

## Salisbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes

---

**Date:** Wednesday, October 26, 2016

**Place:** Salisbury Town Hall, Colchester Auditorium, 5 Beach Rd. Salisbury, MA

**Time:** 7:00 p.m.

---

**PB Members Present:** Chairman Don Egan (**DE**), Gina Park (**GP**), Louis Masiello (**LM**), Helen “Trudi” Holder (**TH**)

**PB Members Absent:** John “Marty” Doggett (**JMD**)

**Also Present:** Bart McDonough (**BMD**), Assistant Planner, Adriane Marchand (**AM**), Planning Secretary

Chairman Don Egan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. **DE** announced, per opening meeting law, that this meeting was being recorded and broadcast live via [www.sctvmc.org](http://www.sctvmc.org).

### 1. New Business

#### **a. Signing of Plans / Permits**

##### **i. ANR, 3-5 School House Lane**

Jocelyn Rennick (**JR**) and Robert Rennick (**RR**) addressed the Board. They are looking to purchase land from a neighboring property to allow them to build a garage on their existing property. **DE** asked which lot they currently live on. **RR** answered lots 1 and 3, **JR** added parcel A is what we are looking to buy.

**TH** motioned to approve the Approval Not Required for 3-5 School House Lane.

**GP** seconded.

**Vote: 4-0 Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

##### **ii. 20 and 22 Folly Mill Road ANR Approval**

Paul Donahoe (**PD**) of Donahoe Surveying, Topsfield, MA, briefed the Board.

**DE** asked **BMD** about the Town’s Right of First Refusal. **BMD** explained the situation. **PD** added to the explanation of the lien on the property. **DE** read the assessor’s comments that explained that the parcels cannot be sold till the right of first refusal requirements are met and taxes are up to date. **LM** stated he did not see any conditions that would need to be added.

**GP** motioned to endorse the Approval Not Required plan, dated September 20, 2016 for 20 Folly Mill Road.

**TH** seconded.

**DE** clarified that they understand the situation and will be working it out with the Town before they proceed with selling.

**PD** and Bill Bartlett (**BB**) trustee, confirmed their understanding.

**Vote: 4-0 Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

**LM** motioned to endorse the Approval Not Required, plan dated September 19, 2016 for 22 Folly Mill Road.

**TH** seconded.

**Vote: 4-0 Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

## **2. Old Business**

### **3. Public Hearing 7:30pm**

#### **a. SPR, Plum Island LLC, 109-113 Bridge Road**

Chris York (**CY**) of Millennium Engineering represented the applicants. Also present are David Cowie (**DC**), Gary Murphy(**GM**) and Kristen Reily (**KR**). **CY** Introduced the Board to the proposed plan to renovate the existing Factory Direct building into a maintenance and storage facility for NRC.

**LM** asked for clarification on if a building was being removed. **CY** confirmed they were not removing the building, only renovating. **LM** asked why there is no handicap parking on the site. **CY** replied that they do not believe it is necessary as this is not a building open to the public. The business the public accesses is across the road. **DE** asked if they are asking for a waiver for the handicap parking requirements. **CY** reiterated they do not think that is required. **DE** stated that he believed it is a requirement to getting their building permit. **CY** responded that if it necessary they will, but this is a private site, not a public one. Discussion on topic follow concluded that they do not think it is necessary but the Assistant Planner will confirm.

**TH** asked if there is screening for the garage doors. **CY** responded that it did not seem necessary. **DE** stated that screening is required in the zoning bylaw. **DE** quotes the bylaw about the landscape requirement asked if the landscaping meets the Planning Board's regulations on landscape guidelines. **CY** answered that there are no landscape plans but shows vegetation that was put on the plan. **DE** requested a landscape plan be added to the site plan for the next meeting.

**DE** quoted 300 §6 of the bylaw which states the parking must be to the rear, or the side, of the structure. Discussion followed on the location of the parking.

**LM** reminded them they cannot block the snow storage area. Stressed the importance of screening. **DE** stated his is very uncomfortable with this proposal as it is missing a landscape plan, elevations, and parking is to the front, not the back or side as required. **GM** responded that construction vehicles will be parked up the hill and will be well screened. The only vehicles visible from Bridge Road will be road worthy fleet vehicles.

**DE** asked if there is room for vehicles to both exit and enter the building. Will they be able to pass in the building? **CY** confirmed there is enough room. **DC** outlined the intention that they would like the area to have a campus feel to it and mirror the building across the street. **DE**.

Asked if they were removing the building. **DC** responded that the structure was staying but they

were removing the metal siding and other renovations to make the building look like across the street. **DE** responded that is a great idea and requests the plans be updated to show that. **DE** doesn't disagree that paving the whole area would be an excess of pavement but the gravel area may cause issues. **LM** asked if they are adding more pavement? **CY** responded they would. **GP** asked what the max number of trucks that will be parked in the front is planned to be. **DC** responded that that is difficult to guess, it would depend on the day. The facility in Newburyport would be a good indicator, could be 10 but is hard to quantify.

Discussion followed on the purpose of screening the vehicles, the intent of the bylaw, and the type of screening to be used. Led to discussion the limit of vehicles to be parked in the front **DE** asked if there is a way to bump the island up to provide screening. **DC** responded that tractor trailers need have room to maneuver and visibility would prefer to have no island but need it for drainage. Discussion on the two (2) entrances. **DE** asked to have the southern entrance as a one way entrance for additional safety while the northern entrance remains two (2) way. **DC** responded that could be done, but is not preferred.

**DE** asked if there have been any accidents at the Newburyport facility. **DC** responded not involving their vehicles. **LM** asked if the side parking area could be used for the fleet vehicles. **CY** responded that the vehicles are too long and would block the traffic lane going up the hill. **DE** asked for the location of the retaining wall(s). **CY** showed two (2) on the plan. One (1) at the back of the gravel parking area and one (1) on the northerly side by the employee parking. Both are very small **DE** refers to Joe Serwatka's letter. Item number one (1) is the parking issue.

Asked to establish a max number of vehicles and a max distance they are parked from the road.

Asked size range of the vehicles. **DC** responded 75 long by 8 feet wide would be the largest.

Discussion on the parking distance followed resulting in **DE** requesting the parking lanes be painted, a distance set back from the road be set, and the travel lane in front of the parked vehicles be marked. The Planning Board offered different suggestions on the island.

**DE** asked if they had discussed cub cuts with the State yet. **CY** clarified state standards and remarked on the application process. **DE** asked why they chose to go with gravel in the back area? **CY** stated they don't want to over-pave the area and the gravel is a better option for drainage. **LM** asked why not just pave the driveway area. **CY** responded they could pave an apron but are looking to limit runoff.

**DE** recapped the recommendation of the Planning Board for the next meeting:

1. Provide max number of vehicles that will be parking in the lot.
2. Only roadworthy vehicles in the parking lanes.
3. Set a minimum distance of the vehicle parking lanes from the road.
4. Add appropriate stripping.

Discussion followed on pavement vs gravel. **DE** recommended making it a condition that vehicles are not to be stored in this area because of contamination from leaking gas, oil. **LM** inquired if they have been thorough the Conservation Commission yet? **DC** responded they have not. **DE** requested the Planning Department sort the issue of vehicle storage requirements out.

Discussion on point two (2) from Joe Serwatka's letter, gravel dust and sediment filters (in this case grassed area) followed. **DE** asked the Planning Department to ask the Town Engineer if there is a way to prevent silt from entering the sediment for bay.

The point third (3) from Joe Serwatka's letter had already been addressed on screening. **DE** asked to add the architectural enhancements to this point.

Item number eight (8) from Joe Serwatka's letter addressed the absence of sidewalk and planting areas and whether handicap parking needs to be provided. **CY** responded the perimeter of the

building is paved so access is provided. **LM** reiterated the handicap parking requirement is going to be addressed by the Planning Department. **LM** asked if the building is handicap accessible. **CY** confirms it is.

**DE** asked if there was a grading plan. **CY** showed the retaining walls. **DE** asked what the elevation difference is. **CY** answered that in the north east corner it is about 2 feet at the most. At the southern corner there is no grade difference. The wall is to mark the parking area and the property line. **DE** stated he did not know the height where a structured wall would be required. **CY** replied that a wall under 4 feet does not need to be a structural wall. **DE** asked them to reply to the Town Engineer's comment about the stacked stone wall.

**DE** stated in regards to the point in Serwatka's letter on ledge, we will wait for a response from the Town Engineer.

**LM** asked if there was a lighting plan. **CY** directed them to sheet 5 of the site plan which shows the lighting plan. **DE** expressed concern about the light spilling into the street. **CY** responded it has no negative effect on the neighbors. **DE** asked if the lights were dark sky compliant. **CY** responded they are. **DE** asked to see the locations of the lights on the plan. **CY** directed him to sheet 2 of the site plan that shows the locations without the luminaires. **DE** requested a photo of the lighting fixtures for the next meeting.

**LM** motioned to continue the Major Site Plan Review public hearing for Plum Island LLC, 109-113 Bridge Road to November 9, 2016 at 7:00pm.

**DE** requested a draft approval at that meeting and to be provided with elevations. Asked if there is any new construction at the top of the hill. **CY** responded there was not. **DE** asked if the driveway is paved. **CY** responded it is gravel. **DE** asked if any work was being done on the building at the top of the drive. **DC** answered it has already been renovated.

**LM** amended the time in the motion to be a 7:15p.m.

**TH** seconded

**Vote: 4-0 Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

#### **b. SPR, Chirag Realty LLC, 45 Toll Road**

Brian Murry (**BM**) of Millennium Engineering was present with Sharrack Patel (**SP**) to represent Chirag Realty. **BM** introduced the Board to the proposed plan to construct a two (2) story mix use building with 4 commercial units on the ground floor and an apartment and additional storage on the second (2<sup>nd</sup>) floor. The plan is to construct the new building and then tear down the old so that the business can continue to run. Requested a waiver on 465 §13 in the rules and regulations on parking. They need to maintain parking while the structure is built so business continue to run. Discussion on the chapter in question followed.

**DE** stated that this is the first public hearing that falls under the new Lafayette/ Main Commercial Zoning Bylaw. Chapter 300 §164 D states the location of off street parking. Discussion followed on the parking that is allowed under the bylaw and the constraints on this project. A special permit was also discussed. **DE** stated a waiver for that requirement cannot be issued but a special permit can be issued. Clarified that the transitional parking is not under review but the completed parking area needs to be compliant with the bylaw.

**DE** requested they continue to work with the Planning Department to see if the parking issue can be resolved.

Discussion followed on possible parking scenarios during construction.

**SP** briefed the Board on the history of this SPR with the Planning Department. They had moved forward to the point of submitting but had issues with the engineer and he was not able to move forward with the project. They had to start over with a new engineer. If they had been aware of the bylaw changes they would have filed before they were adopted. Asked to be excused from the bylaw as they predated it. **DE** explained that there is not grandfather provision in the bylaw, it applies to buildings being built over 2500 square feet. **BM** requested to continue the public hearing to the next meeting to allow them to work with the Planning Board Department to resolve the issue.

**LM** motioned to continue the public hearing for the Site Plan Review for Chirag Realty LLC, 45 Toll Road to November 9, 2016 at 7:15p.m.

**GP** seconded.

**Vote: 4-0 Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

#### **4. Other Business**

#### **5. Correspondence**

- a. Minutes from October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016

**TH** motioned to approve the Minutes for October 12, 2016

**GP** seconded.

**Vote: 4-0 Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

#### **6. Reports of Committees**

#### **7. Adjournment**

**GP** motioned to adjourn the October 26, 2016 Planning Board meeting at 9:44 p.m.

**TH** seconded.

**Vote: 4-0 Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

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

**Minutes Approved By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_