



**CITY OF NEW BEDFORD**  
JONATHAN F. MITCHELL, MAYOR

**PLANNING BOARD**  
City Hall, Room 303  
133 William Street,  
New Bedford, MA 02740  
(508) 979-1488  
[www.newbedford-ma.gov](http://www.newbedford-ma.gov)

Registry of Deeds/City Clerk Use Only:

CITY CLERKS OFFICE  
NEW BEDFORD, MA  
2018 JUN 27 P 1:15  
CITY CLERK

## NOTICE OF DECISION

Case Number:	18-29			
Request Type:	Site Plan for a New Ground Sign			
Address:	387 Church Street			
Zoning:	Industrial B Zoning District			
Recorded Owners:	BRK 1, LLC			
Owner Address:	31100 Telegraph Road, Suite 250 Bingham Farms, MI 48025			
Applicant:	STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc.			
Applicant Address:	226 Causeway Street Boston, MA 02114			
<b>Application Submittal Date</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date(s)</b>	<b>Decision Date</b>		
May 14, 2018	June 13, 2018	June 13, 2018		
Assessor's Plot Number	Lot Number(s)	Book Number	Page Number	Certificate Number
113	475	12396	236	

**Application:** STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc. (226 Causeway Street Boston, MA) on behalf of BRK 1, LLC (31100 Telegraph Road, Suite 250 Bingham Farms, MI) for a New Ground Sign Site Plan approval on a 4.13+ acre site, located at 387 Church Street (Map 113 Lot 475) in an Industrial B [IB] zoned district.

**Action:** GRANTED, WITH CONDITIONS, as described in section four (4).

A copy of this decision was filed with the City Clerk of the City of New Bedford on June 27, 2018. Any person aggrieved by this decision for Site Plan Approval has twenty (20) days to appeal the decision in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 8 of Chapter 40A of the General Laws of Massachusetts and Section 5490B of the City of New Bedford Site Plan Review Ordinance.

6/27/2018  
Date

Kathryn Duff, Chair  
City of New Bedford Planning Board

## **1) APPLICATION SUMMARY**

STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc. (226 Causeway Street Boston, MA) on behalf of BRK 1, LLC (31100 Telegraph Road, Suite 250 Bingham Farms, MI) for a New Ground Sign Site Plan approval on a 4.13+ acre site, located at 387 Church Street (Map 113 Lot 475) in an Industrial B [IB] zoned district.

## **2) MATERIALS REVIEWED BY THE PLANNING BOARD**

### **Plans Considered to be Part of the Application**

- ❑ Plan Set- Self-Storage Facility – 387 Church Street, New Bedford, Massachusetts; Owner: BRK 1, LLC, dated May 11, 2018; date stamped received by City Clerk's Office May 14, 2018. Plans were prepared by Stantec, in Boston, MA and stamped by Frank Holmes, PE; including:
  - Sheet 1 Cover Sheet
  - Sheet 2 Context Plan
  - Sheet 3 Existing Conditions Plan, drawn by Precision Land Surveying, Inc., dated April 2, 2017
  - Sheet 4 Site Preparation Plan
  - Sheet 5 Layout and Materials Plan
  - Sheet 6 Grading and Drainage Plan
  - Sheet 7 Utility Plan
  - Sheet 8 Landscaping Plan
  - Sheet 9 Site Details
  - Sheet 10 Site Details 2
  - Sheet 11 Utility Details
  - Sheet 12 Lighting Plan
- ❑ Architectural plan set materials - Self-Storage Facility 387 Church Street, New Bedford, Massachusetts, dated May 11, 2018, date stamped received by City Clerk's Office May 14, 2018 prepared by Groundwork, LTD, in Buffalo Grove, IL.; including:
  - Sheet A5-0 Building Elevations (East & North)
  - Sheet A5-1 Building Elevations (West & South)
  - Unnumbered Preliminary Site/ First Floor Plan
  - Unnumbered Preliminary Second Floor Plan
  - Unnumbered Preliminary Color Elevations
- ❑ Signage plan set materials – Proposed Signage Self-Storage Facility 387 Church Street, New Bedford, Massachusetts, dated May 9, 2018, prepared by Groundwork, LTD, in Buffalo Grove, IL.; including:
  - Preliminary Sign Plan
  - Preliminary Sign Elevation
  - Proposed Signage

### **Other Documents and Supporting Materials**

- ❑ Site Plan Review Application For New Ground Sign, stamped received by City Clerk's Office May 16, 2018
- ❑ Certified Abutters List
- ❑ Bristol County (S.D) Registry of Deeds Book 12396, Page 236;
- ❑ Department of Planning, Housing & Community Development Staff Report dated June 13, 2018
- ❑ Department of Planning, Housing & Community Development Amended Staff Report dated June 13, 2018
- ❑ Department of Public Infrastructure (DPI) Comments dated June 12, 2018

### **3) DISCUSSION**

Board Members Kathryn Duff, Arthur Glassman, Peter Cruz, Alexander Kalife, and George Smith were in attendance at the June 14, 2018 meeting. Acting City Planner Kirsten Bryan and Staff Planner Jennifer Carloni were present during the discussion.

Cases #18-27, 18-28, and 18-29 all pertained to the same project located at 387 Church Street, therefore the board decided to hold the public hearings concurrently.

Mr. Frank Holmes, STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc. (226 Causeway Street Boston, MA) began the presentation on behalf of BRK 1, LLC. Mr. Holmes indicated that the following individuals were also present with him: Mr. Mike Kennedy representing Cube Smart; Mr. David Whitmar, the architect on the project; and Mr. Brad Johnson, a project engineer from STANTEC.

Mr. Holmes oriented the board using an aerial image and explained the existing site conditions. He detailed that the site features an existing building located on a four acre site. The site most recently housed a luxury blind manufacturing business. The site has vehicular access via two curb cuts on Church Street. The building takes up a majority of the site, while the remainder is predominantly paved with the exception of a few landscaped areas and a grassy area on the south side of the site, Mr. Holmes explained. He noted the locations of the existing storm water sheets over the sidewalk and the driveway entrances to Church Street, and into the municipal system. Mr. Holmes noted there are two existing catch basins on-site; the catch basins and roof leaders are connected to the municipal system. He informed the board there is a high ground water level on-site. Mr. Holmes then turned the presentation over to Mr. Brad Johnson, STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc. (226 Causeway Street Boston, MA).

Mr. Johnson presented the proposed site conditions. He detailed that the existing building would remain. The roof would be raised approximately six (6') feet in select areas of the structure to create a second story, but there would be no change in the footprint of the building. Mr. Johnson explained that the interior of the building would feature 1,200 storage units. The proposal, he explained, improves green space and storm water management by removing a substantial amount of the existing parking, adding grassy areas, and installing two bio-retention basins. The proposal maintains the two existing curb cuts on Church Street. The only grade changes proposed are those that lead to the loading bay areas; these areas would be graded so allow customers to drive their vehicles into the interior loading/unloading area. Mr. Johnson explained that other existing grades on-site would be maintained and continue to slope towards Church Street, he explained. The bituminous sidewalk in front of the site (east) would be replaced with a concrete sidewalk with granite curbing, grass ribbon, and flowering pear trees. Mr. Johnson detailed that a water meter pit would be filled and the meter would be moved to the building. He also noted that the lighting on-site would include 22.5' pole mounted lights and wall pack lighting. All fixtures would have a zero up-lighting measure. Snow removal would be in the grassed area in front of the building. No snow storage would be in the bio-retention basins.

Mr. Johnson explained the applicant was seeking a special permit for a reduction in the parking requirements. He explained that the applicant has many facilities throughout the country. Based on the activity at their other locations, the applicant believed the proposal for nine (9) parking spaces would be sufficient for the proposed use. Mr. Johnson detailed that the business would usually have two employees on-site.

Mr. Johnson noted that the existing pylon sign would be removed. A new sign would be installed which would meet the zoning dimensional requirements. He added that the sign plan would be revised to have the sign setback six feet (6') as required within the city's zoning ordinance.

Chair Duff asked Mr. Johnson if he received the DPI comments, particularly as they relate to the drainage. Mr. Johnson reiterated that the proposal significantly improves the stormwater conditions on-site over the existing conditions. He explained the project results in a 40% reduction of the existing storm water runoff. Mr. Johnson further detailed that replacement of the roof drainage pipes or installation of underground storage tanks would be difficult to due to a high water table. He noted the application included a waiver request for a stormwater management report.

Mr. Johnson then turned over the presentation to the project architect, Mr. David Whitmar (317 W. Dundee Road Buffalo Grove, IL). Mr. Whitmar explained that the existing building has three segments. He stated that the original building was expanded twice for different uses at the site over time. Mr. Whitmar informed the board that an earlier iteration of the plans as submitted proposed additional buildings on-site. However, in order to meet the environmental requirements, the project team decided to add height to the existing building in lieu of additional structures. In response to a question from the board, Mr. Whitmar confirmed that the building would have two elevators on the interior, with key pad entry at each exterior door. He explained that the four (4) garage bays would have high speed glass doors with enough width and height to easily accommodate a typical rental truck.

Mr. Whitmar pointed to the plans to show the board how customer vehicles would enter into the interior loading areas. He clarified that customers would drive into a loading area, park their vehicles, retrieve a rolling cart to unload belongings onto, and then cart their items to their storage units.

In response to a question from Board Member Cruz, Mr. Whitmar explained that floor drains with oil water separators are not proposed in the loading areas, as the floor has to be flat in order to prevent the rolling carts from rolling to the drain area. Mr. Whitmar added that the business currently utilizes a special kind of floor vacuum to sweep up any water, snow, or other elements left behind from vehicles at other site locations. He confirmed that carbon monoxides detectors and venting would be incorporated in the loading areas.

In response to a question from the board, Mr. Whitmar confirmed that customers would be required to sign a contract which would prohibit items such as explosives from being stored in the units. Mr. Whitmar stated that employees would park in front of the building in two (2) of the proposed nine (9) parking spaces.

Board Member Smith questioned the amount of parking proposed. Mr. Smith noted that the proposal would require 435 parking spaces per the city's zoning ordinance, and instead, the applicant proposes nine (9) parking spaces, therefore requesting a reduction of more than 400 parking spaces. Mr. Smith noted he was in favor of all the additional landscaping the plan provided, but asked if more parking could be designated on the paved areas on the site plan.

Mr. Whitmar explained that the existing ordinance does not have specific parking requirement for self-storage facilities, therefore in New Bedford this type of project would fall into a catch-all category that requires much more parking than is required for the use. Mr. Whitmar noted that other communities which have specific parking requirements for self-storage facilities have much lower parking requirements. He reiterated that the company has many locations throughout the country, and given the parking needs and

patterns at the additional locations, the applicant expressed confidence in the number of parking spaces included within the proposal.

Chair Duff noted that the board has not seen many self-storage facilities proposals; however, the board recently heard a case that was also for a self-storage facility located at 91 Cove Street. Chair Duff noted that the 91 Cove Street storage facility project proposed 910 units and 73 parking spaces. Chair Duff also explained that the project was required to have 620 spaces due to the size of the building, which was larger than the current project before the board. She offered that the 91 Cove Street case proposal provided 12% of the required number of parking spaces, or 8% of the number of storage units proposed. The case before the board, 387 Church Street, for comparison, proposes 2% of the required number of parking spaces or 1% of the number of storage units proposed, said Chair Duff. She noted that the number of parking spaces within the 387 Church Street proposal is much less than what was previously approved by the board for the 91 Cove Street storage facility proposal. Chair Duff questioned why paved areas on the site plan proposed for overflow parking were not marked as such. She also explained that the 91 Cove Street proposal provided data to the Planning Board pertaining to their other facilities, and asked if the applicant had such information. Mr. Whitmar offered that the project narrative provided in the application packet addressed the expected number of trips and stated that the applicant could provide more detailed information if required.

Chair Duff inquired about the intention for the gray, paved area shown on the plans (as depicted in the presentation) which would remain unchanged from the existing conditions. Mr. Whitmar explained that it is expensive to remove all the paved areas, and explained that the portion of the existing pavement in question would be left untouched. The proposed resurfaced areas would be feathered into this existing paved section, said Mr. Whitmar.

The board and the applicant's representatives discussed the possibility of creating additional parking spaces to the gray, paved area in question. It was noted the area is approximately 30' wide by 200' in length and therefore, could host additional parking. After discussion between the board and the project representatives, it was agreed that the applicant would provide fifteen (15) additional parking spaces, bringing the total number of on-site parking spaces to twenty-four (24). One of the project representatives requested a fifty foot (50') buffer space on each end/side of this parking area to allow ample turning radius for vehicular and fire fighting apparatus movements through the site; the board was amenable to the request.

The board inquired about the landscaping plan and noted the plans typically include full details and specify species of plants and caliper of trees. The board indicated that a complete landscape plan would need to be submitted to Planning Staff for review prior to final approval.

The board and the applicant's representatives discussed the proposed site drainage in relation to the DPI comments. The board inquired about the catch basin height, the soil detail for the bio-retention area, and also asked project representatives if there would be any gravel or pretreatment areas before the water reached the basins. The board also noted that runoff would still drain out through the driveway. The applicant agents clarified that the catch basin rim should be 6" higher than the bottom of bio-retention basin. They explained that the soil and planting details for the bio-retention areas could be provided and noted the lawn area as a pre-treatment area and noted that stone check dams/weirs are proposed for both basins.

In response to further questions from the board, the applicant's agents confirmed that existing fencing is to remain and new fencing will be installed to close off the access on the northern property line. The project representatives also confirmed that no exterior trash receptacles are proposed for the site, as trash is the responsibility of the customers.

In regards to signage, the Board specified that the newly proposed pylon sign would have to be revised to be six feet (6') from the property line. Mr. Whitmar confirmed this request. Mr. Whitmar added that the remaining proposed signage met the city's zoning requirements. He detailed that the proposed building signage includes: a small sign with the word "Office" on the canopy over the office area; wall signs with the word "loading" over all loading areas; and a wall sign with the words "Cube Smart". All signage proposed would be internally illuminated, he noted. The board noted that the building has access hours from 6am-10pm, and office hours from 8am-6pm. The board decided that the signage hours of illumination should be limited to 6am-10pm to match the storage unit access hours. Board Member Smith expressed concern for the wattage of the signs given the residential neighborhood across the street. Mr. Whitmar noted the pylon sign does not directly face the neighborhood and all signage would meet the signage requirements.

Board Member Cruz made a motion, seconded by Board Member Kalife to open the public hearing. The motion passed unopposed.

In response to Chair Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor, no one in attendance spoke in favor of the petition or wished to be recorded in favor of the petition.

In response to Chair Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition, no one in attendance spoke in opposition of the petition or wished to be recorded in opposition of the petition.

Board Member Smith made a motion, seconded by Board Member Glassman to close the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

The board briefly discussed the case and conditions before indicating a readiness to vote.

#### **4) DECISION**

Board Member Glassman made the motion, seconded by Mr. Smith to approve Case #18-29, for New Ground Sign Site Plan approval on a 4.13+ acre site, located at 387 Church Street (Map 113 Lot 475) in an Industrial B [IB] zoned district. Applicant: BRK 1, LLC (31100 Telegraph Road, Suite 250 Bingham Farms, MI). Applicant's Agent: STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc. (226 Causeway Street Boston, MA). The approval is subject to:

##### **Specific conditions:**

1. The sign may be lit between 6am-10pm, Monday-Sunday.
2. Final sign plan to be approved by City Planner
3. Pylon sign to be installed to meet the six foot (6') setback requirement

##### **General Conditions:**

4. The project shall be completed according to the plans, notes, reports, and specifications submitted for consideration and final approval by the Planning Board.
5. The project shall be undertaken in a manner consistent with the Memorandum from the Department of Public Infrastructure received and placed on file and the Planning Board incorporates the DPI memo as part of these conditions.

6. The applicant shall submit final plan revisions to the Planning Division in the following formats: one (1) -11" x 17" Plan Set and one (1) CD or USB with Plan Set in PDF format and shall ensure that these same plans are properly submitted to the Department of Inspectional Services.
7. The applicant shall ensure that a copy of the Notice of Decision, bearing the certification of the New Bedford City Clerk signifying no appeal has been made against the project's approval, be provided for the Planning Division Case file folder.
8. The applicant shall present any proposed modification from the approved plans for consideration to the City Planner for determination as to whether the modified plan must return before this Board for further review.
9. The rights authorized by the granted approval must be exercised by issuance of a Building Permit by the Department of Inspectional Services and acted upon within one year from the date the decision was granted or they will lapse.

As a result of such consideration, the Board moves approval on the subject application with the conditions so noted. The motion being properly made and seconded, the Chair called for a roll call vote which was taken and unanimously approved five (5) to zero (0).

Board Chair Duff -- Yes

Board Member Kalife-Yes

Board Member Cruz -- Yes

Board Member Glassman -- Yes

Board Member Smith -- Yes

Filed with the City Clerk on:

6/27/2013

Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathryn Duff, Chair  
City of New Bedford Planning Board

