

**Salisbury Planning Board
Meeting Minutes**

Date: Thursday, November 12, 2020

Place: Remotely via Zoom

Time: 7:00 p.m.

PB Members Present: Vice Chair, John “Marty” Doggett (**JMD**) , Clerk, Gil Medeiros (**GM**) , Louis Masiello (**Lou**) and Deb Rider (**DR**) and Alternate John Schillizzi (**JS**).

PB Members Absent: Don Egan (**Don**)

Also Present: Director of Planning Lisa Pearson (**LP**) and Planning Board Secretary Sue Johnson (**SJ**).

JMD brought the meeting to order at 7:18 p.m. remotely via zoom. Announced, per opening meeting law, that the meeting was being recorded.

New Business – 7:00 pm

a. Signing of plans and permits

b. ANR - 11 Schoolhouse Lane & 15 Forest Road (Map 20, Lots 5 & 105) - Request made by Forest Salisbury, LLC.

No representative for this project was at the meeting and **LP** suggested to move it to the end of the meeting to allow time for a representative to be present. The Board agreed (see below for minutes).

2. Public Hearings—7:10 pm

a. Request for Certificate of Completion - 211 Beach Road (Map 28 Lot 32) - Request made by Cobalt Development

Kevin Neville (**KN**) from Cobalt Development stated that he is in front of the Board to get his Certificate of Completion. **KN** stated that after receiving his partial certificate of completion in September they have added the final topcoat and provided the final as-built plan. The Town Engineer (**TE**) provided a letter on November 11th stating “The top course of pavement has been installed since the last site review. The grassed stormwater area is stabilized with grass. The only new item appears to be with the limits of crushed stone depicted on the plan. The crushed stone appears to extend 15-20 feet beyond the property lines, onto land of the Town of Salisbury and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Board may want the crushed stone removed and replaced with loam and seed”. **KN** stated that the crushed stone extends approximately 5 feet not the 15-20 feet that was in the **TE**’s comment. **KN** stated that the primary reason they encroached on the property lines started with the original structure which was right up against the lot line. **KN** stated that when he purchased the project the erosion controls were already in place on the adjacent property to give him enough room to demo the building. **KN** stated that there was limited disturbance that was on the lot line and when they went to do the final landscaping they extended the crushed stone over the property line where there was the limited disturbance. **LP**

stated that she can check with the DPW Director to see if this is a problem but feels that a vote can be made contingent on hearing back from the DPW Director about the stone. The Board members complimented the project and the developer. **KN** thanked the Board.

GM motioned to grant the Certificate of Completion contingent on the DPW Directors comments about if the stone should remain or be removed and replaced with loam and seed.

LM seconded.

Vote: JS-Yes, DR-Yes, LM-Yes, GM-Yes & JMD-Yes – Motion passed.

3. Other Business

a. Review of the 2021 Planning Board Meeting Schedule

JMD suggested cancelling the meeting on 11/24/21 due to it being the night before Thanksgiving.

LM motioned to approve the 2021 Planning Board Meeting Schedule with the cancellation of the 11/24/21 meeting.

JS seconded.

Vote: JS-Yes, DR-Yes, LM-Yes, GM-Yes & JMD-Yes – Motion passed.

b. 10 Bartlett (Map 17, Lot 212)

Dave Elgart (**DE**) stated that he was the owner. **DE** stated that in September the Conservation Commission approved a road surface change from reclaimed asphalt to hot top. **DE** stated that they are running into problems because it is a subdivision which requires a stormwater system. **DE** stated that they were looking at it as a single-family home and the issue is the water runoff from the 250-foot driveway. **DE** stated that on the plan they added and installed a 1 foot wide by 1 ½ foot deep trench along the length of the driveway filled with 1 ½ inch angled crushed stone. **DE** stated that they have not had any water issues since they hot topped the driveway. **DE** stated that the as-built was updated with the hot top. Denis Hamel (**DH**) stated that he was the engineer for the project which started back in 1999 or 2000 with Barbara Souther who was granted a variance for the frontage which is still covered under the subdivision control law. **DH** stated that **DE** bought the project in 2019 and modified the plan to have a different footprint for his house and received an amended order of conditions from the Conservation Commission. **DH** stated that the pavement produces slightly more runoff than the reclaimed asphalt. **DH** stated that he feels that the trench was installed will handle the additional runoff. **LP** stated the **DE** came in front of the Planning Board to change the road surface from crushed stone to reclaimed asphalt and the trench was required as part of that approval. **LP** went on to state that this project is a subdivision and needs to meet stormwater approval. **LP** stated that there is no waiver for stormwater and if **DE** is meeting stormwater standards why can't a report be produced showing this. **DH** stated that there is very little runoff difference between the reclaimed asphalt and the pavement and feels that the trench will accommodate the additional runoff. **GM** asked **LP** what does the Board need **DE** to do now. **LP** stated that **DE** needs to show that he complies with stormwater by providing a stormwater report or remove the asphalt. **LM** agreed with **LP** and stated that we need the stormwater report and the Town Engineer needs to review it. **JMD** also agreed with **LP** and **LM**.

LM motioned to continue until the Board gets a stormwater report that has been reviewed by the Town Engineer.

DR seconded.

Vote: JS-Yes, DR-Yes, LM-Yes, GM-Yes & JMD-Yes – Motion passed.

c. ANR - 11 Schoolhouse Lane & 15 Forest Road (Map 20, Lots 5 & 105) - Request made by Forest Salisbury, LLC.

Matt Steinel (MS) from Millennium Engineering stated that he was representing the applicant. MS stated that one of the homes being built was built too close to the lot line. MS stated that they made a lot line adjustment so all the lots still conform to the frontage requirements and area necessary for the zone they are in but now comply with zoning setbacks.

GM motioned to endorse the ANR.

DR seconded.

Vote: JS-Yes, DR-Yes, LM-Yes, GM-Yes & JMD-Yes – Motion passed.

4. Old Business

5. Correspondence

a. Minutes: 10-14-20

DR motioned to approve.

JS seconded.

Vote: JS-Yes, DR-Yes, LM-Yes, GM-Yes & JMD-Yes – Motion passed.

6. Adjournment

LM motioned to adjourn.

JS seconded.

Vote: JS-Yes, DR-Yes, LM-Yes, GM-Yes & JMD-Yes – Motion passed.

*** Documents provided at the meeting are on file in the Planning Office**

Minutes approved by: _____

Date: _____