as a small company. The Seabrook project had a conditional approval and would have moved along faster except for the announced merger with Sysco. After a time, they determined that they did want to progress to the larger Seabrook facility and were permitted to move forward.

Glynn said that US Foods had operated for 13 years in Peabody, MA, and had identified the Seabrook property as the best option for future growth. The building was secured about 60 days ago and was ideal for their operations; they were on a technical time line for completion. Their customers were hospitals, colleges, universities, schools, restaurants and nursing homes. Currently they employed 270 coming into Seabrook building, and intend to add between 75 – 100 new employees. They operate 6 days per week, select product at night, and trucks go out in the morning as described in their impact study. There were no questions at that time.

Glynn said the capital investment for improvement of the facility would be a minimum of \$30,000,000, with an additional \$5,000,000 for equipment. This division had revenues of about \$400,000,000. They could not predict what how the business would change if the merger goes through. Glynn said this project only was for US Foods.

Gibbons said the building was about 500,000 square feet of which US Foods would convert up to 75 percent for freezer, coolers at different temperatures, and various dry storage space, including the existing loading dock to a dock for shipping perishables. The current offices were not suitable and would be renovated with a mezzanine for more offices. Additionally, there would be space for materials handling and storage. The refrigeration power unit would be located outside. In addition to the building improvements, the separate building for fueling, maintenance,



Town of Seabrook  
Planning Board Minutes  
Tuesday, August 19, 2014  
NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

and truck washing bay for 50 plus trucks and trailers would be constructed as a huge operational and financial advantage in the marketplace.

Gibbons showed several diagrams of the existing and planned site. The building is an existing truck facility with no new pavement constructed, although they would stripe the spaces. The fueling and maintenance facility area is currently where trucks have been parked. He pointed out the snow removal storage area. The zoning is industrial and is near the highway. They would have an entrance patio with flagpoles, some of the siding would be replaced, and a small concrete pad added.

Frigge showed photos of the truck maintenance and fueling facility in Buta, Texas, which will be separated from the maintenance facility. Several redundancies would be added for containment purposes including. The truck turning area is concrete, and the rest is asphalt. Diagrams showed the relative locations of the truck maintenance and fueling facilities, the dumpsters, the 20,000 gallon dual walled holding tank for diesel fuel and the concrete containment area. The canopy would be over all of the fueling area and additional drainage for containment would be added. Trucks drive through the washing facility to capture any cardboard and food product inside the truck which would drop into a holding chamber. Drainage from the facility is run through an oil trap before being channeled through a manhole with specialized media that expands to trap any fuel, so that there is only clear draining for recycling or off the site. In an emergency there is a hand-operated gate valve that shuts off all of the drainage. In the containment area everything drains to the center.

Raine added that about 75 percent of the water is reclaimed and reused. Frigge said an alarm would go off if any fuel got between the dual walls of the tank. Fuel is transported along the overhead canopy and down into one of the dispensers accessed by trucks under the canopy where other fluids like windshield washer are also available. Frigge said that spill kits were located in the 55 gallon drum units at the fueling island and all employees are trained how to clean up the water for recycling and dry the area, for example when the top of a truck cooler sheds water. Sewage is treated and channeled into the sanitary sewage manhole. Frigge pointed out the existing and additional stormwater management lines and inlets collecting any surface waters; the roofline is directly drained into the stormwater drainage system. Drainage from the canopy area would go into the specialized manhole for treatment that allows water to flow while the medium collects oils from the fueling island that can be removed before entering the stormwater drainage system which flows to the detention area. Frigge referenced the demonstration of this technology for department heads and the engineer in Seabrook. If the 20,000 gallon tank were breached the pavement area could contain 37,000 gallons. Frigge summarized all of the containment elements. US Foods has its own manual and follows the SWPPP requirements.

Fernandez said that Frigge had described all of the containment technology and equipment. Her job was to assure that the maintenance was done according to environmental law. They have an environmental management procedure that holds the Company accountable for managing the risks, strategy, and performance of the required maintenance. Ongoing they improve the design and best environmental practices for air, waste and water, and have programs for energy star equipment, leeds and green sustainability. All employees associated with the facility are trained on how to keep these standards in place, properly maintain the 20,000 gallon tank, use the spill kit, and maintain a clean and compliant facility. There is an EPA program for hazardous materials risk, and have their own operations requirements for monitoring and controlling hazardous substances like ammonia. Gibbons added that their snow removal procedure would be according to state requirements.



Town of Seabrook  
Planning Board Minutes  
Tuesday, August 19, 2014  
NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

Gibbons showed photos of the existing building and where additional parking would be provided and the location of the loading dock for perishables. In time part of the facade would be replaced with insulated panels of a matching color. He described the internal renovations to the cooling and freezer areas, and pointed out the dry storage, mezzanine, office and employee space and equipment handling areas. Khan asked about generators; Gibbons showed the location of back-up generators. A part of the building will be designated for expansion. In that event, construction could take place without affecting the existing operation. Gibbons said that US Foods was asking that the building expansion work be separated from the fueling and maintenance site plan review, which they requested proceed to the Technical Review Committee.

Khan recalled that the applicant had met with the Water Superintendent and asked how many gallons of water would be used. Gibbons had provided some figures; he thought the request related to what size water meter would be needed. Janvrin asked if ammonia would be the coolant rather than Freon; Gibbons confirmed this and said it would be much more efficient, CO<sub>2</sub> is also used as a refrigerant – these are closed systems. Chase asked how snow would be removed as there was a fence in place. Gibbons said the fence would be relocated with two access points for snow removal. Frigge said there would be several points for equipment to enter the site; these access points would be locked. Chase asked how the residue is removed from the truck wash. Raine said the debris is pumped out and taken to a waste management site.

Hawkins said while the application was for the entire site, US Foods was requesting that the new construction portions, primarily the maintenance and refueling facility, be separated from the existing building during the review process. He noted that sometimes the Board had waived jurisdiction on some items in this type of a project. The Company had to vacate their Massachusetts location, and had requested permission to get the work inside the building done. Janvrin favored this approach, and asked if work was already being done. Hawkins said they had been working with the Building Inspector on the inside demolition. He noted that the Planning Board did not generally get involved on the inside of a building as department heads and the Building Inspector would be involved. Hawkins said the Board would give consideration on waiving jurisdiction on the inside of the building. Chase thought the previous building inspector agreed. Hawkins said the building Inspector was willing to take on that responsibility is the Board waived jurisdiction.

Chase asked about the changes to the outside of the building. Gibbons said the outside modifications included (i) the loading dock, (ii) replacing outside façade with insulated panels, (iii) the refrigeration pack/condenser stand, (iv) redesigning the front patio and adding flagpoles, and . (v) adding an outdoor patio for employees. Frigge said that all of the refrigeration would be located inside of the building. He pointed out the area that had been used for truck parking, which would become employee parking spaces, and the snow removal area. There would be a new transformer and generator, and a back-up generator. Janvrin asked what would power the generators; Gibbons said either diesel or natural gas. Chase asked about a structure on the first plan, Raine said it had been removed. Gibbons commented that they put everything they could on the inside for economics and speed of construction; the footprint would be the same. .

Hawkins asked if anyone had comments on waiving jurisdiction on the inside building work. Khan asked for a progress report in 180 days. Janvrin said if jurisdiction was waived, required items would be the generator and transformer, concrete pads for the dumpster, the refer skid,



Town of Seabrook  
 Planning Board Minutes  
 Tuesday, August 19, 2014  
 NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

the parking lot restriped to the new regulations, snow removal system, crack filling and the seal coat. All of those items could be handled by the Building Inspector. Zalewski said a transformer had to be set. Gibbons said there would be two transformers in all, with underground electric. Chase asked if the fence was eight feet high, did they need a variance because it's more than 6 feet. Glynn said they needed to be in compliance with the Department of Defense bio-hazard requirement. Hawkins asked if anyone had a problem with the 8 feet; by consensus, none. Janvrin commented that the power plant probably had 8 foot fences.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Hawkins</b>	<p><b>to waive jurisdiction to the Building Inspector on the existing building internal construction for the Case #2013-19 – Proposal by US Foods to renovate the Poland Springs warehouse at 100 Ledge Road (Tax Map 6, Lot 1), subject to:</b></p> <p><b>(i) allowing an eight-foot high fence with equipment access;</b>  <b>(ii) replacing part of the building façade with insulated metal siding;</b>  <b>(iii) installing the generator and transformer in the north west corner;</b>  <b>(iv) locating the dumpster and pad on the southwest corner;</b>  <b>(v) installing the refer skid;</b>  <b>(vi) striping the parking area according to the current Regulations;</b>  <b>(vii) installing the snow removal system; and</b>  <b>(viii) filling the cracks and sealing the parking lot.</b></p>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Lowry</b>	<b>Approved: Unanimous</b>

Hawkins noted that the Applicant wanted to move the process quickly, and that he had suggested August 25 for the TRC Meeting. The Town Manager had committed department head resources, however, there was a conflict with two preconstruction meetings already scheduled for applicants that had waited a while. He wanted to find a day during that week, and asked if they had met with the engineer and the department heads. Frigge said they met with the engineer, but not with department heads although they had some comments from them.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Chase</b>	<b>to accept Case #2013-19 as administratively complete for jurisdiction and deliberation.</b>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Khan</b>	<b>Approved: Unanimous</b>

**Hawkins scheduled the Case #2013-19 Technical Review Committee meeting for Tuesday, August 26, 2014 at 10AM in Seabrook Town Hall.** It would be up to the applicant whether they could satisfy the items raised in the TRC before returning to the Planning Board. Hawkins asked if the Board had any items particular that they wanted discussed by the TRC. He had asked Friberg to figure out a way to assure that in a catastrophic event like hurricane Sandy water and



diesel would not escape the containment. Frigge said between 90,000 – 100-000 gallons of water could be handled.

Chase asked if the building was built to hurricane standards; Frigge said it was. Hawkins remarked that the town's water supply was a couple of hundred yards away, so this was an important issue for attention. He asked for abutter comments; there being none. Hawkins commented that the stormwater operations and maintenance plan is recorded on the plan. It had to be able to address spills. Raine asked if this was to be specific to the site. Hawkins confirmed this, and asked for Friberg's view. Friberg said the challenge would be coordinating with the department heads so that a concise list could be generated for the TRC. Hawkins noted that Friberg had been at the containment technology demonstration and asked if he was satisfied that it would work. Friberg saw this as the secondary containment method, but not as the primary method.

**Hawkins continued Case #2013-19 to September 16, 2014 at 6:30PM in Seabrook Town Hall.**

**Case #2014-21 – Proposal by Jane Knowles Robbins and Robert Brackett and Louise Vognoli for a lot line adjustment at 31 River Street and land south & east of 31 River Street, Tax Map 23, Lot 30, and Map 26, Lot 2.**

Attending: Marvin Robbins

Appearing for the Applicant: Henry Boyd, Millennium Engineering; Attorney Craig Solamon;  
Appearing as an abutter for her Mother: Liza Helen Feliciano;

Boyd said when he looked at the elevations on this property, it appeared that the structure might be over the property line. Several properties on River Street started out as camps and then people began to build. In this case three properties were involved; they had to expand the survey up and down the street as there were no monuments. Robbins thought that the owner of the property in the back might sell her a portion. Initially he had suggested running the property line along the fence. Solamon told him that Brackett and Vignoli would part with a piece. For some reason Boyd said he was asked to make the piece larger. However, it now appeared that Comacho's shed had been on that piece for quite some time, and she may have some rights even without title. Therefore the parcel A would probably be going along the fence line. Morgan asked for an explanation. Boyd said he'd been careful to make the tie ins along all of River Street and would prefer this property line along the fence. The deed for the title lies with Brackett and Vignoli.

Boyd said the purpose of the proposal was so that Robbins could sell her property. A portion of the property was actually about 15 feet beyond it. He will redraw the line and show it along the fence line. They were hoping for a conditional approval; the plans would come back with the proper calculations. Solamon said that Robbins had worked for him for 25 years until she became ill. Her decision was to sell this property and move in with her son. The property is under agreement with a buyer; he also negotiated an agreement with Brackett and Vignoli whose property was marshland assessed at \$2700. Solamon agreed with Boyd about requesting a conditional approval subject to redrawing the line along the fence. That way the buyer could be told they were ready.

Hawkins asked for Morgan's comments. Morgan said this was an unusual request, although not unreasonable. He was troubled at approving a plan without seeing the final lot line; the shed was



Town of Seabrook  
Planning Board Minutes  
Tuesday, August 19, 2014  
NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

on someone else's property. He thought the Board did not have interest in whose property the shed was on, but as a surveyor he had to recognize the rights of others even if they did not have record title. Morgan asked if this was adverse possession. Boyd thought a magistrate would have to declare that; Comacho did have some rights. Morgan asked if the grantor was aware that they wanted to shrink the parcel. Boyd said they would be told; they would be all right because they were originally ok with the lot line change along the fence line and would be willing to convey a little more. Salomon said he had written authorization to speak for them; he thought if the price did not change they would be ok. Morgan asked if the authorization was in the file. Solamon said he had brought this to the Planning Board Office. Kravitz said the authorization to speak for them at this meeting was in the file, but not for the conveyance. Boyd said if they were not in favor they would not convey the deed. Morgan said that would be embarrassing for the Planning Board. Boyd said people can change their mind, and that even if the mylar were recorded nothing happened until the deed was recorded.

Boyd said he would not produce a mylar for the submitted plan knowing that others may have rights. He would redraw the plan as he had first done. Chase asked about the setbacks. Boyd said showed that at the marsh, but could not do that where the shed lies. He said according to Marvin Robbins it was about 2 feet off the fence line. Solomon said the Bracket heirs would be happy to get some money. He was more concerned about not upsetting the neighbors. He asked for the conditional approval because the fence that would be the line was shown on the plan. Janvrin asked if the Brackett/Vignoli land had frontage on a roadway. Boyd thought it was entirely landlocked. Solamon said there was a deeded reference to access from another lot, although it may have been built on. He found that there was a way to wind down to the marsh through the original right-of-way off River Street. Boyd thought there was no fee accessing to a public road.

Feliciano represented her Mother, Mrs Camacho who was the owner of abutting property since 1967. A house had been razed. Her father had directed a sea wall as directed by FEMA. She expressed concern that all of her Mother's property had not been properly depicted and brought the original deed to the property; she thought about 12 feet was missing. Boyd pointed out where the property lines were, and assured her that all of her Mother's property was rightfully depicted on the Robbins plan. He had honored her Mother's frontage and depth, allowed for the deed detail, and pointed out the other owner beyond the fence. Boyd said he had gone through 10 property surveys and assured her that the specifications in her father's deed were depicted on the plan.

Hawkins pointed out that the deed and lot number did not match the title block and had to be fixed. He asked Morgan if he would be ok with a conditional approval that stated that the plans had to be to his satisfaction. Morgan was ok because there was a fence as a guide.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Chase</b>	<b>to approve Case #2014-21 – Jane Knowles Robbins and Robert Brackett and Louise Vognoli for a lot line adjustment at 31 River Street and land south &amp; east of 31 River Street, Tax Map 23, Lot 30, and Map 26, Lot 2 conditioned on (i) redrawing the lot line along the fence; (ii) written approval from the owners of Parcel A to move the lot line; (iii) the revised site plan entirely satisfactory to the Town Planner;</b>
----------------	--------------	--



		(iv) all outstanding invoices being paid
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Hawkins</b>	<b>Approved: Unanimous</b>

**ONGOING CASES**

**Case #2013-15 – Proposal by Arleigh Greene, GRA Real Estate Holdings, LLC and Waterstone Retail Development, Inc. to demolish existing buildings on Tax Map 8, Lots 54-2, 54-4, 54-5, 54-7, 54-8 and 90, and to construct a 168,642 square foot shopping complex with associated parking and access drives, continued from July 2, 2013, July 16, 2013, September 3, 2013; September 17, 2013, October 1, 2013, November 5, 2013; November 19, 2013, December 3, 2013, December 17, 2013; January 7, 2014; continued from March 4, 2014; April 1, 2014; April 15, 2014, May 20, 2014, July 15, 2014. August 5, 2014**

**At the request of the Applicant, Hawkins continued Case #2013-15 to September 16, 2014 at 6:30PM at Seabrook Town Hall.**

**Case #2013-26 – Proposal by 11 New Zealand Road, LLC and Charles Mabardy to establish a convenience store and restaurant at 11 New Zealand Road, Tax Map 7, Lot 87, continued from January 7, 2014, continued from January 7, 2014, March 4, 2014, April 1, 2014, April 15, 2014, May 20, 2014, June 3, 2014; June 17, 2014; July 15, 2014; xxx**

**At the request of the Applicant Hawkins continued Case #2013-26 to September 16, 2014 at 6:30PM in Seabrook Town Hall.**

**Case #2014-13 – Proposal by M & K Complex and Timothy Johnson for a condominium conversion at 920 Lafayette Road, Tax Map 7, Lots 91-201 thru 91-205, continued from May 20, 2014; July 15, 2014;**

**Hawkins continued Case #2014-13 to September 16, 2014 at 6:30PM in Seabrook Town Hall**

**Case #2014-16- Proposal by Istar LLC, Soraghan Realty Trust, Provident Holdings, and DDR Seabrook LLC for a lot line adjustment at 652 Lafayette Road, Tax Map 8, Lots 49, 50, 51-1, and 55-30; continued from June 17, 2014, August 5, 2014;**

Attending: Scott and Jim Mitchell, IStar Seabrook LLC;

Appearing for the Applicant: Wayne Morrill, Jones & Beach; Jeff Hyland, Ironwood Landscaping

Morrill said they had increased the scale for the plansheets for clarification so that the lot-lines to be dissolved as well as the new lines could be visible; setbacks, 6M Zoning, paved areas, permanent structures, and boundary monuments were also updated and/or clarified. As two of the properties had been reduced in size, they modified the legend. The revisions and the information letter were submitted to the Board. Hawkins asked for Morgan's view on the update, and whether to move the lot line case along. Morgan thought they had addressed his comments, and recommended holding further action to see if there were issues with the siteplan. Chase asked about the detention pond. Morrill said that all of the older lots had easements to go into the detention pond; there would be one new easement. Chase asked if this proposal would make the DDR-Noodles site non-conforming. Morgan asked Morrill to speak to this. Morrill said



Town of Seabrook  
Planning Board Minutes  
Tuesday, August 19, 2014  
NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

that lot would actually increase by 9 square feet; they were swapping land. There being no further questions, Hawkins said Cases 2014-16 and 2014-17 would move along together.

**Case #2014-17 – Proposal by Istar Seabrook LLC to construct a 5,640 square foot retail facility at 652 Lafayette Road, Tax Map 8, Lot 49;** continued from June 17, 2014, August 5, 2014;

Attending: Scott and Jim Mitchell, IStar Seabrook LLC;

Appearing for the Applicant: Wayne Morrill, Jones & Beach; Jeff Hyland, Ironwood Landscaping;

Hawkins asked for Morrill's comments. Morrill said the water and sewer lines that had been extended to the site were now shown on the plan. The site was identified as in the 6M North Village mixed use zone. 20 percent internal open space throughout the project was shown. The water department requirement for 48 hour notice for inspections was notated; the snow storage area is shown on the plan. The walkways had been slightly modified. All of the walkways from the bus stop and the neighboring retail areas flowed to the grassed area. As previously presented, the detention area would be dredged and 380 detention units installed grease hoods having the capacity to clean the water and then direct it to a second cleanse within the system before the infiltration. The discharge from the detention area remained the same, but a section was installed at the end to accept the overflow to the Provident Way area. Catch basin details were up to the DPW standards. The ADA ramps for access to each of the buildings was shown with recommendations for walkways access on the site and from the neighboring retail stores. A test pit was done in the pond area to verify the high water table. The sewer run was modified to a one percent slope. S revised drainage report was submitted to account for some modifications.

Hawkins asked for questions in re the drainage. Janvrin said previously he had asked about the overflow onto the town's right-of-way, and if the DDR system could handle that stormwater. The Route 107 subcommittee had been talking about irrigation sources, and asked if there were a way to utilize the stormwater in holding for landscape irrigation. Morrill said the underground detention system would be unable to hold the water for irrigation. They will install an irrigation well so as not to use town water. They were working on that with the NHDES and the town water department. At this time the overflow went along the back side of the Provident Bank and eventually into the town system. The infiltration rate is the same as before, but the DDR pond is at the maximum. Discharging into the DDR pond would change their state permit making it null and void, therefore DDR could not allow drainage into their pond.

Morgan asked for the design standard; Morrill said this handles a 50 year storm. Morgan asked if the storm magnitude were above that level, would the stormwater go to the overflow area through an 18 inch pipe. Morgan asked how many inches of rainfall would cause a 50 year storm overflow. Morrill thought about 4 and a half inches. Janvrin noted that such storms have recently occurred on the east coast. Morrill said they were creating as much infiltration as they could e.g. removing some pavement and using porous walks. Janvrin asked how a discharge onto the town's property would meet the MS-4 requirements. Morrill said the water treatment would be better than before; on any site too much water had to go somewhere. Janvrin asked if there would be provision for DPW monitoring of the water quality. Morrill said the detention chambers would be registered with the state and had to be monitored on a schedule with reports to the NHDES and the town.

Hawkins asked for Friberg's comments. Friberg had reviewed the revised plans on a preliminary basis, and thought they had addressed many of the TRC comments which he would go through with the department heads. He would look closely at drainage related items. Hawkins asked if



Town of Seabrook  
Planning Board Minutes  
Tuesday, August 19, 2014  
NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

the DPW Manager had comments relating to the drainage. Morrill said he wanted to be sure that the detention system was properly recorded with the NHDES and the documentation provided; also that they met the open space requirements. He had comments about the catch basin and sewer manhole details wanting assurance that they met the town standards. Morgan asked about the process and frequency for maintaining the detention system. Morrill said the installation had to be monitored which Jim Kervian of Altus Engineers was doing; a liner and also sand had to go in. The schedule for the first monitoring report would be in 3 months and every 6 months thereafter. They open a row and if there is sand it is cleaned out. Annually they clean out the sediment and grease. Morgan noted that the overflow would go onto town property, and asked what assurance the town would have that the maintenance would be timely done. Morrill said the schedule would be set forth in a document detail that would cover all of the properties using that pond or system. Morgan asked when the document would be available for review. Morrill said it would be drafted for the next meeting.

Hawkins asked for the parking calculations. Morrill said they updated the parking calculations for the entire Sea City property. The front building office parking was 1 space for every 200 square feet; with 3,504 square feet that came to 18 spaces minimum. The back building retail space at 1 space for every 250 square feet with 9,788 square feet the maximum spaces would be 39. For one resident restaurant at 40 seats plus 9 employees and retail they were supplying 22 spaces. Total spaces -62.

Hawkins' calculation on the minimum 3 per 1000 and a maximum - Minimum of 3 per 1,000 square feet and a maximum of 4 per 1,000 results in 67 minimum and 79 maximum. Morrill said there were cross connect agreements. Hawkins asked if those documents had been submitted. Morrill said there were cross access, parking, and drainage agreements with Phase 1 of Sea city Crossing, Pizza Hut, CVS, and Provident Bank. By agreement with DDR, IStar would maintain all of the walkways and landscaping Janvrin noted pedestrian access. Morrill said all of the area would be connected by walkways to the pocket park. Janvrin asked if they might consider a rain garden. Morrill said that would interfere with the detention system. They would use shallow depth plantings, shrubs, and bollard lights. Hawkins asked for further questions or comments on the above; there being none.

Hyland distributed the master landscape plan showing the pocket park, and also renderings of the type of plantings that would be used. He called attention to the pedestrian walkways that would connect to all of the buildings, and the pocket park that would have permanent picnic tables, one of which would be handicap accessible, and benches. Trash and recycling receptacles were placed in two locations, racks for 8 bicycles and bollard lighting. Smaller flowering trees would be used because they work well with the detention system, with some larger trees and berms. Hawkins asked about the size of the trees. Hyland said they would be mostly Liberty Elms, and one shade tree was being preserved; all would be deciduous shade trees. Janvrin asked if red maples could be used. Hyland said they could consider this, but they were subject to insects. They wanted to create an open park space. Evergreens were used for dumpster screening. All of the planting met the town requirements; the stone wall would be continued from Phase 1 and a swale would channel the groundwater. A special surf block would lead to the dumpster. The impervious surface was reduced where possible. The path system would be unit paver except for concrete pads for bencher etc. Another dumpster would have greenery enclosure.

Morgan asked if they'd read the regulations, and asked if the plan complied in every respect for both sites. Hyland said at this point it did, and they had inspected all of the plantings and aimed for larger plantings. Scott Mitchell said that Hyland would be overseeing the plantings for species



and placement. Lowry asked about trees along Route 1. S. Mitchell said one tree was moved because it blocked the sign. Hawkins asked about maintenance and to avoid deterioration. Hyland said the design for maintenance was created e.g. snow storage, mowers, etc. Native tolerant plant varieties were used. J. Mitchell commented that the tables and benches would be of a no maintenance polymer. S. Mitchell said they would be taking care of the landscaping maintenance themselves, use wells and no town water, and hydroseed not sod. The irrigation would be ready soon. Hawkins said the Board did not want town water used for landscaping, so the wells for commercial areas would be good. The pump electricity would be connected to the utility room.

Hawkins asked who owned the CVS and Pizza Hut. S. Mitchell said his former wife owned the CVS, and John Seraget, who had been very cooperative during the construction, owned the Pizza Hut. Hawkins commented that those two properties could look better with landscaping. S. Mitchell said they would re do the Provident Bank parking lot in a few weeks and would take over the landscape maintenance for the other two stores. J. Mitchell said he would work with CVS. S. Mitchell commented that DDR was happy with this property. Janvrin pointed out a small break in the pavement. S. Mitchell said it would be repaved. S. Mitchell did not like the long blank wall on the Phase 1 building facing the DDR entrance. They have decided to install windows along that side. Morrill said a waiver had been submitted for the roof line because a pitched roof was not allowed in Zone 6M, and they wanted it in keeping with the surrounding buildings. They hoped the Board would allow this. Hawkins said they did not want box-like buildings; this building was interesting. Morrill said they wanted to keep the building and landscaping consistent with the Phase 1 building.

Khan asked about their interaction with the Conservation Commission. S Mitchell said a letter from the ConComm had been received in April approving their underground detention system. Chase asked if a drawing with the pitched roof could be shown. S. Mitchell did not want to change the façade. Hawkins thought it would look out of place because the Phase 1 and the DDR buildings were of the same design.

**Hawkins continued Case #2014-17 and #2014-16 to September 16, 2014 at 6:30PM in Seabrook Town Hall.**

**PROPOSAL BY THE PLANNING BOARD TO AMEND THE SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS IN REGARDS TO PARKING, APPLICATION FEES, FINANCIAL SECURITIES,** continued from June 17, 2014; July 1, 2014; July 15, 2014; August 5, 2014,

Hawkins said that fees would be discussed at the September 2 work session. He wanted to address the parking ordinance change for retail properties. Morgan had proposed 3 per 1000 as the minimum and 4 per 1000 as the maximum, which he thought addressed the issue of not having been able to control the parking for retail. He proposed adopting the changes for that Morgan had recommended.

<b>MOTION:</b>	Janvrin	<p><i>t o replace Sections 8.030 and 11 of the Site Plan Review Regulations with the following:</i></p> <p><b>SECTION 11 - Parking</b>  <b>11.010 Parking Spaces: No structure shall be erected</b></p>
----------------	---------	---



		<p>nor shall any non-residential land use be established unless appropriate off-street parking and loading space is provided. The number of off-street parking spaces shall conform to the limits specified in the following table:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Type of Use</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Maximum # of Spaces</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Minimum # of Spaces</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Eating &amp; Drinking Establishments</i></td> <td></td> <td>1 space for every 4 seats</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Manufacturing Facility</i></td> <td></td> <td>1 space per 500 square feet of floor area</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Motels and Hotels</i></td> <td></td> <td>1 space for every sleeping room</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Offices</i></td> <td></td> <td>1 space per 250 square feet of floor area</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Places of Public Assembly</i></td> <td></td> <td>1 space for every 5 seats</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Retail Business</i></td> <td>1 space per 250 square feet of floor area</td> <td>1 space per 300 square feet of floor area</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>If no standard is specified in these regulations, parking requirements will be at the discretion of the Planning Board. <u>The Planning Board may require variation to these standards if in the board's judgment, circumstances warrant such variation.</u></p> <p><b>11.020 Parking Dimensions:</b> Every parking space shall be a minimum of 10 feet in width, and 18 feet in length. Parking lot travel lanes shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width <u>if a herringbone configuration is utilized.</u> <u>Otherwise the travel lanes shall be and a maximum of 24 feet in width.</u></p> <p><b>11.030 Pavement:</b> Parking and loading areas shall be paved, if required by the Planning Board. Parking lots shall be designed in such a manner so as to minimize the construction of impervious surface area. For that reason, a herringbone parking alignment is preferred</p> <p><b>11.040 Parking Location:</b> All parking shall be located on-site, or alternately, a permanent easement may be</p>	Type of Use	Maximum # of Spaces	Minimum # of Spaces	<i>Eating &amp; Drinking Establishments</i>		1 space for every 4 seats	<i>Manufacturing Facility</i>		1 space per 500 square feet of floor area	<i>Motels and Hotels</i>		1 space for every sleeping room	<i>Offices</i>		1 space per 250 square feet of floor area	<i>Places of Public Assembly</i>		1 space for every 5 seats	<i>Retail Business</i>	1 space per 250 square feet of floor area	1 space per 300 square feet of floor area
Type of Use	Maximum # of Spaces	Minimum # of Spaces																					
<i>Eating &amp; Drinking Establishments</i>		1 space for every 4 seats																					
<i>Manufacturing Facility</i>		1 space per 500 square feet of floor area																					
<i>Motels and Hotels</i>		1 space for every sleeping room																					
<i>Offices</i>		1 space per 250 square feet of floor area																					
<i>Places of Public Assembly</i>		1 space for every 5 seats																					
<i>Retail Business</i>	1 space per 250 square feet of floor area	1 space per 300 square feet of floor area																					



Town of Seabrook  
Planning Board Minutes  
Tuesday, August 19, 2014  
NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

		<b>recorded for alternative parking off-site, so long as the off-site property's potential for expansion is not hindered. Parking is encouraged to be in the rear.</b>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Khan</b>	<b>Approved: Unanimous</b>

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Khan announced that the Assessor had to return \$54,000 to the Yankee Greyhound Dog Track because of a reduced valuation.

Hawkins adjourned the meeting at 9:30PM

Respectfully Submitted

Barbara Kravitz, Secretary  
Seabrook Planning Board