

**Salisbury Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, June 24, 2015 7:00 p.m.**

PB Members Present: Don Egan (DE), Chairman, Brendan Burke (BB), Helen "Trudi" Holder (TH)

PB Members Absent: Robert Straubel, Berenice McLaughlin and Lou Masiello

Also Present: Leah Hill (LH), Asst. Planner, Lori A. Robertson, Planning Board Secretary

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Chairman Egan called the meeting to order at 7:09 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.

1. New Business:

a. Signing of Plans and Permits: N/a

Old Business

a. Extension Request SPR-233 Beach Road-233 Beach Road LLC, DE stated we can make the determination that substantial progress has been made towards its completion. It was read into the record the requirements of extension request. **TH** asked how long the governor's extension was for. **LH** stated 2 two year extensions. **LH** noted there were only three members present and the vote would need to be unanimous for approval.

Steve Paquette (SP), of 233 Beach Road LLC addressed the board. I am okay with a vote tonight. **LH** stated the bylaw allows for 2 year extension. It would be two years from the vote.

TH motions to grant the extension of 2 years with the site plan expiring on June 24, 2017.

BB Seconds-Vote on motion 3 – 0 unanimous.

b. Request for minor modification for SPR-233 Beach Road LLC, David Udelsman (DU) of Udelsman Associates addressed the board on behalf of the applicant. Discussed the parking plan noting the limits of the building. Discussed the floor plan of the building. Discussed the roof plan. Shows the comparison between the new building and the old building.

Discussed the Design Guidelines for the Beach Overlay District:

- A. The design of buildings, structures and site layout shall follow "new urbanism" principles and be reflective of both traditional and modern interpretations of vernacular coastal New England architecture for the purposes of promoting appropriate waterfront scale and character, including building materials, massing, density, scale and roof lines. **The Building will be clad in vinyl clapboard siding with 4" exposure as well as shake siding which is delineated with varying trims such as water table boards, corner boards and door and window trims consistent with New England vernacular. IT further takes its cues in materials and forms from the existing building on the same site. We have used double hung windows, hipped roof lines and vary the style of siding to break up the façade. The massing and scale of the proposed building is similar in scale to the existing with a 15% smaller footprint.**
- B. Large expanses of blank walls shall not be allowed. Facades shall have frequent architectural articulation. Major such articulations shall be spaced no farther apart than 25% of the building length at street level (but in no case farther apart than 70 feet). Street levels lined with extensive windows and frequent well-designed entrances to street level uses are encouraged, permitting continuous public views and access in and out of buildings in order to create a lively street atmosphere. Window designs in a vertical orientation are encouraged. **The design of the elevations incorporates generous windows allowing the sea air to refresh the interior spaces and plenty of natural light in the rooms to reduce the dependency on artificial lighting in most rooms. Our street level elevation does not have an occupied use as implied in the guidelines. This is our parking area.**
- C. Screening of ground floor parking from pedestrian view with appropriate doors, building elements and/or landscaping features is required for parking areas along public ways. **The entrance to the grade level parking area is announced on the west elevation by a small roof and pilaster structure. At the perimeter of the parking area we have provided for privacy screening with walls and siding where appropriate and use small opens windows as fenestration in the same manner as the existing building.**
- D. All projects shall be designed to minimize the size and number of curb cuts. Full-width curb cuts will not be allowed. In keeping with the theme of screening parking from the public view, efficient traffic patterns are encouraged to support ingress and egress from lots. Curb cuts may not exceed an aggregate of 24 feet for every 100 feet of frontage. Lots with less than 100 feet of frontage may have one curb cut, 14 feet in length. **Vehicles coming to**

the ground level parking area will be directed by way of Beatrice Street located on the west side of the site and continue north to the west side of the proposed building b. Access to this back building location uses on existing 24'-0" wide curb cut on Beach Road at the west side of Building A.

- E. Underground utilities for new and redeveloped buildings are required unless physically restricted or blocked by existing underground obstructions. **Underground utilities will be used to service the building.**
- F. A straightforward use of natural, traditional or sustainable building materials is encouraged. Brick, stone, high-quality metals, cast concrete, wood, and cement fiberboard will achieve the greatest level of compatibility with the surrounding area and will best stand the test of time in terms of both changing community tastes and withstanding the historically vibrant commercial climate of the Salisbury oceanfront. Exterior material substitutions, in particular products and applications that are of higher quality than those described in these guidelines, are encouraged. **The materials on the exterior of the proposed b are vinyl clapboard siding with a 4" exposure and vinyl shake siding designed to complement the existing building a. The trims shall also be vinyl in sizes consistent with those typical of the Salisbury local. We feel the use of these materials will perform exceptionally well in an environment subject to salts, moisture and wind driven rain and snow for many years reducing the repairs and materials waste.**
- G. Building facades shall include architecturally distinct styles promoting diverse design, particularly with rooftop appurtenances such as cupolas, turrets, spires, widow walks, etc. **The elevations of building b gain interest with the change in textures and undulate with the expression of stair towers and varied window heads including transform windows in the public corridor. Further, the upper two story end units project the living space to manipulate the wall surface even more. All units are afforded abundant deck areas which have rails and pickets that add interest to the north elevation.**
- H. A diversity of roof heights, gable orientations, and volumes in new buildings is required. **The roof lines are broken up with several sections of hip roofs projecting both in and north-south direction and east west direction. Dormers on the side roofs give a nod to the existing building a and building projections add another layer to the hip roof.**
- I. Traditional arrangement of facade components into base, middle, and top composition may be used to achieve compatibility and continuity within the surrounding architectural context. Additionally, projecting bays, recessed balconies, and roof shape variation shall be utilized to provide interest, individuality, and appropriate scale to new development. **Vertically the building façade is broken up into three portions. The parking level is the simplest as privacy screen with small openings; the middle section consists of the second and third floor and third section is the most diverse with variations in projections and siding materials and some decorative brackets as well.**
- J. Sidewalk amenities such as street furniture, lighting and awnings that encourage year-round pedestrian use and sidewalk-cafe-style seating to enhance the public realm are encouraged. **Since the proposed building is not directly on Beach Road and does not house any commercial purpose all landscaping on site shall be for the purpose of water run-off management and unit owner's pleasure. No café seating or pedestrian use is expected except by unit owners.**
- K. Rear vehicular access to ground floor parking is preferred to minimize curb cuts on principal streets. Use of streets other than Broadway and Oceanfront South for vehicle access is preferred. Use of shared access points is encouraged to minimize the number of curb cuts. **Curb cuts to the site are minimized by sharing access to Beach Road through the existing access to Building A on Beatrice Street.**
- L. Placing buildings oriented parallel with the front setback line is required to keep a consistent "street wall," with primary entries oriented towards the street. **The building orientation is east to west in like with the existing building and is parallel to the front setback line.**
- M. Building setbacks may be varied and are encouraged to recognize the siting and scale of adjacent development. **Building B is located to not interfere with building setbacks and is in scale with the adjacent building on the site.**
- N. At the intersection of the building line with crossover streets, there may be variation to the building edges to allow for corner elements and circulation functions. The building edges may be articulated and organized in such a way to achieve an architecturally rich and contextually varied composition. Variation in the building edge beyond the minimum setback is encouraged. **As mentioned earlier the entrance to the lower level parking area is expressed with the projected roof and flanked with pilasters on the building's west side to help in locating the entrance. The upper area of the same elevation projects creating a separate roof line above and second projected roof at the corner further breaks up the façade.**
- O. The facade proportions used in new development shall incorporate compatible architectural details, storefront design, window openings, and roof shapes to balance the proportions of facades into pleasant and cohesive compositions. **The components of the elevations use vernacular elements such as double hung windows, watertable boards, strong corner boards and classic trim sizes to define the fenestration. Added decorative brackets and banding of trim help keep the scale of facades similar to the neighboring buildings. The hip roofs bring the feel of the building height down to a comfortable scale.**
- P. Building elevations are required to incorporate architecturally appropriate techniques to articulate the massing of the proposed building, such as projecting bay windows, different material for the ground floor base, cornice lines, and/or material changes, etc. **elevations of building b have been designed to be both varied and interesting et express a classic and sincere articulation of the living spaces within.**
- Q. To the extent feasible, provisions shall be made to accommodate the construction and use of an elevated pedestrian walkway (boardwalk) along the oceanfront within the Salisbury Beach Overlay District boundaries stipulated in Exhibit I^{EN} and to accommodate the future extension of the walkway along the oceanfront to the north and south of the overlay district. **Residents have access to the existing sidewalk system to allow for a pedestrian way to the town center and beach.**
- R. To the maximum extent reasonably possible, the ground floor levels in the Broadway Revitalization Subdistrict and the Oceanfront South Revitalization

Subdistrict shall be elevated to the minimum elevation stipulated by the State Building Code, and such elevations shall permit continuous sidewalks and/or boardwalks to be constructed along the building frontages that will permit easy access for pedestrians to building entrances and easy access to and from the boardwalks, the street and the beach. **Residents have access to the existing sidewalk system to allow for pedestrian way to the town center and beach.**

- S. Ground floor noncommercial habitable spaces provided at the base of buildings in the Oceanfront South Revitalization Subdistrict shall be initially designed so as to be capable of conversion at a later date to commercial use. Design features necessary for such conversion include, but are not limited to, proper ceiling height, construction assemblies meeting building codes for mixed uses, and accommodation for provision of future handicapped access. **There are no ground floor habitable spaces in this proposed building to be converted.**

DE stated we received a letter from William Vandeventer of 233 Beach Road – Unit 9A dated June 9, 2015. Most concerns are outside of our purview. The only issue that would come under our purview is regarding drainage. We will provide Joe Serwatka a copy of the letter so he is aware of the drainage issues.

DE stated one of the requirements is that this goes before the Design Review Committee. This board is no longer in existence. **LH** was able to get in contact with one of the previous member. He would be willing to look at this project and give a recommendation. **DE** stated the PB does not have the leeway to waive this requirement. We could send a letter to the Town Manager asking him to reinstate the design review board as soon as possible. Right now we are not in compliance with the zoning bylaw. He read into the record Section 300-70 of the zoning bylaw. **BB** asked in all fairness to the applicant did he know there was no design review committee anymore when he started this process. **SP** stated if the original project was approved by the design review committee and the board concurs this is a minor modification can't you approve as a minor modification without regard to having to go through the process again. **DE** stated the purpose of the Design Review Committee is to review all site plan review applications submitted to the Planning Board. **SP** stated if there was any indication that I would need to reapply for this building early on. I wouldn't have moved forward. **DE** stated when you have your initial discussion with the Planning Department it was conceptual. When the concept started meeting paper it was obvious it was a different design. **BB** asked what is it that you don't like about the presentation? **DE** stated the roof still looks different. The widows walk is not on this building. The dormers are more substantial. I don't see that on the new proposal. There is a lot of open space in Building "A". The articulation of the north elevation is not consistent. It's virtually a straight line. I like the fake chimneys on the original building. **SP** stated we have roof problems on Building "A". We didn't put the chimneys on to minimize roofing issues going forward.

Resident, William Vandeventer of 233 Beach Road-Unit 9A addressed the board. Concerns about roof, fake chimneys and dormers, they may be nice to look at but I have many leaks due to these designs. The deck on Building "A" is a nightmare. There is waterfall in the garage during the spring due to the deck. My concern is water in the southwest corner sometimes 1-2' deep.

TH asked about visitor parking. **SP** stated there were 32 parking space under Building "A" and Building "B" was intended to be a mirror image. **DE** stated I can't imagine we allowed this project without visitor parking.

Discussion regarding design review committee (drc). **DE** suggested we submit this to the member willing to look at this for their evaluation and accompany that to a letter to the Town Manage asking him to reconstitute the committee because this application is pending. Simultaneously reach out to the former member to take a look at it and get his feedback. Assuming the Town Manager is unsuccessful in appointing a committee evaluate the feedback we get.

SP stated to try to hold me to a standard to a board that doesn't exist puts me in a tough position. Then to say you are going to have one person review it that's problematic. A design review board there maybe a consensus.

DE asked you don't want the previous member of the (drc) to look this over. **SP** stated if you are asking us to sit with the architect I'm willing to work

DE motions to continue the request for minor modification for SPR 233 Beach Road LLC until the July 22, 2015 meeting with the following conditions. 1. Write a letter to the Town Manager asking him to appoint a Design Review Committee as soon as possible so they can review this plan. Simultaneously we will reach out to the former member who maybe available to assist in reviewing and giving us his/her feedback pending full committee.

BB Seconds-Vote on motion 3 – 0 unanimous.

7:30 Public Hearing

a. **Cont. Definitive Subdivision – 20 Ferry Road/Douglas Avenue-Elite Builders:**

LH stated the applicant is requesting a continuance until the July 22, 2015.

BB motions to continue the definitive subdivision – 20 Ferry Road/Douglas Avenue-Elite Builders until the July 22, 2015 meeting at 7:30 pm.

TH Seconds – Vote on motion 3 – 0 unanimous.

4. **Other Business:**

a. **Comments on Minimum Building widths as proposed for the Lafayette – Main zoning corridor: Ronald Laffely, 22 Lafayette Road of Fulcrum Architects addressed the board.** (information packets passed out). I am not representing any other property owners on this subject. I am concerned about adding value to this area. The design of the public way is key to maintaining contextual sensitivity and enhancing property owners values. Crosswalks should be put in. Speed limit is 40 mph and is fast for coming into town. Feels dimensional control for Node D does not work. Goes over plan with sketches of different scenarios. Noted existing property frontages. He noted 20' setback would allow for outside seating cafes in front and relief from residential being close to the road. Curb cuts that look like streets are dangerous. 100' is the minimum frontage needed to meet accessibility laws and regulations for business. A two story building requirement will require about 1,200 s.f of additional floor area to meet the building code. This additional floor area adds 3 additional parking spaces. DE stated 25% of the building should be built to a consistent line. 50% building frontage forces all the parking to the rear of a 100' wide lot and increase pavement lot coverage by 10%. A 10' minimum front setback does not consider winter conditions and adverse environmental conditions caused by a posted 40 MPH roadway; noise, fumes and grime. BB stated I love the picture of the sidewalk café. He asked about the Route 1 project and if there is still time to make comments on it.

DE stated the next Zoning Workshop for the Lafayette/Main Zoning Corridor is Wednesday, July 15, 2015 at 7:00 pm at the Hilton Center.

5. **Correspondence:**

6. **Minutes from June 10, 2015**

TH motions to accept the minutes from June 10, 2015

BB Seconds- vote on motion 3 – 0 unanimous.

7. **Reports of Committees:** Letter dated June 10, 2015 from FEMA noting there would be upcoming meetings.

8. **Adjournment:**

TH motions to adjourn at 9:23 pm

BB Seconds – Vote on motion 3 – 0 unanimous.

Chairman

Date

