The Brockton Planning Board held a meeting on May 7, 2013 at 7:00 PM in the GAR Room, City Hall. Members present: Wayne McAllister, Susan Nicastro, James McCarthy, Avalon McLaren, and Scott Ford. Also present was Ruthy Andrade (secretary) and Marc Resnick, BRA Director.

1. Endorsement of Plans/ Minutes
(ANR Plans, Subdivision Plans and/or Lot Releases)

Endorsement of Definitive Subdivision – 1093 N. Montello Street (Trout Lane)

Brandon Sullivan said that on November 3, 2010 the Planning Board approved the proposed definitive subdivision of this property. He said he is here tonight to have the Board sign the mylar so that it can be recorded. He said that it is their opinion that they fall under the "Permit Extension Act" Legislation and that the approval is still valid. As per a condition of approval the plan reflects the changes contained in the DPW memo; i.e. pavement markings, signage, curbing and utilities. He said he contacted the DPW on 3/21/13 requested verification of the changes, but to date has received no response. He said the covenant was signed by the property owner and a copy was sent to the office.

Since the members questioned whether or not the "Permit Extension Act" applies in this case and there was not verification from the DPW on file it was agreed to continue the matter to the next meeting.

A motion was properly made (Nicastro), seconded (McCarthy) and unanimously passed to continue this matter to the June meeting.

Family Dollar
Attorney James Burke
Corvo Enterprises (Anthony Rosedo)

Attorney Burke said although the Board granted Site Plan Approval of the project at the last meeting, with the condition that the Board approve the proposed façade of the building. Attorney Burke said he was here tonight with those proposals, copies of which the members have received. The client's preference would be no windows as they need the space for walls; however they are proposing to install "dummy" glass giving the illusion of windows.

Ms. Nicastro said the visual presence will be better if the building faced Main Street. Attorney Burke said the building was originally proposed for Main Street, but all the loading would be from Arch Street and they felt that would be an issue for the neighbors. He said the Ward Councillor has looked at the proposed location and is satisfied with it.

The members were concerned about the look of the building going from south to north down Main Street. They were told that there will be seven to twelve foot arborvitaes covering that side of the building.

Ms. Nicastro said she had a third alternative which included no windows, additional arborvitaes, moving the “blocks” up higher and the red line is to be at the Main St. elevation. She also asked about the cleanup of the site and was told that the tanks are removed and all reporting is up to date with DEP.

After additional discussion by the members of Ms. Nicastro’s proposal the following motion was made:

A motion was properly made (McCarthy), seconded (Nicastro) and unanimously approved to add additional arborvitaes three to four feet apart in distance, there are to be no windows on the Main Street side, the “red line” is to be at the Main Street elevation around the entire building with architectural block up to the “red line” and metal siding above and below the line.

Permission to Return to Zoning Board of Appeals
Amilcar ATA construction
Property Owner: Marcilino

ATA said that he appeared before the Zoning Board of Appeals for permission to add an addition to Mr. xxxx home and were subsequently denied as they submitted inadequate plans (there were an old set of floor plans and a 2007 plot plan). He said they have a new floor plan and a certified site plan.

Ms. Nicastro read into the record under what conditions an applicant can be granted permission to return.

No one spoke in favor of the proposal and Irene Basset an abutter spoke in opposition stating that the addition will violate the set back requirements which require 30 feet in the rear and there will only be 18 feet. Mr. McAllister explained that was the reason he was seeking a variance and was an issue for the Zoning Board.

A motion was properly made (Nicastro), seconded (Ford) and unanimously passed to grant permission to return to the Zoning Board based on the new and different information submitted to the Board.

Site Plan Approval
Property: 1330 Main Street
Applicant: DEC LLC
Representative: Bruce Malcolm, Land Surveys Inc.

Mr. Malcolm said that the plans now reflect a second egress for units 1 through 4; the driveway widened to 14 feet; added the shrubs to screen the residential abutter’s property; they agree to maintain the northerly side driveway width; added sliding doors and two doors that swing onto the sidewalk.

Mr. McCarthy asked if the door could swing in instead of out and asked that a railing be added on the sidewalk for safety reasons.

Public portion was opened and closed with no comments.

BRA Director Marc Resnick said there are still issues that the applicant has not addressed. There was still no photometric plan for the property to show how bright the lights will shine; he said this request was made at prior meetings. He said he is concerned that the proposed juniper bushes will be ruined if used as a snow storage area; Mr. Malcolm said they will reserve two spots for snow clearance in addition to the planting strips. Mr. Resnick said that the front of the building should be kept free of snow because of its proximity to the sidewalk.

A motion was property made (Ford), seconded (Nicastro) and unanimously passed to continue the hearing to the next scheduled meeting.

Site Plan Approval
Property: 76 Campanelli Drive
Applicant:
Representative: Sean Oates, Coneco

Mr. Oates said that the proposal is for a 14,400 square foot addition for warehouse storage to the existing building. He said that several years ago the Board approved a prior 8,000 square foot addition for a dialysis center. He said the addition will be located on the existing concrete pad and is 2,300 square feet smaller than the pad. He said that business has grown 25% since last year and they are predicting additional 10% to 15% growth.

Public portion was opened and closed with no comments.

Henry Nover, Nover-Armstrong Assoc. said that he reviewed the stormwater portion of the project for the Conservation Commission. He said the project is considered a re-development project and complies fully with the state stormwater management regulations. He said as part of the approval the Commission required that the condition of the existing forebay be improved.

A motion was properly made (Ford), seconded (McAllister) and unanimously passed to grant site plan approval of the plan as submitted.

Site Plan Approval
Property: 32 N. Manchester Street
Applicant: Evans Machine
Representative: John Holmgren, JK Holmgren

Mr. Holmgren said Mr. Evans business is growing necessitating an addition to his existing facility. He said that that there were minimal comments from the Technical

Review Board which he has addressed the plan now shows the addition of a sewer cleanout, shows a temporary capping of utilities, and a man hole.

Public portion was opened and closed with no comments.

Mr. Nover said that the 2009 project made improvements to the existing drainage system. He said that the Conservation Commission asked for minor modifications to the existing system for this proposal and was satisfied with the final plan.

A motion was properly made (Ford), seconded (McCarthy) and unanimously passed to grant site plan approval of the plan as submitted.

Site Plan Approval
Property: 35 Manley Street
Applicant: Nissan 24
Representative: Christian Farland,

Mr. Farland said this property abuts Route 24 and the proposal is for a 1,980 square foot addition to the existing building. He said the following revisions were made to the plan per the request of the Technical Review Board: subsurface drainage, roof runoff infiltration, stormwater improvements and parking lot layout to improve traffic circulation. He said green space was also added to the front of the building and the water line was re-routed as it would have run under the proposed addition.

Public portion was opened and closed with no comments.

Mr. Nover said that Conservation did not review the project and the DPW reviewed and approved the stormwater system.

A motion was properly made (McLaren), seconded (McCarthy) and unanimously passed to grant site plan approval of the plan as submitted.