# Salisbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, November 13, 2019

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

Time: 7:10 p.m.

PB Members Present: Chair Don Egan (DE), Clerk, Gil Medeiros (GM), John "Marty" Doggett (JMD),

Louis Masiello (LM) and Deb Rider (DR).

PB Members Absent: None

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

<u>**DE**</u> brought the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.in the Colchester Auditorium, Salisbury Town Hall. Announced, per opening meeting law, that the meeting was being recorded.

### 1. Public Hearings—7:10 pm

a. **Modification to a definitive subdivision plan**—28 Rabbit Road (Assessor Map 10, Lot(s) 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 123,124, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, &132—Request made by ZAP Development, LLC **GM** recused himself.

Eric Botterman (EB) of Millennium Engineering stated that he was representing ZAP Development. EB stated that they would like to request a continuance.

JMD motioned to continue until 12/11/2019 at 7:10pm.

DR seconded.

Vote: 4-0, motion passed.

b. Modification to a minor site plan—28 Rabbit Road (Assessor Map 10, Lot(s) 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 123, 124, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, &132—request made by ZAP Development, LLC GM recused himself. EB stated that while going through permitting through the Conservation Commission, the Town's wetland scientist would like a 10 foot separation between the grading and the wetlands. EB stated they are proposing 700 linear feet of Jersey barrier to hold up to withhold up to 2 feet of fill as separation to the wetlands. EB handed out photos of Jersey barriers being used in a similar fashion. LM asked if they would be new barriers. EB replied that they are using the barriers that were used on the Whittier Bridge and went on to state that they are in good shape and do not have any cracks. JMD asked about the erosion on the barriers in the photos presented. EB replied that the barriers in the pictures are approximately 30 years old. DR asked what the previous material was going to be, EB replied that there was only going to be grading. DE asked if the Town Engineer had a chance to review the modification. EB replied that he did not know as it was just sent out this morning. **DE** asked **EB** what specifically the Conservation Commission ask for. **EB** the Conservation Commission asked for a 10 foot separation between any grading on the project and the wetland lines. **DE** asked if the Conservation Commission approve the use of the Jersey barriers. **EB** replied yes. **DE** stated that he has concerns because the Town Engineer has not had a chance to review the modification and believes he needs an opportunity to weigh in on this. EB replied that his name and stamp are on the plan not his. **DE** replied that the Town Engineer is who this Board relies on to accept or reject proposals from an engineering perspective. DE suggested a conditional approval based upon receiving the Town Engineers feedback. EB replied that he has no problem with a conditional approval. BMD asked about the barriers eroding and suggested a maintenance plan to replace them over the years as needed. **EB** stated that he would have no problem with a maintenance plan.

**JMD** motioned to grant a provisional approval for the modification of the site plan subject to the recommendation of the Town Engineer.

**DR** seconded.

Vote: 4-0, motion approved.

c. **Special Permit and major site plan review**—238 Lafayette Road (Assessor Map 23, Lot 17)—Request made by Ganesh Wellness, LLC

EB stated that the propose project for this site is to take the old Stella's restaurant and make it into a marijuana facility. **EB** stated that they are proposing to rehab/refurbish the existing building which is a little over 2,000sf on a lot approximately ½ acre. EB stated that Lafayette Road is controlled by MassDOT. EB stated that he had spoken to MassDOT design people a couple months ago to ensure that what they came up with for driveway accesses was not incompatible with the project that they have on Lafayette Road. EB went on to state that MassDOT has plans reconstruct Lafayette Road and add a sidewalk. EB stated that they have received plans from the Town Engineer but are not prepared to respond at this point. DE stated to the Board that this project is in the Lafavette and Main Commercial District which has its own zoning requirements and the special permit is under the Recreational Marijuana Overlay District bylaw. EB stated that they are proposing to have 31 parking spaces and parking is not allowed in front of the structure in the LMC District. EB stated that there is the ability for them to ask for a waiver for up to 15% of the required parking. **EB** stated that they spoke with the Building Inspector and he determined this to be a retail facility and 7 parking spaces would be needed. EB stated that the flow of traffic would be entering on the southern end of the property to access the parking on that side of the building or drive in front of the building to access parking on the northern side of the building and then all vehicles would exit out of the northern side onto Lafayette. EB stated that sewer will begin to be installed on Lafayette Road in the spring. EB stated the site has a failed septic system and they are proposing to do a tight tank. **EB** stated that there should only be 6 to 7 employees on site at any one time so there will not be a huge waste flow. EB stated that this would be an interim solution until they could hook up to the sewer. EB stated that they believe the parking is adequate and do not have additional offsite parking at this time. EB stated that generally when these types of facilities open they schedule appointments. DE stated that the applicant is looking for guidance on a few key points such as the number of parking spaces, the location of parking spaces, the driveway in the front and the architectural drawings. GM stated that he agreed with the applicant that there should not be parking behind the building. DR asked what the required number of parking spaces was. DE stated using the formula they have in place now calculates the required number is 7 spaces. **DE** stated that if you compare it to the Elm Street property 7 parking spaces wouldn't cut it. EB stated that he had spoken to the owners of the Elm St. store and they were surprised how many customers this location was taking away from their Salem, MA store. LM stated that the Elm St. location has satellite parking at the Sylvan Street Grille and may be something that you would want to look into for this site. **DR** asked if a customer is pulling in to the parking lot on the right and finds that there is no parking is there space to turn around. EB said no they would need to back out. GM stated that he feels that customers would be able to see if there were open spaces in that parking lot because there aren't that many. LM stated that if there was a driveway in the back as the Town Engineer had suggested it would eliminate this problem. **EB** stated that he didn't feel that this is a significant issue for the customer to have to back up and went on to state that with this kind of facility having anything behind the building is not a good idea. GM agreed that there should not be access to the back of the building. Anand Patel (AP) stated that the neighbors directly behind them had concerns so to be good neighbors they propose to put up a fence and keep all activity to the front of the building. AP stated that they have gone door to door speaking with the neighbors to introduce themselves and ask about any concerns that they have. JMD asked if the fire department had any concerns about access to the site. EB replied that they have not heard back from them and went on to state that they will be hearing back from all of the department heads regarding the special permit. **DE** stated in regards to parking will the applicant be scheduling appointments with customers. AP stated

that they are working closely with the police chief with their traffic plan and if the police chief thinks that appointments are needed they will do so. **DE** stated that the Board may need to incorporate this as a condition and at some point the applicant can come back to request a non-appointment system. DE stated that from his perspective there is not enough parking at the site. JMD asked how they would handle deliveries. EB stated that deliveries will be made off hours in a secured fenced in area. AP stated that deliveries would be made by an unmarked commercial van at random times not to create a pattern. AP stated that there would be 2 people in the van and one would remain at all times. BMD stated that there will be 6-7 employees which will reduce the number of parking spaces. **DE** asked if the driveway in front would it create any hazards for people entering and exiting the store. EB stated that he did not believe so. EB stated that the driveway is a one way loop and went on to state that MassDOT would not give them in and out access at each lot. DE discussed possibly having a right turn only leaving the parking lot. LM asked about signage. EB stated that they would have one sign near the entrance but do not have a design yet but it will meet the zoning regulations. DE asked if there was any opportunity to tear the building down and relocate a new building on one side of the lot. EB replied no, economically it is not feasible. DE discussed the architectural drawings and stated that they may be mislabeled and suggested that they discuss at another meeting. EB agreed and stated that they could have the architect there to address the Board's questions. JMD asked if EB could check with the architect about the purpose of the decks in the back. AP stated that they were there when they bought the property and they are not sure if they will keep them or not.

**GM** motioned to continue the hearing until 12/11/2019 at 7:10pm.

LM seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

d. Minor site plan review: 139 Elm Street (Assessor Map 9, Lot 18)—Request made by Li Realty Trust EB stated that in the spring they did a survey to do a Certificate of Compliance with the Conservation Commission and found out that there were things that were not built as they were supposed to be. EB stated that their plan is to get permission to fill some of the wetlands in the back of the property which would give them an additional 20 parking spaces. EB stated that for them to do this they would need Conservation Commission approval. EB stated that at this point they are not ready to move forward and is requesting a continuance until the Conservation Commission makes a decision on their plan. EB asked for a continuance until 12/11/2019 at 7:10pm. BMD asked EB to submit the request for a time extension in writing.

LM motioned to continue the hearing until 12/11/2019 at 7:10pm.

JMD seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

### 2. New Business

- a. Signing of plans & permits Nothing to be signed.
- b. **Certificate of completion and bond release**—208 Elm Street—Request made by 208 Old Elm Street Salisbury, LLC

**BMD** explained that a \$7,500.00 bond was retained for the applicant to complete the bus stop shelter. **BMD** showed the Board pictures of the bus stop shelter. GM stated that he drove by and it looks nice. **BMD** stated that their developer's escrow has a negative balance of \$150.00 and suggested to condition to have that paid prior to releasing the bond. **DE** asked if it was a cash bond and **BMD** replied that it was.

**GM** motioned to grant the final Certificate of Completion and bond release subject to payment of the outstanding \$150.00 review fee.

DR seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

c. Certificate of completion and bond release—20 Ferry Road (2-10 Sycamore Ln.)—Request made by Bradley Kutcher

BMD stated that the applicant has submitted as-builts to Joe Serwatka (JS) and the Board for review. BMD explained that JS has questions for the applicant that they have not yet replied to. BMD went on to state that some of the concerns are lighting and landscaping and BMD suggested to the Board to do a site visit. DE stated that at the last meeting there were several abutters with concerns and one of them was flooding and the installation of spotlights that were installed by the homeowners. BMD stated that there have been site walks done by the Planning Department, JS and the residents. BMD went on to state that the main issue is the lighting not being dark sky compliant. BMD stated that it was stressed to the homeowners that dark sky lighting is a condition that they must adhere to. DE asked BMD to coordinate with the developer to meet on Monday, 11/25/2019 after dusk with all exterior lights on. BMD stated that he would arrange a time frame and advise the Board.

LM motioned to do a site walk and continue until December 11, 2019.

DR seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

#### 3. Other Business

a. None

### 4. Correspondence

a. **Minutes:** March 27, 2019 **LM** motioned to approve.

DR seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

b. **Minutes:** August 28, 2019 **JMD** motioned to approve.

GM seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

c. **Minutes:** September 11, 2019 **DR** motioned to approve.

JMD seconded.

Vote: 4-0, motion passed (LM abstained; he was not at meeting).

d. **Minutes:** October 9, 2019 **GM** motioned to approve.

JMD seconded.

Vote: 4-0, motion passed (LM abstained; he was not at meeting).

## 5. Adjournment

**GM** motioned to adjourn.

JMD seconded.

Vote: 5-0, motion passed.

* Documents provided at the meeting are on file in the Planning O	ffice
Minutes approved by:	
Date: 7/8/2020	