

**Salisbury Planning Board
Meeting Minutes**

Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2019

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

Time: 7:00 p.m.

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

PB Members Absent: None

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

Don Egan 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** - Nothing to be signed

2. Other Business

- a. **Update:** Brief discussion on key outcomes made from the June 3, 2019 Merrimack Valley Planning Commission (**MVPC**) transportation workshop.
BMD stated that **MVPC** came and presented an update for their 20 year plan and stated that **LM** and **JMD** attended. **BMD** stated that the Town was praised on their complete streets and rail trail projects.

3. Public Hearings—7:10 pm

- a. **Planning board rules and regulation amendment**— to vote to amend the Town of Salisbury Planning Board Rules and Regulations and the Town of Salisbury Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land; including procedural and submission requirements, design standards and related text changes.
John Sykora (**JS**) from Weston and Sampson and stated that they were there to present a brief introduction of what the MS4 is. Gina Cortese (**GC**) stated that MS4 stands for the Municipal Storm Sewer System which is all man-made stormwater collection and conveyance infrastructures owned by a municipality. **GC** stated that in order for the Town to be in compliance with the permit year 1 which runs from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 the Town submitted a notice of intent October 1, 2018. **GC** stated that they are looking to add/modify language to the rules and regulations for Construction Site Runoff Control to include, requirements for erosion and sediment control BMP's, requirements for waste control on construction sites, create written procedures for site plan review and site inspection and enforcement.

LM motioned to close the public hearing.

GP seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

GM motioned to approve the rules and regulations

LM seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

JMD motioned to approve the amendments to the Site Plan and Subdivision Rules and Regulations. **LM** seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

b. Cont. Special permit and major site plan review—3 Bridge Road and 4 Beach Road—Liberty Real Estate Strategy, LLC and Downeast Investments, LLC
Rob Ciampitti (RC) stated that they were here to address the following 5 points which were brought up in the last meeting:

1. Parking Design
2. Traffic Impacts
3. Environmental Assessment
4. Open Space and Park Improvements
5. Building Design

RC stated in regards to parking allocation there are 4 visitor parking spaces. **RC** stated that they plan to assign 1 space per residential unit and stated that residents could also park in any available non-assigned spaces including parking in the commercial parking area or visitor parking. **RC** discussed the traffic impact study. **RC** discussed environmental impacts and stated that **Bill Simmons** of **Simmons Environmental** verified all the records with **DEP** for the abandoned gas station site. **RC** stated that it was determined by **Bill Simmons** that all of the work was done as it should have been. **RC** stated that in regards to open space and park improvements they are committed to working with the Town by greening up, softening and improving the Town's right of way. **RC** stated in regards to the building design of the townhouses they have created relief, added texture, porches, skyline elements and color to their design. **GP** asked if the front porches were on the ground. **Bill Nolan (BN)** stated that they each have 1 step to get onto the porch. **GP** asked how many bedrooms are in each unit. **BN** replied that the end units have three bedrooms and the middle units have 2 bedrooms and a loft and the remaining unit have 2 bedrooms. **LM** asked where the air conditioning compressors would be located. **BN** stated that they have not made a decision where they would be located yet and added that they would be hidden from view. **JMD** asked how far it was from the parking lot to the porches. **Eric Botterman (EB)** replied approximately 10 feet. **GP** asked if there were dumpsters for the residential units. **EB** stated that it would be between the eight unit building and five unit building. **GP** asked if there was green space behind the residential units. **EB** stated that there was and each unit will have a patio at grade level. **DE** asked how far off the property line on Bridge Road was the closest parking space. **EB** replied approximately 5 feet. **GP** asked if the residential units will have lighting in the front. **BN** stated that he thought there would be porch lights but the details have not been finalized at this time. **GP** reminded the applicant that all lighting needs to be dark sky compliant. **DE** stated that the lighting plan did not show porch lights and that their plan would need to be updated to reflect this. **RC** stated that they would update their plan. **GP** stated that the Town Engineer (**TE**) had some comments that needed to be addressed. **BMD** stated that the applicant submitted revised plans yesterday and the **TE** had not reviewed them yet. **EB** stated that they believe they had addressed all of the issues. **DE** stated that by removing one tree to add a parking space leaves a one dimensional look to the landscaping and asked them to redesign the landscaping plan for this area. **EB** stated that they would work with the landscape architect to do this. **DE** stated that he would like to discuss the special permit criteria tonight to see if the Board identifies anything that needs to be changed. **DE** read the purpose of the Village Center District Bylaw. **DE** then read the Design Guidelines. **DE** stated that the building cannot be wider than it is tall. **DE** stated that by looking at it, it appears to be wider than it is tall. **RC** stated that they will work on the design to meet the by-law. **DE** asked if there were primary entrances on the side. **RC**

stated that there are entrances in the front and back. **DE** stated that on the ground level portion of the front facade of a commercial building, windows should comprise at least 20% but not more than 80% of the facade surface and asked the applicant to provide the percentage for this project. **DE** stated that Buildings should avoid unarticulated and monotonous facades and window placements regular spacings, or building placements that will be viewed from the street as continuous walls **DE** stated that he had some concern on the south west side which is very prominent when driving by it and asked the applicant to put a little more attention on that side. **BN** stated that they are working on updating the plans. **DE** asked what materials and colors would be used. **BN** replied they are going with slate blue with a nautical theme using complimentary materials that will follow the guidelines. **DE** stated that flat roofs are not allowed. **BN** replied that they are leaning towards a mansard roof. **DE** read the building placement guideline “at least 50% of the front side of a lot facing the street, measured in percentage of the linear feet of lot frontage, shall be occupied by buildings oriented toward the street or by a pedestrian plaza located within 15 feet of the street side line” and asked the applicant to give the Board the measurements. **EB** replied that the frontage on this parcel is approximately 130 feet and the building is 50 feet wide. **DE** stated that it is 15 feet short. **DE** asked if anything could be done with the small landscaped area next to the building. **RC** stated that they could add a bench and some landscaping. **DE** stated that it would meet the criteria. **DE** asked what the width of the curb cut is on Bridge Road. **EB** stated that it is approximately 24 to 26 feet wide. **DE** stated that it can't be more than 24 feet. **DE** asked if all of the utilities were underground. **EB** replied yes. **DE** asked if any of the dumpsters were within 50 feet of a sidewalk. **EB** replied that they were within 50 feet of the internal sidewalks. **DE** suggested that **BMD** add this to the list of special permits. **DE** read through the parking requirements and asked if the commercial parking spaces would be shared spaces. **RC** replied yes. **DE** asked the applicant to come back with the square footage of the retail & office space to show that the building has the correct # of parking spaces.

GM motioned to continue the Public Hearing to June 26, 2019 meeting at 7:10pm.

JMD seconded.

Vote 5-0, motion passed.

BMD stated to **DE** that there were residents that wanted to make public comments.

LM motioned to reopen.

JMD seconded.

Tom DeFronzo (**TD**), 10 Beach Road, asked if there would be a fence or hedge between this property and his property. **RC** replied that they would put up a buffer and stated that he would be in touch to get his feedback. **TD** stated that he would prefer the applicant to get dumpsters with a sliding side door and a flip open top versus a dumpster with only a flip open top. **RC** stated that it would not be a problem to use dumpsters with a sliding side door.

GP motioned to continue the Public Hearing to June 26, 2019 meeting at 7:10pm.

JMD seconded.

Vote 5-0, motion passed.

- a. **Major site plan modification**—98 Elm Street and 5 Bartlett Street—DPW Realty, LLC Eric Botterman (**EB**) stated that he was representing SPS to expand their parking lot by 18 spaces. **EB** stated that they would like to use concrete curbing in the new lot which would be the same as in their current lot. **GP** would like to see the applicant continue the sidewalk to the end of their property.

GP motioned to continue the Public Hearing to June 26, 2019 meeting at 7:10pm.

JMD seconded.

Vote 5-0, motion passed.

4. Correspondence

- a. **Minutes:** April 24, 2019

LM motioned to approve.

JMD seconded.

Vote 4-0, motion passed. GP abstained because she was absent for this meeting.

5. Executive Session

- a. Executive session under G.L. c.30A, §21(a)(3) to discuss strategy with respect to litigation: Big Block Development Group v. Town of Salisbury Planning Board – Nothing new to discuss.

6. Adjournment

GP motioned to adjourn.

GM seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

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

Minutes approved by: 

Date: 8/28/19