



**PEMBROKE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2016**

PRESENT: Daniel Taylor (Chairman), Rebecca Coletta (Vice-Chairman), Thomas Irving (Clerk), Brian VanRiper (Board Member), Andrew Wandell (Board Member), Matthew Heins (Planning Board Assistant), Peter Palmieri, James Costello, Dennis Dunphy, Richard Grady, Paul Martin, Ronald Del Pino, Paul Morrison, Tracy Morrison, Karen Price, Eoghan Kelley, Steven Guard (Attorney), Paul Lestan, and Brian Taylor.

Vice-Chairman Rebecca Coletta opened the meeting by reading the Chairman's statement. (At this time the Chairman Daniel Taylor was not yet present.)

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SITE PLAN #SP5-16 300 CENTER ST.

Brian VanRiper made a motion to re-open the public hearing for site plan #SP5-16 at 300 Center Street. Andrew Wandell seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

Ms. Coletta noted that the board has received a letter from Peter Palmieri of Merrill Associates. Matthew Heins explained that the developers of 300 Center St. are scheduled to meet with the Conservation Commission on October 24.

Richard Grady submitted new drawings and documents that his firm has prepared for 300 Center St. He went over some of the plan revisions. They have added a deep sump hooded catch basin. They spent some time investigating an existing catch basin, but were unable to definitively establish where it discharges, though it does not seem to flow into the pond. They have also made some other changes in accordance with Mr. Palmieri's comments.

Mr. Grady went over the waiver requests. The developers wish to keep the existing landscaping and lighting, for the most part, so they are requesting waivers relevant to these. They are also requesting a waiver from the traffic study requirement.

Mr. Grady mentioned the bylaw requirements for parking. A discussion ensued about these requirements, the number of seats in the restaurants, and the number of parking spaces on the site. This led to a discussion about a neighbor's fence that intrudes on the property.

Mr. Grady explained that the property line is slightly different from what was originally assumed; thus the parcel is slightly larger than was previously believed. He also discussed the easements on the site, and the ambiguity over whether one easement was ever issued. Mr. Grady and the board discussed how a rear parking and loading area is accessed from the road.

Mr. Grady and the board discussed the separate building on the site, and whether a variance or determination is needed for its use as residential.

Mr. Grady, Mr. Palmieri and the board discussed an easement, the pipe related to it, and drainage issues. Mr. Palmieri described it as an unusual and convoluted drainage arrangement.

The board and Mr. Grady returned to the issue of the separate building and its use, and the separate entrance to the site for it. Mr. VanRiper explained that this entrance had previously been closed off. There was a discussion of how this building is described and what it consists of, its parking arrangements, and its septic system.

Mr. VanRiper, Mr. Grady and the board discussed the parking requirements and expectations, for employees and customers, in greater detail. The limitations of the bylaw were noted. The location of employee parking was discussed, and it was agreed that this arrangement is problematic. Mr. VanRiper noted that the assumptions for the quantity of employees parking seem unreasonable. He also pointed out that adjacent areas may experience overflow parking from the restaurant. An extended discussion ensued about parking issues.

Mr. Dunphy clarified, in reply to a question, that he made an agreement with the neighbors that there will not be any outdoor entertainment. He and the board discussed whether or not the restaurant will serve special functions and/or have a function room.

Mr. VanRiper mentioned that it might be wise to designate the employee parking as such. There was a discussion of whether the employee parking could be on a nearby site. The need to stripe the parking lot was discussed.

Mr. Palmieri talked about stormwater issues. He feels confident there will be a decrease in impervious cover, and thus doing new stormwater calculations might not be necessary. He went into some technical details about drainage. Mr. Irving, Mr. Dunphy and Mr. Costello discussed how the site handled a recent rainstorm. Ms. Coletta asked about the fence along Hobomock Street and traffic safety issues.

The board discussed the waiver requests, and whether or not to grant any of them. The board and Mr. Heins discussed how the waiver requests that are granted will be officially recorded.

Mr. VanRiper made a motion that waiver requests 4.7, 4.10, 4.21, 4.22, 5.1 and 5.2, from the letter dated October 6, 2016, from Grady Consulting, be granted. Mr. Wandell seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

A discussion ensued about the site plan, and it was agreed that the developers need to go to the Conservation Commission before the Planning Board can approve it. Since the developers are meeting with the Conservation Commission on October 24 at 7:40 pm, it was decided to continue the public hearing on the same day at 8:30 pm. Mr. Wandell made a motion to continue the public hearing to Monday, October 24, 2016, at 8:30 pm., Mr. VanRiper seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED SMALL PARKING LOT AT NEWBURY COMMONS

Paul Martin, of the engineering firm Noblin and Associates, and Ronald Del Pino described the project proposed at Newbury Commons, the townhouse condominiums located on Washington Street. There is an issue with people parking on the road (i.e., extended driveway) inside the complex, which narrows the way and in one case prevented an emergency vehicle from getting through. Thus they propose to build a small new parking lot with space for five cars to park, and to ban parking on one side of the road.

Mr. Martin showed the board the drawings that have been prepared, which show the site and where the new parking would go. Several board members expressed the opinion that a site plan review was not necessary for such a minor change to an existing development.

Mr. VanRiper made a motion to approve the proposed five new parking spaces and the required turnaround area, with access to be provided on the interior of the lot. Mr. Wandell seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE LANDSCAPING BUSINESS OPERATION ON WASHINGTON STREET

Paul Morrison and Tracy Morrison came to discuss the idea of relocating Paul Morrison's landscaping business, currently based in Marshfield, to a site on Washington Street near Marylou's Coffee. The site is a parcel they are considering purchasing.

Paul Morrison described the proposed changes they would like to make to the site. He showed the board a set of plans for an unrealized project for that site which were drawn up about ten years ago and approved by the Planning Board. These drawings are merely a point of reference; his intent is not to build the same thing.

Paul Morrison envisions clearing part of the site, putting in a gravel driveway and parking lot for trucks, and making it usable for his operations in general. He would not immediately construct a building, but

wishes to have the ability to do so in the future. He wants to use the site as a base of operations for his landscaping business; customers would not be directly served there.

Thomas Irving pointed out that the proximity of wetlands could be a problem for the site. Mr. VanRiper mentioned that the previously proposed site plan was evidently deemed acceptable in that regard. The board discussed issues of drainage, and the need to prevent runoff to the nearby brook.

A few board members noted that he would need an access permit from the state, since Route 53 (Washington St.) is a state highway. Issues of getting water from a well were discussed. The board discussed how the project could be phased as one site plan review, or as multiple reviews. The board members outlined the general process of how site plan review proceeds, and what expenses are involved.

The board and Paul Morrison talked about issues of water supply and the possible need to put in a septic system. Electricity and signage were also discussed.

The Chairman of the Board, Daniel Taylor, arrived at this time.

DISCUSSION OF SOUTH PAWS DOGGIE DAY CARE COMPLETION

Karen Price, of South Paws Doggie Day Care, came before the board. She is waiting for the building inspector to do a final inspection of the site, based on Tyler Nims' comments, so the board can sign off on it. The building inspector has not yet carried out this inspection, and the board and Mr. Heins discussed the need for this to be done soon.

DISCUSSION OF EQUESTRIAN ESTATES ROADWAY ACCEPTANCE

Eoghan Kelley, a developer of the Equestrian Estates subdivision, came before the board. Mr. Kelley and the board discussed a fence that the DPW is asking them to move.

Mr. Kelley and the board talked about the schedule of the roadway acceptance process. Several residents want the school bus to go into the subdivision when picking up children, and this situation was discussed. The board and Mr. Kelley also discussed whether or not Pheasant Lane is a public way.

Mr. VanRiper left the meeting at approximately this time.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED WAREHOUSE BUILDING EXPANSION ON PEMBROKE WOODS DRIVE

Attorney Steven Guard, property owner Paul Lestan, and civil engineer Brian Taylor came before the board to present the proposed expansion of a warehouse building at 56 Pembroke Woods Drive.

The plan is to build a 15,000-square-foot addition to the existing building, and reconfigure the parking/loading area. The site will need extensive new work to improve its drainage. Mr. Taylor and the board members discussed the details of how the site will be changed and what they propose to do. They hope to talk with Mr. Palmieri about the plan once the application for site plan review has been submitted.

Mr. Heins explained the time frame and schedule of the application process, and a lengthy general discussion followed.

DISCUSSION OF WOLVES DEN FIELD HOUSE, SMITH EXCAVATING, AND ROUTINE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Several board members expressed their concern about the dirt parking area that has been created, without site plan approval, adjacent to the paved parking lot at Wolves Den Field House on Oak Street. Mr. Heins explained that the owner claimed, in a phone conversation, that they cleared the area of brush to revolve a drainage issue. The board members expressed worry about this alteration, for various reasons, and discussed the option of talking directly about this with the appropriate person at Wolves Den.

The board members also expressed concern about the land use activities of Smith Excavating at 43 Mattakeesett Street, which may be violating their site plan review agreement.

Mr. Heins discussed a new spreadsheet that he is creating to list all the current ongoing site plan and subdivision projects.

Mr. Wandell made a motion to accept the minutes for Monday, September 12, 2016, as presented. Mr. Irving seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

Ms. Coletta made a motion to approve the request to withdraw the application for approval of site plan by petitioner Washington ARL, LLC, for the multifamily dwelling project off Brisan Way and Old Washington Street, and further that this withdrawal be without prejudice. Mr. Wandell seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

Mr. Heins and the board discussed whether all board members should receive copies of the agendas and decisions of the other boards and commissions of the Town of Pembroke.

Mr. Heins mentioned that a property owner near the Route 3 interchange is considering the idea of having a hotel built there. The board members discussed the possible advantages of such a project. A general discussion ensued about the options for bringing more commercial development to Pembroke, and what types of development benefit the town's tax revenue.

Another discussion took place among the board members about the need to do a new master plan for Pembroke, and how this could be carried out. Mr. Wandell described his experiences in a previous master planning process.

Mr. Heins mentioned that a Pembroke resident complained about a parcel of land on Oak Street having its trees clear-cut, and this led to a discussion about the site, the surrounding area, and its development future.

Mr. Heins mentioned that a resident of Fairview Avenue is concerned about a neighbor parking trucks and other equipment, and cutting down trees, on an adjacent property.

Ms. Coletta made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wandell seconded the motion, and the board voted unanimously in favor.

The next regular meeting of the Planning Board will be held Monday, October 24, 2016, at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Heins, Planning Board Assistant