3225 MAIN STREET • P.O. BOX 226
BARNSTABLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02630

(508) 362-3828 • Fax (508) 362-3136 • www.capecodcommission.org

CAPE COD COMMISSION

Minutes
Cape Cod Commission DRI Subcommittee Hearing
True Storage Redevelopment, Bourne (Commission File No. 19014)
June 19, 2019 at 5:00 p.m.
Bourne Community Center
239 Main Street, Buzzards Bay, MA

Subcommittee Members Present: Harold Mitchell (Chair), Charles McCaffrey, Jack McCormack, Richard Roy, and Tom Wilson

A quorum of Subcommittee members present, Mr. Mitchell, the Subcommittee Chair, opened the hearing at 5:00 p.m. by reading the hearing notice. The Subcommittee members introduced themselves.

Mr. Mitchell asked for a presentation on the True Storage Redevelopment project ("Project") at 170 Clay Pond Road in Bourne, MA ("Property") from the applicant.

Atty. Eliza Cox presented on behalf of her client, Clay Pond Acquisitions, LLC ("Applicant"). She used a PowerPoint presentation. She said that the Applicant has the property under agreement. She introduced the Project team, Chris Lewis with the Applicant and Joe Henderson from consultant Horsley Witten. Atty. Cox said that recently she had met informally with the Bourne Planning Board to get feedback on the Project. She reviewed existing conditions (w/aerial photo) of the Project site and described the existing zoning and current development on and around the site. She discussed the Commission's history of permitting for the Property, including the original Development of Regional Impact ("DRI") Decision from 1991 which permitted the existing uses. She mentioned that the 2007 DRI Modification Decision allowed for shared infrastructure with the neighboring multifamily housing use to the south (i.e. a property interconnection/access drive over the site and ability to connect to the neighboring wastewater treatment facility ("WWTF")).

Atty. Cox reviewed photos of the Project site from MacArthur Boulevard and Clay Pond Road to show that the Property (or development on the Property) wasn't particularly visible or visible at all from these roadways. She reviewed photos of the existing site building, pointing out the existing smaller units currently partially occupied by tenants/businesses. She said that the building was primarily occupied in the past by a grocery store use, which is the largest of the building units and currently vacant. She discussed the proposed changes to the building and site, with an illustrative site plan. She discussed the interior and exterior proposed storage spaces/units and discussed details like fencing around the outside storage units. She said that the building changes mimic the existing permitted building design and reviewed the proposed massing of the redeveloped building. She said that all development was in existing structural or impervious footprint. She discussed the sidewalk and landscaping improvements proposed; the proposed changes will create a more attractive streetscape and safer access.

Atty. Cox said that the Project will hook up to the existing WWTF on the neighboring property. This will be beneficial by adding flow to the existing facility (where it is needed) and by reducing nitrogen load from the currently untreated flow from the site. She discussed benefits of the Project. She listed redevelopment; reduction in impervious coverage; reduction in nitrogen load, water use, wastewater flows, and traffic vs. permitted conditions; stormwater enhancements; pedestrian and landscape improvements; the efficiency of sharing infrastructure; reduced energy generation; low impact use; solar panels proposed (the Applicant is working out details); and the Applicant's market study of evidenced demand for such use by Cape Cod residents. She reviewed the local permitting needed for the Project. She said her client agreed with the suggested Conditions set out in the staff report.

The Applicant having concluded its presentation, Mr. Mitchell asked Commission staff for comments.

Kristen Clothier, Commission staff, presented and summarized the written staff report for the Subcommittee. She said that Commission staff reviewed the Project primarily through the lens of redevelopment and adaptive re-use, which greatly influenced RPP consistency review and limited many areas of potential regional concern. She discussed neighboring development and the Cape Cod context 'Placetypes' from the RPP. She cited the letter received from the Town planning staff, and its recommendation that the Project is consistent with local development bylaws. The letter cited several suggested Project benefits as well.

Ms. Clothier gave an overview of Commission staff's review relative to the DRI standards of approval, including applicable and material RPP issue areas (water resources, community design, transportation, energy, and economy). She said Commission staff suggest that, subject to Conditions the Commission deems necessary, the Project is consistent with RPP goals and objectives deemed applicable and material in light of the observations outlined in the staff report. She highlighted key aspects of the staff report; additional details were included in the staff report itself which was posted in advance of the hearing.

Ms. Clothier reviewed proposed stormwater and wastewater management for the Project. She discussed building design, including existing screening of the site from public roadways. She discussed the improved streetscape of the access drive, which is essentially an extension of "Harmony Hill Road" to Clay Pond Road. She discussed the suggested lack of regional impacts, especially in terms of natural resources. She discussed the lower vehicle trip generation vs. permitted conditions – as a result, no mitigation work/infrastructure is required. She discussed energy efficiency and generation features (including solar panels) – the energy demand will be lower than the former supermarket use. She concluded by discussing the RPP issue area of economy: she discussed the adaptive re-use of the building on an underutilized commercial site. She discussed how the existing small retail units totaling 12,200 sq. ft. will be retained.

Ms. Clothier also reviewed probable benefits of the Project, similar to those cited by Atty. Cox. She stated staff's recommendation that the Subcommittee direct staff to prepare a favorable draft Decision for further Subcommittee review, containing Conditions of approval as outlined in the written staff report.

Mr. Mitchell took questions and comments from the Subcommittee members.

Mr. McCaffrey: If the Commission approved the Project, would it be harder to permit retail in the future at the site?

Draft 7/11/19

Jon Idman, Commission staff, responded that approval might make permitting for additional retail at the site in the future more challenging, but he added that it would really depend on the circumstances present in any given matter.

Mr. McCormack: How long has the former grocery store unit been vacant?

Mr. Lewis, with the Applicant team, responded between 5 and 10 years.

Mr. Mitchell opened public comment.

Mr. Bartlett, 20 Laura Lane (which road is immediately to the west of the Property), said as a neighbor he is concerned with exterior lighting and with impacts on his neighborhood. He also asked whether the Applicant had the entire property under agreement.

Mr. Lewis said that existing lighting was being replaced with downlit LED lighting, and that the proposed activities were in the easterly portion of the site, away from the portion of the site closer to Laura Lane. He said the Applicant was looking to acquire the entire Property.

Sandra Goldstein said that she is a Bourne Planning Board member *(Note: she appeared to be speaking in her individual capacity)*. She asked several questions: What are the proposed hours of operation for the storage facility? Does Stop and Shop retain a lease? What is the legal status of Harmony Hill Road? She also commented that she understands that the market for retail development is challenging, but that she would like to see a project on the site that she thinks would provide greater community benefits.

Mr. Lewis said that the storage hours would be "standard," approximately 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m., with a Property manager on-site during this timeframe, but storage tenants would have individual access to units at other times as well.

Jane Henzie, 18 Laura Lane, said that she is concerned about noise and traffic. She said the Property has been vacant and hasn't been used that often. Storage tenants could come at any time of day or night. She is worried about security. She thinks that there will be sounds late at night. She said that there is a wood fence separating the Property from others in her neighborhood that needs repair. She said to keep residents in mind during Project construction and operation.

Mr. Mitchell, seeing no others from the public who wanted to provide testimony, took further questions and comments from the Subcommittee.

Mr. Roy: Is there any landscaping proposed between the Property and Laura Lane?

Mr. Lewis responded that there is no additional landscaping proposed along the western property line. The Project is really located in the easterly portion of the site. There is additional landscaping proposed to screen the outdoor storage units. He confirmed that a landscaping plan was included in the DRI application. He clarified the location of the wood fence Ms. Henzie referenced and stated that the Applicant could repair or replace it.

Mr. McCaffrey: What is the useful life of storage facilities?

Draft 7/11/19

Mr. Lewis discussed that self-storage is at the higher end today, including climate control as proposed. He said that accordingly, a storage developer makes a greater initial, long-term investment, and that there is really no 'end' of useful life for such facilities.

Mr. McCormack added that based on his personal experience, there is very little regular vehicle traffic associated with self-storage and infrequent visits by tenants.

Mr. Wilson said that he thinks the Project is a good redevelopment and use of the property.

Mr. Mitchell discussed with his fellow members and Commission staff the next steps in the review: he discussed directing staff to prepare a favorable, draft DRI Decision, with Conditions as referenced in the staff report, for the Subcommittee's further review.

Mr. Idman stated that staff could include, as a Finding in the draft Decision, a recommendation that the Town consider replacement of the wood fence along the western property line, as discussed during the hearing. The Subcommittee agreed that this was a good approach to the issue.

Mr. Mitchell motioned to direct staff to so prepare a draft favorable DRI Decision for its further review. Mr. McCormack seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Mitchell motioned to continue the Subcommittee hearing to Wednesday July 17, 2019, 5:30 p.m., Cape Cod Commission offices, 3225 Main Street Barnstable, MA 02630. Mr. McCormack seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

The hearing concluded at 5:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____ _____

Harold Mitchell
Subcommittee Chair

Date

Draft 7/11/19