

**Salisbury Planning Board
Meeting Minutes**

Date: Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Place: Colchester Auditorium, Salisbury Town Hall, 5 Beach Road

Time: 7:00 p.m.

PB Members Present: Vice Chair Gina Park (GP), Clerk John “Marty” Doggett (JMD), Louis Masiello (LM), Gil Medeiros (GM) and Alternate Deb Rider (DR).

PB Members Absent: Chair Don Egan (DE)

Also Present: Assistant Planner Bart McDonough (BMD), Planning Board secretary Sue Johnson (SJ).

Gina Park brought the meeting to order at **7:00 p.m.** in the Colchester Auditorium, Salisbury Town Hall. Announced, per opening meeting law, that the meeting was being recorded.

1. New Business

- a. Signing of Plans / Permits**
None

2. Public Hearings

- a. Major Site Plan Review—57 Railroad Avenue, The Daly Group, LLC**
Katie Cruz (KC) stated that she was a Civil Engineer with Hancock Associates and is presenting this project on behalf of the Daly Group who is the developer of the project. KC stated that the project will be four 2 unit buildings for a total of 8 units. KC stated that these residential units will be elevated with parking underneath. KC stated that the site improvements will include a driveway, landscaped areas, new utility services, storm water drainage system and sidewalk. KC stated that the storm water system was designed to meet Massachusetts storm water standards. KC stated that this project was approved by the Conservation Commission. KC stated that they did receive a peer review letter from the Town Engineer in which they are in the process of replying to and are also in the process of coordinating with the DPW to make sure all of the proposed utility services and improvements meet their requirements and have scheduled to meet with them next week. GP asked if there is new information from the last time. KC replied that they changed the width of the building and the piling locations to allow for easier traffic and firetruck turning into the site. KC stated that they met with the fire department and got their approval. KC stated that they had originally shown a crushed stone driveway and changed it to a crushed clamshell driveway which they feel is more stable and more appropriate for the area. KC stated that they moved a couple of staircases around at the recommendation of the Planning Department. LM stated that the Town Engineer gave a very thorough review and had a lot of issues that need to be addressed. LM asked that the applicant review the letter in detail and prepare some solid solutions. LM went on to state that this seems to be a

difficult site in regards to getting in and out with a vehicle, snow storage and all of the utility issues that he raised. **JMD** agreed with **LM** that there are a lot of issues that need to be addressed. **GP** also agreed and stated she had concerns with guest parking, snow storage, space between buildings, and lack of open space, make sure that the lighting is dark sky compliant and address the utility issues. **GP** asked **KC** to discuss the stairways underneath that impede with the parking area. **KC** stated that those staircases are heading down toward the back of the building and that at the next meeting they will present an elevation drawing showing how this would work. **GP** stated that visitor parking and snow storage are essential. **KC** stated that the parking was sized to meet the zoning requirements and have the proper amount of parking spaces and they meet the size requirements and stated that she will discuss visitor parking with the developer. **KC** stated the plan for snow storage was to store what they can on site and have the rest removed by a snow removal company which the condo association would pay for. **KC** stated that they acknowledge that there is limited space available on site for snow storage between the buildings and at the front of the site **KC** went on to state that they assigned volumes to these areas and the developer acknowledges that snow that exceeds those volumes would have to be removed. **GP** asked if the space between the buildings was 6' as opposed to 10'. **KC** stated that between the buildings there is 6' which is driven by the required size of the parking spaces underneath the building and this is the space that is leftover in order to meet the setback requirements. **GP** asked **BMD** what the fire rating code was and if the buildings were fire rated. **BMD** stated fire rating requires 5' and the Building Inspector would not allow it if the buildings were not. **LM** asked what the purpose of the 2 temporary propane tanks. **KC** replied that it was a contingency plan to acknowledge the National Grid shutout and their backlog in providing gas services to new residential properties. **KC** stated that the temporary propane tanks were going to be in place to serve the units until gas services were available to the project. **Nicole Stevens (NS)** stated that she lives directly across from this site and asked how far in approvals has this project already gone. **BMD** replied that they received initial approval in 2007 for a different configuration and the applicant asked for extensions up until this past October when the Planning Board denied their last extension request when they tried to modify the application to look like what they are presenting tonight and were forced to reapply for approval and are in the first public hearing with the Planning Board but have already received approval from the Conservation Commission for this design. **NS** stated that she has been at her property for over 20 years and remembers 2 units on this lot and now they are looking to put 8 units and went on to state that parking is already horrendous and snow storage is a nightmare. **NS** asked how tall the buildings will be. **BMD** replied 33 feet. **NS** asked if it was too late in the project to ask not to jam 8 units onto a site where there used to be two and please don't do this to the neighborhood. **NS** stated just because zoning allows them to jam 8 units onto this site is that what Salisbury really wants to do. **GP** stated that this is the trend that we are seeing and our zoning allows for this. **NS** asked how far the setback was for this project. **BMD** replied that the setback is 5'. **LM** stated that the zoning changed in the early 2000's to allow smaller setbacks and denser development and it is the Board's job to get the best project that we can within the zoning laws and this is why the Board is asking the applicant questions about visitor parking and snow storage. **NS** stated that she would like to see a nice building but not 8 units crammed onto a postage stamp. **Chuck Takesian (CT)**, 9 16th street, stated that

he agreed with NS and went on to state that the number of parking spaces that a property can accommodate will dictate the numbers of units allowed. CT believes it is time for the Planning Board to look at the 2 parking space requirement per unit and no provision for visitor parking. GM asked the applicant how much time they will need to reply to the Town Engineers letter. KC replied that they should be ready by the next meeting on January 23rd.

GM motioned to continue this public hearing until 1/23/19 at 7:10pm.

JMD seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

3. Other Business

a. Discussion regarding potential zoning amendments.

GP stated that it is time to review the zoning and make sure that it still makes sense as things change over time. GP stated that there are off street parking standards that the Board can look at which could apply to the whole Town. LM stated that the Board always runs into visitor parking issues which is currently not in the bylaws. LM went on to state that the Board could look into what other Towns are doing and what is typical. LM stated that at the beach during July and August visitor parking is in great demand and suggested requiring more visitor parking for the beach. GP stated that there should be a criteria for snow storage. GP suggested that the Board look at the setback requirements at the beach. LM stated that when the beach was rezoned the reason for the smaller setbacks was because there was a desire to increase density at the beach to generate more residents which would support more businesses. LM went on to state that maybe a 5' setback is too little but a 20' setback would be too much and it is not an area where we wanted to encourage single family homes and is the reason it was zoned for multifamily. GP replied that the beach is not seeing new business and has become mostly residential.

LM referenced the off-street parking standards draft from 2009 and asked why the requirements for off street parking did not apply to the following districts:

*Village Center District Bylaw

*Commercial Development in the Beach Commercial District

*Salisbury Beach Overlay District Bylaw

*Village Residential Overlay District

BMD replied that those are the areas where you would find more density in Town unlike R1 and R2 where you would find more single family homes and went on to state that this draft from 2009 needs to be updated. LM stated that visitor parking should be looked at for each district where the off street parking did not apply.

LM stated that he had a suggested to update the following language in regards to off street parking standards:

Product assembly - 0.75 per employee in maximum shift plus 1 per company vehicle.

LM suggested changing the wording to read 1 per employee.

| §300-151. Maintenance.

Parking lots are to be maintained as needed, including curbing, pavement, landscaping, lighting and clearly painted lines and crosswalks as well as kept free from litter. The building inspector shall be the authority on ensuring that parking lots are maintained in keeping with this bylaw.

In regards to the section above, **LM** stated that in regards to lighting the Board does not reference anywhere that a parking lot has to be lighted or how much is needed and believes regulations should be created to cover these issues. **BMD** stated that many projects go through site plan review which is where lighting would come up.

LM stated that in regards to Special Provisions for Village Center District section 300.82.4 he would like to see clarification regarding the definition *Automated teller machine (ATM), not attached to a full-service banking office, provided that public access is available only from within a building and is operated in connection with other uses in the same building.* **LM** stated how can it be not attached but still only require public access only from within a building. **BMD** stated that this would need to be clarified.

GP would like to review the sign bylaws especially regarding electronic signs. **LM** asked who reviews the signs. **BMD** replied the Building inspector.

LM stated that there should be definition for Gas Station (Full or Self-Service) and Vehicle Maintenance Facility.

LM stated that the definition of Restaurants, Fast Food does not mention a drive through food where food is not generally consumed on site. **BMD** stated that he would review the definition.

LM stated that the Sign, Oscillating or Flashing title should probably include the word digital.

LM stated that he would not be here for the next meeting.

4. Correspondence

- a. **Minutes:** December 12, 2018
Not completed

5. Adjournment

GM motioned to adjourn
LM seconded.
Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

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

Minutes approved by:

Donald E. Fu

Date:

2/27/19

