

**Salisbury Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, July 24, 2013 7:00 p.m.**

PB Members Present: Robert Straubel (RS), Berenice McLaughlin (BHM), Lou Masiello (LM) and Trudi Holder (TH)

PB Members Absent: Don Egan

Also Present: Leah Hill, Asst. Planner, Lori Robertson, Planning Secretary

Time: 7:05 p.m.

Chairman Straubel called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Colchester Room, Salisbury Town Hall. **RS** 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/Permits: N/A

b. Request for Modification to Approved Site Plan-191 Beach Road-191 Beach Road Realty LLC c/o Equity Alliance- Mr. Joel Kahn (JK) of Equity Alliance addressed the board on behalf of the applicant. We are looking to make changes to the approved (6 building site plan). We are looking to make the changes stated in a letter dated July 3, 2013 from me:

Elimination of the connector between the rear two buildings. This would:

- Provide easier access to the proposed salt marsh viewing areas.
- Provide additional access for fire apparatus around the side and rear of the building.
- Eliminate a problem pertaining to snow removal and potential icing.

Combine the front four buildings into two larger buildings. This would:

- Improve the parking flow in or about Building #1
- Remove garage access from the primary entry drive which will help improve the grading and drainage as well as the visual appeal of the project entry drive.

Request that the Planning Board consider a number of changes to the building design which would still achieve the Victorian/New England design goals of the Design Review Committee while maximizing the visual appeal of the property.

- Open 50% of the garage to outside air based upon establishing a slightly higher finished floor elevation. This would help protect the property against an unforeseen weather event. It would also allow us to improve grading throughout the site. By opening the garage, we also improve ventilation in the garage area avoiding having to install large fans for ventilation.
- Utilize the roof to screen all air conditioning compressors. This can be done by placing them on a flat section of the roof hidden from view from all building elevations. We have been looking at some Victorian style buildings that provide the look and feel we believe you are looking for while allowing for a hidden section of the roof to be flat.
- Improve access to the building by eliminating a number of the sloped walkways initially envisioned during the early stages of the design. This would address liability and safety concerns.
- Construct the units with a ceiling height of between 8'6" – 9'0". This provides a better experience for the occupant.

LM asked where visitor parking would be located? **RS** asked if the number of parking spaces proposed in the original plan are the same as now? **JK** stated we changed nothing on the parking. **LM** stated the original had 442 spaces. Would there be enough parking for visitors? **JK** stated we will match what we originally had. If we have to make changes to the plan on parking we will be back in.

RS noted there is a hearing scheduled for 7:30 p.m. we could temporarily pause and continue after the public hearing. Eric Botterman of Millelennium Engineering representing the applicant for the public hearing (**EB**) stated you can continue on.

LM noted on the original plan 22 on-street parking spaces. **JK** stated we will provide them if that's what is required. **LH** stated its on street parking in the development.

LM stated in the decision it states if the applicant or successors acquire any interest in parcels Map 28 Lot 9...**RS** stated this piece does not belong to the land owner. Nobody can figure out who owns it. They thought it was more economical to wall it off.

RS stated we are here tonight to decide if the applicant needs a whole new hearing. I believe there was no change to the grading or impervious surface? **JK** stated we will be changing the grading around the building. **RS** asked if the buildings will be at the same elevation as the original plan. **JK** other than the elimination of some fill everything will remain the same. **RS** stated we don't have complete engineering plans with the proposed changes.

BHM asked what the square footage of the apartments would be. **JK** stated we are still working that out. We would guess on average a 1 bedroom would be 775-800 s/f and 2 bedroom would be 1,000-1,100 s/f.

LM motions that the board has determined that the connector between the two buildings is a minor change.

BHM Seconds - Vote on motion 4 – 0 unanimous.

LM motions that combining the front four buildings into two larger buildings is a minor change.

BHM Seconds – Vote on motion 3 – 1 (RS opposes). Motion Passes.

RS asked if the non-structural peaks above the ridge line would be above 45'. **JK** stated yes. We could get rid of them. I just think it looks smarter. **RS** stated I like it too.

LM motions that the number of design changes to the building design is a minor change

- a. Open 50% of the garage to outside air based upon establishing a slightly higher finished floor elevation.
- b. Utilize the roof to screen all air conditioning compressors. This can be done by placing them on a flat section of the roof hidden from view from all building elevations. [Utilizing a false roof].
- c. Improve access to the building by eliminating a number of the sloped walkways initially envisioned during the early stages of the design.
- d. Construct the units with a ceiling height of between 8'6"-9'0".

BHM Seconds – Vote on motion 4 – 0 unanimous.

2. 7:30 PM Public Hearings (7:50 PM)

- a. **SPR-18 Fanaras Drive-Keith Harnum:** Mr. Eric Botterman (EB) of Millennium Engineering addressed the board on behalf of the applicant. Based on Joe Serwatka's letter dated July 22, 2013 – *Lighting Plan-The plan indicates adequate lighting levels around the building, but indicates no lighting at the two driveways. The board may want the engineer to discuss this issue. The response states that the "lighting plan has been revised to increase lighting output"; however the intensities at the driveways are still at 0.01, or less than a tenth of recommended minimum values. Light standards may need to be shown at each driveway. The board may want the engineer to address this issue.* **EB** stated we did the lighting plan over with the maximum wattage available for those fixtures. Keith will have to work with the building inspector to get light into the front entrance. We made changes to the constructed wetlands to what Joe Serwatka and Mary Rimmer wanted. We added a cement forebay and swale. We did move/rotate the three parking spaces on the side. Also, in the decision it is noted **that vertical granite curbing shall be added to the front of the landscaping beds that abut the building to contain the landscaping as well as serve as protection of the building from vehicles.** **EB** stated

Keith Harnum would like berm instead of curbing. He would like not to have the expense of putting the curbing in. **RS** stated I had a conversation with the planner and we believe granite is needed. We believe it's a safety issue. The alternative to no granite would be bollards. **KH** stated we would like to use asphalt berm. **RS** stated asphalt is a poor substitute for granite. **EB** stated they do not have a huge customer base that would be going in and out of the building. **RS** stated we are looking ahead, we need to make this as safe as we can within reason. I believe the granite would be better. **LM** stated I think we need to look towards the future too. I'm in favor of the granite.

BHM asked about the installation of granite. **EB** stated the granite would be 13" deep pieces - 7" would be buried and 6" would be exposed abutting the pavement.

LH stated they need to provide an ANR plan before receiving their building permit.

RS asked if there any abutters? None present.

TH motions to close the Public Hearing for SPR-18 Fanaras Drive-Keith Harnum

BHM Seconds – Vote on motion 4 – 0 unanimous.

LM motions to approve the project with these conditions in the draft decision dated July 24, 2013 for 18 Fanaras Drive.

TH Seconds – Vote on motion 4 – 0 unanimous.

3. Old Business: N/a

4. Other Business: **ANR Discussion**

LH stated in speaking with the Andover, MA planning department, I found out they complete ANRs in the office instead of at a meeting. They still have the same review time allowed by statute and receive a filing fee, but normally turn the ANRs around quicker. The Planning Board then doesn't have to have a five minute meeting solely for an ANR. If this is something you are interested in pursuing, we would have to amend the PB Rules and Regulations to state the Planning Board or authorized agent can act on ANRs. The authorized agent would be the Planning Department. The ANR would be reviewed just as it is for the planning board and if it is determined that the proposed plan is in fact a subdivision, then the plan would not be endorsed and the applicant notified that it is a subdivision.

5. Correspondence: **Planning Board minutes from June 12, 2013 to be accepted and signed**
No quorum.

Planning Board minutes from July 10, 2013 to be accepted and signed

BHM motions to accept and sign the minutes from July 10, 2013 PB meeting.

TH Seconds – Vote on motion 4 – 0 unanimous.

6. Reports of Committees:

7. Adjournment:

BHM motions to adjourn at 8:20 p.m.

LM Seconds-Vote on motion 4 - 0 unanimous.

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

Minutes Approved By:_____Date:_____