

PLANNING BOARD
Regular Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2021

Members present: Mark M. Schafron/*Chairman*, Robert J. Swartz/*Vice Chairman*, Steve Cormier, Robert J. Bettez, Sr., and Paul A. Cormier/*Members*, and Trevor Beauregard/*Director-City Planner*.

Members absent: *None*

Also present: Chris Coughlin-*City Engineer*, Rozanna Penney-*Heywood Hospital*, William Hannigan-*Hannigan Engineering*, Tom Bovenzi-*Bovenzi & Donovan*, Christine Martines Fucile-*DCDP*, and Steven Rockwood-*Resident (signed attendance sheet on file)*.

ANNOUNCEMENT - Any person may make a video or audio recording of an open session of a meeting, or may transmit the meeting through any medium, subject to reasonable requirements of the Chair as to the number, placement and operation of equipment used so as not to interfere with the conduct of the meeting. Any person intending to make such recording shall notify the Chair forthwith. All Documents referenced or used during the meeting must be submitted in duplicate to the Director of Community Development & Planning pursuant to the Open Meeting and Public Records Law. All documents shall become part of the official record of the meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion to approval Public & Regular Minutes of August 10, 2021.

R. Bettez/P. Cormier.

Vote – All in Favor.

2. NEW BUSINESS:

2.1 *None.*

3. OLD BUSINESS:

3.1 **Site Plan Approval ~ Heywood Hospital Expansion Project**

No further discussion at this time.

3.2 **Special Permit ~ Heywood Hospital Expansion Project**

Mr. Schafron stated he is going to reconvene the public hearing on the Special Permit for Heywood Hospital Expansion project, and explained Peer Review, and review of the Peer Review, and asked where this project stands at this point.

T. Beauregard commented there have been a number of meetings with Fuss & O'Neill, as well as Hannigan Engineering, and noted to Mr. Schafron there is correspondence from each one of those meetings in the meeting packet showing the progress that has been made. In addition, there is a final letter received yesterday from Fuss & O'Neill which outlines a couple matters still outstanding, and have been addressed in the "draft" conditions in the special permit. Further, T. Beauregard understands these matters will be addressed tonight in more detail during the proponent's presentation.

Mr. Hannigan introduced Attorney Tom Bovenzi, as well as Rozanna Penney, both representing Heywood Hospital.

Mr. Hannigan noted since the last meeting, the peer review has been completed, therefore, an updated set of plans were submitted and reviewed again by the peer review reviewer, and as T. Beauregard said, we had a couple of meetings with them.

Mr. Hannigan stated a construction phasing plan was fulfilled, and submitted to both the City Engineer and to the Planning Director/Board, as well as Fuss & O'Neill, and basically all of those comments have been resolved as part of the peer review.

Mr. Hannigan noted his updated letter of August 30, 2021, showing the peer review comments, and his responses in this letter, as well as each comment being "resolved".

First spoke of the silt and sedimentation control plan which has been submitted with regard to cleaning provided for the project. Further, noted Comment #4c requiring a completed copy of the stormwater pollution prevention plan for construction be provided to the City Engineer prior to construction.

There was some confusion on erosion control details they are going to use, so this was clarified in the site plan, as well as the construction phasing plans. Mr. Hannigan noted the first four comments are all about the construction phasing plans which, again, have been submitted and reviewed.

The system for groundwater recharge, as part of the project, provides a drainage system that incorporates underground chambers, and has the ability to infiltrate the surface water after it is being treated, so there is a treatment process that happens both in the catch basin, as well as the water quality unit that grabs the water before it actually goes into chamber system which then will go into the chamber, sit in the stone, and then rise as the storm gets higher, or runs through, then it eventually just drains out through the groundwater.

Also did some test pits in there to verify groundwater depths to prove out the offset requirements relative to stormwater management.

Comment #5 is directed to the proprietary structure, which is a Hydroworks unit. MASTEP Technology Review was included as part of the stormwater compliance documentation to the Planning Department as well as the Peer Reviewer.

Number 6 is mainly about the permitted use on the property relative to a hospital and medical office use in the two zones. The property is split zone with rural to the back, and single family residence at the front, therefore, these elements were reviewed. The Peer Reviewer acknowledged this was part of the ZBA special permits, which, were both approved tonight before this meeting.

The table theory for lot, frontage, and height requirements talks about the maximum lot coverage with impervious area, and noted, what he has done, through the ZBA process, is request they approve the expansion of those elements, and extending those elements to even more impervious than what would be typically allowed in the zones. Mr. Hannigan said T. Beauregard requested he put together a plan, and will submit tonight. This plan takes a look at the entire site, and included the pieces of land that are being leased from the City, as well as an easement included in the overall land area. Also took a look at the open space which is defined as those areas that are not pervious, not rooftop, not paving and parking areas, not allowing sidewalks in landscaped areas. The existing open space numbers do not meet the open space requirement, therefore, trying to acknowledge the fact that the site does not comply with zoning currently, and will not comply with the zoning relative to the impervious areas. Discussed with Attorney Bovenzi, and those elements are being worked out on the ZBA level in their decision.

Comment #8 with regard to snowplowing, the landscape layout plan displays the areas calculating the landscape requirements, as well as the areas of snow storage. The snow storage is addressed by what can be provided within the parking areas which has been added to the site plan. The intention is to show there will be some parking areas that will be taken up during larger storm events for the purpose of temporary snow storage. Further, the snow will be removed after a certain period, possibly a day or so after the storm has ended.

The buffer strips relative to landscaping requirements have been updated on the site plans, as well as the landscape plan. In addition, the landscape plan was updated based upon several of the Abutter comments. Proposing a solid wall fence along the property line, with additional landscaping, as well as additional plantings along the back slope bank. The types of plants are listed on the plan, as well as the grass area that could be used for snow storage. Mr. Schafron inquired about the buffer width. Mr. Hannigan replied, the paving is 21 feet off the front property line, but there is also a few feet between the property line and the sidewalk, but can only count 20 feet because that is what is required. T. Beauregard asked if the vegetation will also be along the guard rail. Mr. Hannigan answered yes.

Mr. Hannigan stated during one of his site walks with the ZBA, they looked at the height requirements for the typical headlight heights of vehicles. The typical guardrail detail has one beam going across, so added a second beam and adjusted the heights to be basically one foot/four inches above the top of curb, and then three feet above the curve. The headlight height is normally around 30-32 inches. This is what will be along the entire frontage area to try to prevent the light from getting through to the neighbors as the vegetation grows in. T. Beauregard asked if there will be anything along the access road. Mr. Hannigan said no, other than vegetation, and on the south side against the abutter, is the solid wall fence extending back to where his garage is. P. Cormier asked what the height of the fence is. Mr. Hannigan believes a six or eight foot fence. Mr. Schafron asked if the fence is composite material. Mr. Hannigan replied yes.

The lighting plan was updated per the site plan requirements, and to reduce the spill on to the neighboring property. The light level in most cases are at zero, with some at 0.1 or 0.2. Mr. Hannigan noted there is some trespass of light onto the sidewalk but not out beyond the street, and not onto the abutter's property. It was noted on the north side of the property, the lights are controlled by motion under the solar panels, and pointed out on the plan the areas talked about to have controlled by motion as well. However, the areas along the entrance of the building in the front, lights would be on all the time.

P. Cormier asked if there will be special parking for the staff from 11 pm to 7 am, with regard to providing lighting. Ms. Penney said that staff does not use the south entrance at night because they work on the floors, and the closest way through the building to the floors is from the main entrance where the large staff parking lot is located. Further, Ms. Penney stated they have not started plans for staff parking, however, thought it would be more convenient to have parking closest to their floors, rather than the south entrance. P. Cormier spoke about the different shifts coming and going, and how parking could become an issue. Mr. Hannigan commented they are looking at the parking area along the drive as being more for employees, as well as an entrance to the building along the sidewalk (*pointed out on plan*), and thought motion lighting beneficial for safety concerns.

Mr. Hannigan confirmed an impact statement was provided to the Planning Director, and asked if there were any comments. T. Beauregard replied no, however, requested a brief analysis on

each one of the items in the impact statement required on the zoning. Mr. Schafron asked T. Beauregard if the points were met to his satisfaction, and T. Beauregard replied yes.

Mr. Hannigan noted stormwater by-law, and noted in the existing conditions plan, there was a manhole (*pointed out location*), that was marked “drain”, but was actually a sewer main, so the peer reviewer questioned where the water was coming from, and where is it going to, therefore clarified it is a sewer line connection. Further, once construction begins, will need to work with the plumbing inspector to determine how they will handle that manhole.

Mr. Hannigan spoke of another question regarding the existing roof drain systems. One was the drainage calculations showed the new roof connection into manhole (pointed on plan), but did not have the connection shown on the plan, so that has been added to the plan. The other question was with regard to whether there was existing roof area in the main building, and if there is an overlap with an existing trailer/prefab unit for the existing MRI. The answer is yes, there is an overlap and is accounted for in this new system.

Mr. Hannigan noted there were some typographical errors on the water shed plans that were both added, as well as requested to add the soils information, and Tc information of the watershed plans, and have been submitted.

T. Beauregard asked again about the roof drainage, and asked if Mr. Hannigan could speak about the existing roof drainage, and not sure of where it actually goes now. Mr. Hannigan explained no one really knows where the existing roof drainage goes. The valid concern the peer reviewer brought up, as well as the City Engineer, is what will happen if we run into an underground roof drain system (*pointed out on plan*), that will need to then connect to (*pointed on plan*). Further, an agreement was made this would be a condition of approval if something is found (*pointed out on plan*), will need to connect to (*pointed out on plan*), and will then figure out what part of the roof it is coming from, as well as check to make sure this system has the capacity to deal with it.

Mr. Hannigan confirmed the lighting and drainage plans have been updated. The only item that needs to be added to the set of plans to complete is the test pit locations, however, a sketch has been provided at this time.

Mr. Hannigan asked if there were any questions. No one from the Board had any further questions.

Mr. Schafron asked thrice if there was any member of the public in favor of this project.

Mr. Schafron asked thrice if there was any member of the public in opposition of this project.

No one from the public spoke.

Mr. Schafron declared the public hearing closed at 7:34 p.m.

3.1 Site Plan Approval ~ Heywood Hospital Expansion Project

Motion to approval Site Plan approval with two conditions prior to issuing a Building Permit:

- 1. Applicant shall receive a Surface Water Protection Overlay District Special Permit from City of Gardner Planning Board.***
- 2. Applicant shall receive all required Special Permit(s) and zoning relief for the project from the City of Gardner Zoning Board of Appeals.***

R. Bettez/R. Swartz.

Vote – All in Favor.

3.2 Special Permit ~ Heywood Hospital Expansion Project

Mr. Schafron first asked if the revisions to the lighting plan met with City Engineer's approval. Mr. Coughlin replied yes.

Mr. Schafron asked the Board if any discussion is needed for the Special Permit.

T. Beauregard noted each Board Member has a copy of the "draft" of Findings and Decision, however has since added to the draft to include the open space review plan that was submitted today.

T. Beauregard read under Decision section, numbers 9, 10, and 11.

Number 9: The Planning Director and City Engineer shall be notified if existing roof drainage is located during the construction process. If it is determined that the existing building drains to the proposed "new" drainage system, drainage calculation shall be revised to ensure the drainage system can accommodate stormwater flow from the existing building(s).

Number 10: A completed copy of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall be provided to the Planning Board for approval by the City Engineer prior to construction. At the Board's discretion, the plan may be further reviewed by the Peer Reviewer. Review and approval should be focused on the following items of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan: *Designation of fuel filling areas should be identified, and a fuel spill kit shall be kept on side at all times in case of a spill. A formalized sequence of operations with dates shall be provided to the Board prior to construction and be incorporated in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. At a minimum, the sequence shall indicate the timing for storm drain and culvert installation, duration of exposure soils, and critical area stabilizations, both temporary and permanent. It shall indicate the date when critical area stabilization, paving, seeding, mulching, or sodding is to be completed.*

Number 11: Per the City of Gardner dimensional requirements defined in Attachment 2 of the Zoning Code, a breakdown of Lot Coverage with Impervious Surface and Open Space Requirements shall be provided to the Board and shown on the Plans indicating conformance with the Code. If conformance cannot be met, the applicant shall request, and be granted the necessary zoning relief by the Zoning Board of Appeals to meet this criteria. *T. Beauregard noted Mr. Hannigan presented the plan tonight and was included in the submittals. T. Beauregard said will wait to see what the ZBA results are from their meeting tonight. Attorney Bovenzi added the ZBA approved tonight. T. Beauregard asked if the approval of the pre-existing non-conforming use include dimensional requirements. Attorney Bovenzi answered yes approved, drafted, and needs to be signed.*

T. Beauregard further noted the annual operation and maintenance reports shall be submitted to the City Engineer within 30 days after completion, and said this is something that is fairly new as part of the City's local storm water permitting requirements. C. Coughlin added per EPA requirements as well.

T. Beauregard also noted all construction activities shall be restricted to weekdays and Saturday between 7:00 am and 5:00 pm. Anything outside of this would need approval by the Building Commissioner 24-hours in advance.

Motion to accept Special Permit with conditions as presented to the Board and read into the record by Mr. Beauregard.

S. Cormier/P. Cormier.

Vote – All in favor.

T. Beauregard asked whether the Applicant has any concerns, or questions with the Conditions as stated. Mr. Hannigan noted No. 6 in the conditions with regard to not being sold, and said it sounds like this would be for a different use other than what is allowed by the Special Permit. Also, the ZBA did 7 am to

5 pm Monday through Friday, and 7 am to Noon on Saturday, however, for consistency, would like both requirements waived. T. Beauregard said he will review and make any necessary changes.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS~~NEWS~~ARTICLES~~EVENTS:

... Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 at 7 p.m.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn.

R. Bettez/R. Swartz.

Vote – All in

favor.

The meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

All documents referenced or used during the meeting are part of the official record and are available in the Department of Community Development and Planning pursuant to the Open Meeting and Public Records Law.