

Town of Scarborough

Planning Board

Tuesday, April 22, 2008

MINUTES

Members Present

Staff

Mr. Callahan  
Mr. Fellows  
Ms. Littlefield  
Mr. Thomas

Mr. Bacon, Town Planner  
Mr. Chace, Assistant Town Planner  
Ms. Logan, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order

Mr. Fellows called the meeting to order at 7:00 P. M.

2. Roll Call

The Recording Secretary called the roll; Messrs. Chamberlain and Paul were absent. Mr. Fellows welcomed Jeffrey Thomas to the Board and authorized him to vote.

3. Approval of Minutes (March 31, 2008)

Ms. Littlefield moved to approve the minutes of March 31, 2008; Mr. Callahan seconded.

Voted 4-0

4. The Planning Board will hold a public hearing to receive input regarding a Contract Zoning Agreement with Broadturn Farm, LLC and to consider preliminary site plan review

Mr. Bacon stated that this was a site plan going through the Contract Zone process following a joint meeting between the Planning Board and the Town Council. He stated that there was a variety of activities such as weddings, construction of a small commercial kitchen, the building of cabins and raising pigs. Mr. Bacon stated that the applicant also wanted to run a farm day camp, for which they needed parking and an access. He stated that there needed to be a public hearing and site plan review for preliminary site plan approval, followed by the Town Council process for a Contract Zone.

Mr. Chace explained that parking was one of the prevalent issues for the 17 planned events this summer, but the parking regulations did not give a precise number for these uses; he stated that the staff used the figures for theaters, churches and auditoriums for 200 people and added ten spaces for caterers for a total of 60 spaces. He stated that staff did not think a full traffic analysis was necessary. Mr. Chace stated that there were notes about the cabins and he would meet with the applicant and the Code Enforcement Officer to discuss life safety codes.

Mr. John Bliss, of Broadturn Farm, noted that the Scarborough Land Trust, their landlord, was a co-applicant in this project. He explained that he and Stacy Brenner had been running the farm for one season and had gotten permission for that season for a summer farm camp and a few events. He stated that their primary operation was organic vegetable gardening as a co-op for which members volunteered and purchased vegetables, chickens and eggs. He stated that they had a few cows, sheep and needed approval for up to 20 pigs. He stated that their education program was very popular. Mr. Bliss noted that the pigs' shelter was moved around so there was no buildup of manure.

Mr. Bliss stated that the farm camp was their second largest operation from mid-June to mid-August. He stated that they were also requesting the use of cabins to house their farm interns. He stated that the barns were being renovated. Mr. Bliss stated that the reason for the Contract Zone was to hold weddings and other events, raising pigs, housing interns in the cabins, the farm camp, and construction of a commercial kitchen. He stated that this project followed the Comprehensive Plan and they were grateful for the support they had received so far.

Mr. Fellows opened the public hearing. No one spoke for or against the project. Mr. Fellows closed the public hearing.

Mr. Callahan asked the location of the kitchen and whether the septic system could handle the amount of people onsite; Ms. Brenner replied that there was a very large tank because the former tenants intended to produce goat cheese. Ms. Brenner stated that the kitchen would be in an existing building separate from the house. She stated that last summer they had 32 children and used the three bathrooms in the house but would have portapotties with outside sinks in the future. She stated that it would not make sense to have permanent facilities for the eight to 10 weeks they would be used. To a question from Mr. Callahan, Ms. Brenner replied that they rented the farm and the revenues from the various ventures were theirs.

At the request of Ms. Littlefield, Ms. Brenner showed 12 parking spaces along their access road with two other parking areas for 41 and 46 cars respectively, for a total of 99 ten by twenty foot parking spaces; she stated that there was a dropoff area for children. Ms. Brenner stated that they were concerned about traffic in and out of Broadturn Road so they are using their gravel access road from Hanson Road. Mr. Bliss stated that they envisioned service vehicles to use their driveway where there was plenty of space; he stated that there was an access road to the event building. Ms. Littlefield stated that she agreed with waiving the traffic study.

Mr. Fellows noted that there was an outpouring of support at the public hearing held by the Town Council. He stated that he also favored waiving the traffic analysis. Mr. Fellows stated that preliminary site plan approval by the Board would trigger the next step for the Contract Zone with the Town Council.

Mr. Fellows moved that, pursuant to the provisions of the Town of Scarborough Zoning Ordinance, Section II (2) b. the Planning Board finds that the application meets the standards of the Site Plan Review Ordinance and therefore grants preliminary, provisional approval of the plans, subject to enactment of the Contract Zoning Amendment by the Town Council, with the condition that, prior to final site plan approval the applicant shall demonstrate that the site can adequately accommodate the requisite number of parking spaces (staff recommends 60 parking spaces). Mr. Callahan seconded.

Voted 4-0

5. Southborough, Peter Anastos requests final approval for restaurant development on Lot 200 on site off Payne Road

Mr. Bacon noted that, at this point, the applicant did not have DEP approval so this would be a discussion for final approval and there could be a consent item on the agenda following receipt of that document. He stated that there was a staff memo from Mr. Chace regarding tactile strips at tip downs and questions raised in Mr. Bray's memo. Mr. Bacon stated that the Board had copies of the DOT permit.

Mr. Al Palmer, of Gorrill-Palmer, stated that they had received an indication from the DEP that the final permit was being drafted. He stated that they met with the Fire Department and changed some of the driveway radii. He stated that they added pedestrian access between Phases 1 and 2A with a crosswalk to connect to the sidewalk to the hotel for a direct connection as well as the hotel on the other side of South-

borough Drive; he stated that there was a sidewalk to connect to the restaurant and a pedestrian access to Phase 2B if it does not become a restaurant site. Mr. Palmer stated that the freestanding sign was approved with Phase 1; he stated that the impact fees would be paid and engineering peer review had been completed. He stated that they would address Mr. Bray's concerns. He stated that they showed the right turn lane from Payne Road in accordance with Mr. Bray's request and pedestrian connections across Payne Road and Southborough Drive. Mr. Chace noted that the Fire Department's concerns had been satisfied.

Mr. Joe Delaney, of Whipple-Callender Architects, stated that this was a 7,300 square foot building, slab on grade, with an 800 square foot exterior paved area. He stated that there would be a parking lot near the kitchen area for employees and services. Mr. Delaney stated that there was a tank room and a lounge and a bar with limited seating as well as the restaurant area and a small retail space with its own entrance. He stated that the exterior of the building would be two colors of vinyl siding; he displayed the elevations and a lot of plantings. He stated that the building would have a stone base and there would be awnings and raised roofs to hide the mechanicals.

Mr. Tony Coles, of Carroll Associates, stated that there would be berming with evergreens and deciduous trees and shrubs on the west side, and there would be a retention pond with plants on the south side. He stated that there would be screening at the kitchen parking area and low foundation plantings at the façade and in the islands in the main parking lot.

To a question from Ms. Littlefield, Mr. Chace replied that the staff was satisfied with the landscaping in lieu of the parking space size which had been addressed as part of peer review. To a question from Ms. Littlefield, Mr. Palmer replied that the crosswalk on Payne Road was placed on the south side of the intersection for safety reasons. Ms. Littlefield stated that she had no issues with the project. Mr. Callahan confirmed that there was no sidewalk on either side of Southborough Drive; he stated that it seemed that, with two big hotels there should be a sidewalk. Mr. Bacon stated that there was a sidewalk connecting to Southborough Drive and there would be a crosswalk so the sites would be linked. Mr. Palmer stated that there would be a sidewalk along Payne Road and a pushbutton crosswalk light.

Mr. Fellows noted that the landscaping had been thoughtfully done and the pedestrian connectivity was significantly improved. Mr. Fellows stated that the applicant should return as a Consent Item at the next meeting with the DEP permit, the plan showing tactile warning strips at all tip downs and Mr. Bray's concerns addressed.

##### 5. Scarborough Gallery, LLC requests sketch plan review for retail and restaurant development on Lot 1

Mr. Bacon noted that this site was next to the Texas Roadhouse restaurant. He stated that there were comments from the staff regarding vehicle circulation and parking layout where there were a lot of conflict areas. Mr. Bacon stated that there was a conflict with the sidewalk and the landscaping at Texas Roadhouse so the staff suggested connecting to the Roadhouse sidewalk. Mr. Bacon stated that there were several architectural renderings and staff had worked with the applicant regarding the design standards.

Ms. Littlefield noted that her firm did not have ownership in this project, but did have out of state joint ventures with a portion of the Scarborough Gallery owners; no one had an issue with Ms. Littlefield participating in this item.

Mr. Frank Doherty, who represented Taco Bell, stated that they appreciated working with the staff; he stated that their traditional prototype was what the Town did not want and they were working on those issues. Mr. Al Palmer, of Gorrill-Palmer, showed the location of this site between I-295 and Gallery Boulevard; he stated that there would be a retail building and a restaurant building with the site laid out

for both uses. Mr. Palmer stated that parking along the storefronts with easy access and a little separation to the restaurant, especially with the drive-through, was critical. He stated that they needed eight car lengths for queuing for the drive-through; he noted that the design guidelines did not want drive-throughs to be seen from streets and he did not think anyone driving through the Turnpike tollbooth would notice the drive-through and they felt that the best place for the drive-through was at the back of the building. Mr. Palmer stated that there was a median strip in Gallery Boulevard so there would be right turn in and right turn out only and they created an interconnection with the Texas Roadhouse site. He stated that there was a cumbersome area in the center parking because of the queuing for the drive-through and reducing to two access points would help simplify and maybe more landscaping would mitigate the setback of the building. He noted that there was a deep driveway throat so there should not be conflicts with vehicles backing out of parking spaces; he stated that they would work on organizing the parking lot.

Mr. Palmer stated that they showed pedestrian connection between Texas Roadhouse and the Boulevard to connect to the sidewalk on the roadway. He stated that they may look at widening the sidewalk between the Texas Roadhouse and the Boulevard so the Roadhouse landscaping would not be interrupted. Mr. Palmer stated that the stormwater was approved as part of the subdivision and was shared between the two restaurant lots. He stated that their runoff would be less than that approved because the impervious surface would be less. He stated that traffic was slightly above what was permitted and their figures would be submitted to the DOT and Mr. Bray but they did not expect anything to change other than the impact fees.

Mr. Lou Allevato, architect for the retail building, stated that there would be two to three tenants in the 80 by 60 foot retail building and the storefront would be on the long wall, depending on the tenant. He stated that it would be a wood frame building with a hip style roof where there would be no mechanical equipment. He stated that the building would be white, tan and light blue and there would be decorative light fixtures on the building as well as blade signs for each tenant. Mr. Allevato stated that the building would be 30 feet to the top of the roof and 20 feet to the cornice and they would install gutters and downspouts.

Mr. Dan Whitney, a representative for Taco Bell, stated that this would be one restaurant selling two brands, the second being Kentucky Fried Chicken. He stated that the staff's main issue was the lack of a peaked roof, he stated that they showed two peaks. He stated that they had not initially shown a window and may use a false window on the kitchen side of the building. Mr. Whitney stated that the rear door would be in the front of the building at the side because of the drive-through in the rear. He stated that the front of the building would face Gallery Boulevard and the rear would face I-295. He stated that they had raised the parapet walls to hide the mechanicals.

Mr. Thomas stated that the parking needed a lot of work and the restaurant building should have the fourth window for balance; he stated that the rendering shown was a lot better than the first one. Mr. Callahan agreed that there should be a nonfunctional window for balance. He asked that the whole subdivision with the driveways be shown at the next meeting. To a question from Mr. Callahan, Mr. Palmer replied that the connection to Texas Roadhouse was to give full access to Gallery Boulevard since their access was right in and right out only. Mr. Palmer noted that the developer wanted to limit the number of driveways on the boulevard. Mr. Palmer stated that the dumpsters and deliveries would be at the rear of the building. Mr. Whitney noted that deliveries would be made during the early morning; he stated that the restaurant would be open from 10:00 A.M. to midnight. Mr. Callahan agreed that circulation was an issue.

Ms. Littlefield stated that the intersection from Texas Roadhouse needed to be better designed and the parking looked tight for backing out near the retail building. To a question from Ms. Littlefield, Mr. Palmer replied that there was a lane at the corner where cars at the drive-through could be passed. Ms. Littlefield stated that there should be internal directional signs especially for exiting the site; she agreed

that there should be a fourth window for balance. To a question from Ms. Littlefield, Mr. Whitney replied that there would be dry storage and a large unit with the freezers and refrigerators in the rear.

Mr. Fellows stated that he understood this was driven by the franchise needs; he stated that the circulation needed work and the two uses could be flipped to isolate the drive-through but that would bring it to the front of the building. He stated that the curbcut was existing but if it could be relocated there could be a straight shot into the restaurant use. Mr. Fellows stated that he generally agreed that the sight lines from I-295 were not as important as those from Gallery Boulevard but he would like to see some buffering. He asked that view corridors from each side incorporating the landscaping be shown; he stated that he shared the concerns of the blank wall.

Mr. Fellows stated that he liked the retail building, appreciated the roof approach and thought the blade signs would be an enhancement. He stated that it would be nice to see some brick accent to tie into the other buildings in the subdivision. Mr. Whitney stated that the restaurants liked to show that there was some difference between the brands, but they could make the difference in the colors more subtle. Ms. Littlefield stated that the base stone could be on both sides to tie them together. Mr. Whitney stated that the applicants felt they had given in a lot so this change would be difficult. Mr. Chace noted that one of the provisions in the Architectural Standards was that arbitrary changes in materials or embellishments that were not in keeping with the rest of the building were discouraged.

Mr. Fellows stated that he agreed that there should be a window on the blank wall. He stated that at the next meeting the Board should see lighting, traffic and stormwater clarification, pedestrian movement, signage, landscaping, elevations of view corridors and circulation and parking. He stated that the Board preferred textured paving for sidewalks.

#### 6. Administrative Amendment Report

There were no Administrative Amendments.

#### 7. Town Planner's Report

Mr. Bacon noted that, with some adjustments, the new B-3 Zoning and Performance Standards for High Tech Facilities had been approved by the Town Council.

Mr. Bacon stated that there would be a workshop between the Town Council and the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee regarding the Running Hill Road Study and infrastructure for additional growth in that area. He stated that a discussion of the Growth Management Ordinance was also on that same agenda for Wednesday, April 30, 2008, at 7:00 P. M.

#### 8. Correspondence

Mr. Bacon noted that there was an invitation to a sitewalk at Larrabee Farms on Sunday, April 27, 2008, at 9:00 A. M.

#### 9. Planning Board Comments

Mr. Fellows welcomed Mr. Thomas to the Board.

#### 10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P. M.

