

TOWN OF ERWIN PLANNING BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2015

7 P.M. ERWIN TOWN HALL

310 TOWN CENTER ROAD

Present: Chairman Wayne Kennedy, James McCarthy, Ted Metarko, John Gargano, Patricia Thiel

Absent: Doug Cole, Doug Porter, Matt Maslyn

Guests: David Lineman, Frank Thiel, Dave Iocco, Rita McCarthy, Barb Lucas

CHAIRMAN WAYNE KENNEDY OPENS THE MEETING AT 7:00 PM.

In accordance with the Planning Board's established procedure, the Board will hear all matters up until 9 PM. Any matters not completed by that time will be held over to the next regular meeting. As is the usual practice, the Board's consultants have met with the applicants prior to this meeting and have gone over the applications to ensure that they are as complete as possible and to point out any errors or omissions that can delay approval.

THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2015 MEETING WERE APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

MOTION BY: TED METARKO

SECONDED BY: PATRICIA THIEL

DISPOSITION: 5-0

1. APPLICATION FROM BEARTOWN ALLIANCE CHURCH FOR A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT TO CONSTRUCT A GRAVEL OVERFLOW PARKING LOT 120' x 98' AT 21 BEARTOWN ROAD. WITH PUBLIC HEARING.

POINTS TO CONSIDER:

The project is located in an R-10 Residential zone.

The applicant seeks to install an overflow, gravel parking lot, approximately 120' X 98" to park an additional 30 cars. There are currently 32 parking spaces. This project will also include placing a 2' berm with plantings between the new parking area and the tree line that separates it from the adjacent house on Mill Street.

Applicant to provide info on types of plantings

Applicant to provide # of parking spaces in current, primary, paved lot

Criteria:

Required:

Proposed:

Parking Spaces

1 per each 6 seats of sanctuary
400 seats = 67 seats

62 + main parking lot

David Lineman, Trustee for the Beartown Alliance Church presented the application. He noted there is an existing paved lot with 90 parking spots and an existing gravel lot with 30 parking spots. The Church would like to expand the gravel lot by 30 spaces to accommodate a total of 60 vehicles. The existing gravel lot was built with 18" bank run gravel topped with 6" finer gravel. Current parking, including both paved and gravel, allows for one or two empty spaces for visitors when 10-15 Church members park at the Erwin Valley School.

The Church plans to build a berm between the parking area and a house on Mills Avenue. Five foot Norwegian Pines would be planted on the berm.

Regarding runoff, Mr. Lineman indicated that water from the gym roof currently drains on the existing gravel lot with no standing water.

Chairman Kennedy read comments prepared by Robert Drew, acting engineer for the Town. Engineer Drew indicated a slight concern for storm water runoff reaching surrounding properties due to the total size of the proposed parking area and the fact that gravel tends to become impervious to water when compacted. He indicated that the depth of gravel in the proposed expansion should provide for enough storm water storage to capture the water until it can penetrate the ground without overflow. He noted that the Church should do infiltration tests in the proposed area. He recommends a minimum of 6" crushed gravel, or deeper, if pavement with asphalt is a possibility in the future. Engineer Drew requests the Church provide a statement of the depth of the gravel and a map indicating the locations of a minimum of three onsite infiltration test sites. The test sites should be dug to a minimum of 6" below the proposed gravel layer. He also requests that if the Church plans to expand the lot further, or pave the area with asphalt in the future, then a survey and engineer plan for storm water collection should be provided to the Town for approval.

Mr. Lineman indicated that the existing gravel lot design was already approved and exceeds the proposed minimum 6" layer of gravel.

THE PLANNING BOARD DECLARES THE APPLICATION TO BE COMPLETE.

PLANNING BOARD REVIEWS THE EAF:

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM (EAF) – Part 2 – Impact Assessment

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? | NO |
| 2. Will the proposed action result in a change in use or intensity of use of land? | NO |
| 3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? | NO |
| 4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? | NO |
| 5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? | NO |
| 6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? | NO |
| 7. Will the proposed action impact existing: | |
| a. public / private water supplies? | NO |
| b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities? | NO |
| 8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? | NO |
| 9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)? | NO |
| 10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? | NO |
| 11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? | NO |

THE PLANNING BOARD DECLARES ITSELF LEAD AGENCY AND MAKES AND PROPERLY FILES A NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE.

MOTION BY: PATRICIA THIEL

SECONDED BY: JAMES McCARTHY

DISPOSITION: 5-0

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY OPENS THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:14 PM.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY CLOSSES THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:14 PM.

UPON HEARING NO APPLICABLE ADVERSE COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC, THE PLANNING BOARD APPROVES THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT WITH A CONDITION OF APPROVAL THAT IF THE CHURCH IS PLANNING ON PAVING ANY OF THE GRAVEL AREA IN THE FUTURE, IT WILL BE NECESSARY TO RETURN TO THE PLANNING BOARD FOR AN AMENDMENT FOR ENGINEERING AND DRAINAGE STUDY COMPLIANCE. THE CHURCH MUST ALSO PROVIDE A STATEMENT INDICATING THE DEPTH OF THE GRAVEL AND A MAP INDICATING A MINIMUM OF THREE ONSITE INFILTRATION TEST SITES.

MOTION BY: PATRICIA THIEL

SECONDED BY: JOHN GARGANO

DISPOSITION: 5-0

2. SUBDIVISION/RESUBDIVISION APPLICATION FROM COOPERS PLAINS LONG ACRES FIRE DEPARTMENT TO COMBINE TWO LOTS AND ADD A PORTION OF A 3RD LOT AT 204 MAIN STREET. WITH PUBLIC HEARING.

POINTS TO CONSIDER:

The project is located in an R12.5 zone.

In the first resubdivision, the Campbell-Erwin Baptist Church has already transferred 0.189 acres (Parcel B on the Hallett Map dated May 31, 2007) to the CPLA Fire Department. This action addressed existing encroachments of Fire Department structures onto Church property. The subdivision of Parcel B from the Church’s main lot, Parcel A was never approved by the Town of Erwin Planning Board.

In 2002, the CPLA Fire Department bought the lot on the west, adjacent to the existing Fire Station lot. The CPLA Fire Department wishes to combine this pre-existing west lot to their lot. The non-conforming setbacks and encroachments are pre-existing and cannot be cured with this subdivision. The CPLA plans to seek at site plan amendment to expand the existing firehouse onto this adjacent lot. IT is anticipated that such site plan will include demolition of all existing buildings on the west lot.

Therefore, the present resubdivision action will subdivide off Parcel B from the Church and resubdivide both Parcel B and the adjacent west lot into a single lot for the Fire Department.

Criteria:	Required:	Proposed:
Lot size	25,000 sq ft	Church 53,970 sq ft Combined CPLA 39,940 sq ft
Lot width	200’ max	Church 194.25’ Combined CPLA 169.5’
Setbacks		
Front	35’	No change from existing
Side	20’	Church 23.6’ Combined CPLA 72.2’*
* Cures existing non-conformity		
Rear	50’	Church 150’± Combined CPLA ** 16’

** Pre-existing, non-conforming, building was encroaching on Church property. This application makes the property more conforming but no opportunity to cure.

Applicant should provide a signed, stamped survey of the entire, combined CPLA parcel.

Member Matt Maslyn recused himself from proceedings for this application.

Dave Iocco, Engineer for the Fire Department, presented the application. He addressed the five items requested in the preplanning meeting: The EAF was corrected; the site plan now includes a preliminary drawing indicating the location of the building on the combined parcel; Patrick Moore has been hired and started the requested survey of the combined parcel; it was determined that the old buildings on the combined lot will be removed; review of the setback indicates that it is still nonconforming, but by a small amount; and he was unable to locate a stamped drawing of the property to the west of the Fire Department property.

Engineer Iocco noted that the Fire Department is acquiring a much larger fire truck and would like to enlarge the building to house it.

Rita McCarthy noted that a stamped survey of the combined parcel must be submitted to, and signed, by the Planning Board. The parcel should then be filed with the county within 62 days of the signing.

THE PLANNING BOARD DECLARES THE APPLICATION TO BE COMPLETE.

PLANNING BOARD REVIEWS THE EAF:

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM (EAF) – Part 2 – Impact Assessment

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? | NO |
| 2. Will the proposed action result in a change in use or intensity of use of land? | NO |
| 3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? | NO |
| 4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? | NO |
| 5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? | NO |
| 6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? | NO |
| 7. Will the proposed action impact existing: | |
| a. public / private water supplies? | NO |
| b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities? | NO |
| 8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? | NO |
| 9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)? | NO |
| 10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? | NO |
| 11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? | NO |

RESOLUTION TO CLASSIFY THIS AS AN UNLISTED ACTION BECAUSE IT IS A NONRESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF LESS THAN TEN ACRES, DECLARE THE PLANNING BOARD LEAD AGENCY AND MAKE A NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE.

**MOTION BY: JAMES McCARTHY
DISPOSITION: 5-0**

SECONDED BY: JOHN GARGANO

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY OPENS THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:28 PM.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY CLOSSES THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:29 PM.

UPON HEARING NO APPLICABLE ADVERSE COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC, THE PLANNING BOARD APPROVES THE SUBDIVISION CONTINGENT UPON SUBMISSION OF A SIGNED, STAMPED SURVEY OF THE ENTIRE, COMBINED PARCEL.

**MOTION BY: TED METARKO
DISPOSITION: 5-0**

SECONDED BY: PATRICIA THIEL

RESOLUTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING

**MOTION BY: JAMES McCARTHY
DISPOSITION: 5-0**

SECONDED BY: JOHN GARGANO