

SALISBURY PLANNING BOARD

ZONING WORKSHOP

Date: Wednesday, March 18, 2015

Place: Hilton Senior Center, 43 Lafayette Road

Time: 6:00 p.m.

6:00PM ZONING WORKSHOP

Lafayette Road and Main Street Corridors Zoning Workshop

In Attendance: Don Egan, Berenice McLaughlin, Jane Purinton, Bob Carroll, Bruce D. Ackerman, Herman Fortin, Gordon Blaney, Diana Papoulias, Scott Vandewalle, Susan Pawlisheck, Freeman Condon, Dave Pritchard, Wilma McDonald, Ronalee Ray-Parrott, Jessica LaBonet, Clyde Holland, Frank Bertolino, Brendan Doherty, Chris Chapman, Leah Hill, Wayne Capolupo, Sheila Brown, Judi Barrett (consultant)

Introductions were made. Don spoke to the purpose of this zoning, why it is being looked at. We want to encourage development that we want, for instance, dense residential in the village area, targeted areas to attract development that is desirable for the town. Judi stated that currently Salisbury's commercial zoning is strip development; this proposal creates nodes, a place to a place. Residents stated that they want different uses at different sections of the corridor.

The nodes are generally:

- A: highway access, larger footprints
- B: a lot of land, mixed-use, housing
- C: longer term projects
- D: More village feel, just outside the existing village zoning

Discussion points:

1. Node A:
 - Highway uses-gas, hotel, should allow drive-thrus for food in this Node (have to change table of use)
 - Why not allow single-family homes in this node? Doesn't match with the intended uses of hotels, fast-food, etc
 - Frontage in this node is increased to 150'. Herman questioned his property as he has 125'. Judi stated that allowing a smaller frontage creates many curbcuts. One way to satisfy both is to keep at 150' but allow a smaller frontage with shared access (Herman OK with this option).
2. Node B:
 - Why are there no single-family detached houses listed in Node B? Judi answered that this area could allow for further housing diversity. An option would be to allow single-family if provided within a mix of other housing options.
 - We want commercial in the front of this Node and residential buffered in the back.
 - Decision to allow single-family homes as an option in this node.

- This Node should be extended further down, to across from the elementary school. Judi stated that the map hasn't been updated, was waiting to do all at once.
- Questioned why hospitals were allowed in A, but nursing homes only in B & D. What about nursing homes with a medical component to them? Answer: This would be considered part of the nursing home development project and not a stand-alone hospital per se.

3. Dimension Control Table

- What does the last row of the dimension control table mean? “% Lot Width Occupied by Principal Building(s) at Maximum Front Setback”. Judi stated this keeps the buildings as what defines the road, rather than the parking. The percentage is the minimum.

4. Parking Requirements

- People were concerned that it appears that the parking is stricter. It does match the current site plan requirement of wanting the parking to the side and rear.
- These new zones would create different parking requirement numbers based on use.
- This new zone would allow for some parking in front, but not all. Requiring a special permit for a larger amount

5. Other

- Concerns as to whether this “guts” the new site plan requirements?
- The section on design guidelines to be adopted in the Planning Board Rules and Regulations was brought up. This is typical to zoning that you don't include all design standards in zoning. Rules and regulations are also a public hearing by the planning board.
- One-unit attached residential is allowed in C and C-2, this new zone changes that. But also allows for other new uses. As with everything else in zoning, existing is protected.
- Why are we trying to match the master plan? Rezoning this area, along with many action items, were included in the town-adopted master plan.

