

**Salisbury Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, October 14, 2015 7:00 p.m.**

**PB Members Present:** Don Egan (DE), Chairman Helen “Trudi” Holder (TH), Brendan Burke (BB), Lou Masiello (LM), Berenice McLaughlin (BHM), Gina Park (GP), Alternate

**PB Members Absent:** None

**Also Present:** Lisa Pearson (LP) Planner, Lori A. Robertson, Planning Board Secretary

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

Chairperson Egan called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Colchester Room, Salisbury Town Hall. **DE** announced, per the Open Meeting Law, that this meeting was being recorded and broadcast live via [www.sctvmc.org/index](http://www.sctvmc.org/index).

**1. New Business:**

**a. Signing of Plans and Permits: N/a**

**7:00 Public Hearing:**

- a. To amend the Zoning Bylaw of the Town of Salisbury by creating a new zoning bylaw entitled Lafayette-Main Commercial District and to take any other action relative thereto.** **LP** stated this is the final version. This is what went to the warrant. No comments from the board.

**BHM** motion to close the public hearing to amend the zoning bylaw of the Town of Salisbury by creating a new zoning bylaw entitled Lafayette-Main Commercial District and to take any other action relative thereto.

**LM** Seconds – Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous.

**LM** motions to recommend that Town Meeting approve the zoning change for Lafayette-Main Commercial District.

**TH** Seconds – Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous. **Motion passed.**

**7:30 Public Hearing:**

**TH** stepped down as an abutter.

- a. Cont. 123 Bridge Road-Dan Dandreo LP** noted a draft decision was passed out. Taylor Turbide (TT) of Millennium Engineering addressed the board. **TT** stated Joe would like us to do another test pit on site to demonstrate that infiltration is not possible. We did 3 test pits on site. He is asking for one more to be done at some point. If the board would like us to do this, its something we can evaluate while digging up for construction. He had a concern with the turnaround area. He suggest that it should be landscaped. I think it should stay the way it is shown to maneuver a three point turn. He also has a concern about the stacking. Your regulations require 60' and we have 52'. We will have to ask for a waiver for that. **DE** stated I don't want the possibility of stacking out onto Bridge Road. **GP** and **TT** discussed the turnaround. **TT** stated we are filing with Conservation and MassHighway. We need Planning Board approval before we file for those. **LP** stated this is not true, you can file for MassHighway before Planning Board. I think the PB decision should be pending MassHighway approval. Went over other conditions in the draft decision. The architectural plans must come back before the Planning Board for review. 2. Deliveries will be on off-peak hours-toward the back of the property. Delivery vehicles cannot park on Bridge Road. 3. Maintenance plan must be provided for the upkeep of landscaping. It must be submitted to the planning board and also must be a requirement of the lease of the tenant. 5. Exit be expanded/left, right turn make 24'; add signage and crosswalk. 6. Joseph Serwatka's comments dated October 13, 2015. We will get back to that with the comments we want in there. 7. Sidewalk on Bridge Road. 8. Lot lining and appropriate signage remains in place.

Waivers: **LP** stated you could list them but you could miss them. It would be better if they submitted a list of waivers they are asking for. **DE** stated because the applicant is coming back. I am okay with verbally reciting them again.

**DE** stated the waivers:

1. Site plan requirements, section F(1), states that parking shall be prohibited between buildings and street layout.
2. Section F (4) requires parking to be located to the side or rear of the building.
3. Section F (6) this section allows for only one curb cut per site frontage. The current site design has two curb cuts. **LP** noted that we are not overstepping MassHighways decision to have two curb-cuts verses one curb-cut but per the recommendation of the applicant. (if MassHighway makes a different determination you are not saying it can't be changed.)
4. The proposed site conforms to section I relative to separation between access connections. The proximity of the abutting curb cuts, which may only be about 30 feet from the proposed exit driveway.
5. The section K (1) requires 60 feet from the stacking lane to property line, but the plan only provides about 48 feet.
6. The building plan submittal at this time (architectural, etc.) **LP** stated this was formally asked for.

**LM** motions to approve the waivers as stated above.

**BB** Seconds

Discussion about the stacking. **DE** asked if MassHighway changes the location of the curb then there could be an issue, you won't be at 60 feet anymore. **TT** stated presumably you will know that when we come back. **LP** stated amend the decision subject to MassHighway approval.

Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous. Motion Passed.

Joe Serwatka's letter dated October 13, 2015:

**#17- The proposed 6 inch sewer is shown connecting to a 6 inch forcemain. The engineer should detail how this will work.** *The response states that the intent is to tie into the existing sewer stub onsite, but the plans depict a proposed 6" sewer service from building to sewer main. The Salisbury Sewer Department states that there is an existing 2" sewer forcemain stubbed to the property line. The engineer should depict a 500 gallon (typical) pump chamber outside the building with a 2 horsepower duplex pump, connecting to the existing 2" stub. A grease trap should also be depicted if there will be a kitchen in the proposed building. All of this should be depicted and detailed on the plans. The sewer department said it would be helpful to have building layout plans to review. The engineer should submit these plans.* **TT** stated I will seek approval from the Salisbury Sewer Department and Planning Department on this item. **LP** stated it will be conditioned upon the approval of Don Levesque and Joe Serwatka prior to the submission of architectural plans.

**#2- Any existing water/sewer services into the site should be depicted so that the contractor can cap/remove as needed. The response states that record information was unavailable, but that the site will be dig safe marked prior to construction. The applicant has had nearly 6 weeks since the previous review letter to Dig-Safe the site for these utilities, and depict them on the plans. The board may want to inquire as to why this has not been done.** **DE** stated typically we do require that utilities be shown on the plan. Can the utilities be shown on the plan? **TT** stated yes. **DE** stated the condition will be when you come back before us with the other conditions the utilities will be shown on the plan. **TT** stated do you want us to work this out with Joe Serwatka prior to coming back to you. **DE** stated yes. **#11- I would recommend that the engineer/applicant put more thought into the traffic circulation/parking design. The plan places 60 percent of the parking spaces at the rear of the building in a dead-end parking arrangement. This requires vehicles to backup into the drive thru or bypass lane if no parking spaces are available at the rear of the site. The designated one-way circulation associated with the 8 parking spaces at the front of the building may require vehicles to enter, exit and re-enter the site via Bridge Road in an effort to secure a parking space. The revised design reduces the front parking to 6 spaces, reduces the rear parking to 10 spaces, and adds 7 spaces along the northerly property line. The response states that 2 parking spaces have been eliminated in the rear parking area to allow for cars to turn, but only one space has, in fact, been eliminated. The other space has been depicted as a striped area which will allow for a vehicle to park. The front parking area, now reduce, has been revised to two-way traffic.**

*A "no parking" sign has been added at this space. There appears to be no reason to have this extra "space" on the plan which adds impervious area to the site. There would be no need for the striping and sign without the extra paved area. The board may*

want to require that this area be landscaped. **GP** stated it makes it clear that people can turn their car in that area. **DE** stated we want to accept the applicant's plan for that comment.

**#12** *The board may want the engineer to address traffic impacts as required by the by-law. My concern is that the parking spaces provided do not address the peak hour demands for a typical "Perfecto Caffè" as noted on the submitted building drawings, not including the additional rental space. Personal experience with the North Andover Perfecto Caffè (which is approximately half the size, with no drive-thru) would lead me to believe that peak Saturday/Sunday morning hours should be observed relative to parking needs. The board may also want the building drawings to depict proposed seating in the facility, which would help to assess parking requirements. The response states that the parking count on site has been increased to the "extent feasible". The response does not state whether actual vehicle counts from similar stores will be provided, and does not address whether the building still contain two tenants. The response states that 5 spaces are required by zoning and 23 spaces are provided, with only one tenant. The Board should decide whether the proposed parking is adequate, or whether the engineer should support the design with parking data from similar establishments. The Board may also want to condition any approvals to allow for only one tenant/use on the site.* **DE** stated we can add this as a condition.

### **Landscape Plans-**

**#3-No lawn areas appear to be proposed. Bark mulch appears to be used throughout the site. The board may want irrigated lawn areas to be proposed.**

*The response states that bark mulch will be provided in landscaped areas only. All other areas will be loamed and seeded.*

**BB** stated we have a condition for a maintenance plan for landscaping. **LP** stated technically the landscape plan is separate. You can condition the landscape plan for more review. **DE** stated let's put that in as a condition. When you come back with the architectural plans, if it doesn't change it doesn't change but if it requires changes you can submit them at that time along with the maintenance plan.

### **Stormwater Management-**

The narrative rules out any recharge based on D type soils and high water table. This should be verified by on site soil testing, as is typical. Further, the area of mapped B type soils may be able to support a roof recharge system. Test pit information has been provided in the area of the constructed wetland only. The board may want test pits conducted in the "B" soil area to verify whether a roof recharge system can be installed. Site elevations are being raised approximately 4 feet, which will allow a roof recharge system to be installed above seasonal high groundwater. *The response states that "we will leave this up to the Board's discretion. This is more Conservation issue that can be addressed when the Notice of Intent is filed". Section 465-13 (E) of the site plan performance and design standards gives the board jurisdiction over drainage and on-site infiltration. The engineer should verify whether a roof infiltration/recharge system can be installed on the site.* **TT** stated do you want us to work this out with Joe Serwatka prior to coming back to you. **DE** stated yes. **TT** stated I will get in contact with Joe Serwatka, go to the site with him and figure out where he would like the test pits. We will make him feel comfortable that infiltration is not feasible and if it is we will get it designed.

**DE** noted another condition if anything changes with Conservation the applicant needs to come back before us.

**BB** motions to close the public hearing for 123 Bridge Road-Dan Dandreo.

**BHM** Seconds - Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous. **Motion passed.**

**BB** motions to approve the site plan for 123 Bridge Road subject to the Planning Board standard terms and conditions as well as special conditions and waivers which will be presented in a revised site plan approval letter at the meeting of the Planning Board on October 28, 2015.

**LM**-Seconds – Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous.

TH came back to the board.

#### **b. Cont. SPR-105 Rabbit Road-Ameresco, Inc. d/b/a MA Solar Highway LLC**

**LM** motions to continue the SPR – 105 Rabbit Road – Ameresco, Inc. d/b/a MA Solar Highway LLC until the October 28, 2015 meeting at 7:00 pm.

**BHM** Seconds – Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous.

**4. Other Business:**

**5. Correspondence:**

**a. Minutes from September 23, 2015**

**BB** motions to accept the minutes from September 23, 2015.

**TH** Seconds – Vote on motion 3-(3-abstained)

**b. Minutes from September 30, 2015**-continued to next meeting

**6. Reports of Committees:**

- **LP** noted there will be a cleanup at the Community Garden on October 18, 2015 from 12-3.
- **LP** discussed the updates on Stevens Trail she is hoping it's up and running for next season
- **LP** discussed Borders to Boston

**7. Adjournment:**

**BB** motions to adjourn at 8:28 pm

**TH** Seconds – Vote on motion 5 – 0 unanimous.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chairman**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

