



PEMBROKE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 2021

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Daniel Taylor (Chairman), Alysha Siciliano-Perry (Clerk), Stephan Roundtree, and Heather Tremblay.

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Andrew Wandell (Vice-Chairman), James Noone, and Daniel Smith, Jr.

OTHERS PRESENT: Matthew Heins (Planning Board Assistant), Kevin Grady, Jeffrey De Lisi, James Smith, Valerie Johnson, Lillian Sullivan, Jim Shea, Peter Mason, Michael Cohen, Mia Liani, John Naples, E. Naples, Eric Reiche, Andrew Timmis, Dan Robinson, Lisa Robinson, and others.

OPENING THE MEETING

Chairman Daniel Taylor opened the meeting by reading the Chairman's statement.

REVIEW OF ROUTINE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

The board agreed to postpone reorganizing until a future board meeting with more board members present.

Mr. Roundtree made a motion to postpone the board's reorganization until a future date, Ms. Tremblay seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

The board agreed to meet on July 26 for a public hearing.

Ms. Siciliano-Perry made a motion to accept the minutes for May 24, 2021, and June 14, 2021, Mr. Roundtree seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

Mr. Heins explained some changes to the procedures for special permits for restaurants.

DISCUSSION ABOUT CONSTRUCTION PROBLEMS AT SUBDIVISION #1701 BRISTOL ESTATES

The board and Mr. Heins discussed Subdivision #1701 Bristol Estates and the ongoing disagreements between the builder and two residents there regarding how certain portions of it were constructed. It was agreed that the board's peer review engineer for the project, Tyler Nims, would take another look at the subdivision's progress and submit a new report.

The board waited a few minutes until 7:30 pm, when the public hearing for 715 Washington Street was scheduled to begin.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR PROPOSED SITE PLAN #SP1-21 AT 715 WASHINGTON STREET

Mr. Taylor reopened the public hearing (continued from March 22, 2021, April 12, 2021, May 10, 2021, May 24, 2021, and June 14, 2021) for the application of George Thibeault, 599 Summer Street, Marshfield, MA 02050, requesting Site Plan approval under the Zoning Bylaws of the Town of Pembroke Section V.7. (Site Plan Approval). The applicant proposes (as per the description in the original application) to construct a two-story building with a 5,000-square-foot footprint consisting of lumber fabrication on the first floor and offices on the second floor, a small kiln building, a furnace, and parking areas, along with outdoor storage and work areas. The project would be a light industrial use related to lumber and/or wood products. The property is located in the Residential-Commercial District, at 715 Washington Street, Pembroke, MA 02359, as shown on Assessors' Map F9, Lot 24. A copy of the application is available in the Office of the Planning Board.

Attorney Jeffrey De Lisi, representing the applicant, was present, along with Kevin Grady, the engineer for the project.

Mr. Grady explained that a sound survey was done to evaluate the likely audio impact of the project's wood-cutting machinery ("the processor"), and he described the details of this. Referring to the written document of the sound survey, he discussed in detail how it was done and what the results were. He essentially concluded that the noise would have little effect on those living on adjacent properties.

Mr. Roundtree said he was satisfied by the sound survey, and he noted that the proposed wood-cutting processor would be much less loud than traditional wood-cutting machinery.

Mr. De Lisi said that the building inspector had verbally stated that the project falls under the category of light industry, which is allowed by right in this zone. He also explained that they were not applying for a special permit for "outdoor storage, display and sale of goods," because they felt the proposed temporary storage of wood on the site did not fall into this category. Conversation followed between him and Mr. Taylor.

A member of the public asked about the nature of the business, and discussion ensued. Mr. Grady summarized the proposed business activities. He explained that the project includes a two-floor commercial building, with the kilning of specialty lumber taking place on the first floor. Offices and equipment would also be in the building. There would be a wood-processing (wood-cutting) machine on the site. Once the wood is cut, it would be placed in a cage and then another kiln. After the kilning, the wood would be placed in large bags for storage and transport. There would also be a portable sawmill, but that would not be the main focus of the business.

Mr. Grady went over where these structures and activities would be located on the site, and described the access and parking. He explained that the project had been approved by the Board of Health and the Conservation Commission. He described the stormwater system.

Mr. De Lisi emphasized that the site would not be a conventional lumber yard for the general public, as the purpose of the business is for specialty lumber and/or firewood.

Ms. Siciliano-Perry asked about the amount of traffic and how often contractors would come. Mr. Grady and Mr. De Lisi answered her questions and explained that there wouldn't be a showroom for the public.

Mr. Taylor opened the hearing to public comment.

Dan Robinson, a nearby resident, asked some questions about the nature of the business, and said that as a “sawmill” it should not be classified as light industrial. Mr. De Lisi said the building inspector, as the zoning enforcement officer, had verbally stated that the project is a light industrial use. Mr. Heins mentioned that the building inspector had not submitted anything in writing about the use.

Mr. Robinson asked questions about how the sound survey was done, and Mr. Grady answered them.

James Smith, a nearby resident, emphasized his opposition to the project. He described it as a “sawmill” and said it would bring tractor-trailer trucks. He noted the presence of residences in the vicinity. He disputed the water quality and air quality issues, and he said there have not been any traffic studies. He also expressed concern about pollutants in the ground.

Mr. De Lisi again explained that the building inspector had stated the project is a light industrial use. Regarding water quality, he said the stream has been defined and certified as an intermittent stream, and that he expects Mass. DEP to reject the ongoing appeal of this. He said that a traffic study is unnecessary given the project is on a state highway and would not make a major impact.

Mr. De Lisi and Mr. Grady added that they have received approval from the Board of Health regarding wells and drinking water. Mr. De Lisi noted that the zone is partly commercial and contains many businesses, including some that are light industrial.

A member of the public described his concerns about air quality.

John Naples, a nearby resident, mentioned that he is on well water, and asked how many trucks would enter and exit the site. Mr. Grady said the project meets requirements for groundwater, and explained that the numbers for trucks had been submitted but he couldn’t recall the figure.

Michael Cohen, a nearby resident, discussed water quality and septic systems. He described the history of the property’s ownership, and argued that the stream is an active brook. He expressed concerns about the project in general, and stressed the impact it would have on residents in the area.

It was clarified that the Zoning Board of Appeals’ decision granting two variances to the project specified the hours of operation to be 8 am to 6 pm Monday through Saturday.

Mr. Grady explained that the business’s operations would not put chemicals into the ground, and that stormwater would be properly infiltrated.

A discussion took place about the stream and conservation issues, and Mr. Grady talked about the previous attempts to develop the site.

It was clarified that the zoning classification of the site has not changed.

Lisa Robinson, a nearby resident, asked about how trucks would access the site, and in particular whether they would back in. Mr. Grady explained that they generally would be able to enter normally.

A member of the public asked about vibrations from the trucks, and Mr. Grady described how the transfer of logs would be carried out.

Eric Reiche, a nearby resident, asked how much louder the noise would be when the trees have lost their leaves in the winter. Mr. De Lisi and Mr. Grady explained that it would probably make even less of an impact due to the increased ambient noise.

In reply to a question, Mr. Grady said the enclosure for the saw-cutting machinery would be a "Calhoun enclosure." He showed images of it, and explained it would help dampen the sound. He also briefly described the kiln.

Andrew Timmis, a nearby resident, asked various questions about the details of the stormwater system, which Mr. Grady answered. He also asked about the noise impacts, and the water from the kilns.

It was agreed, after some discussion, to continue the public hearing to July 12.

Ms. Siciliano-Perry made a motion to continue the public hearing to July 12 at 7:45 pm, Mr. Roundtree seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

Ms. Roundtree made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Ms. Siciliano-Perry seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor by roll call.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Heins, Planning Board Assistant