

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
May 4, 2015

The Chairman Peter McNamara called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00pm.

The Secretary Paul Dadak called roll:

PRESENT: Peter McNamara, Roger Montbleau, Paul Dadak, Paddy Culbert, Mike Sherman, Selectmen Representative William McDevitt, Alternate Tim Doherty, Alternate Joseph Passamonte, Planning Director Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Jason Croteau

Mr. McNamara then appointed Mr. Passamonte to vote in Mr. Croteau's absence.

OLD BUSINESS

PB Case#PL2015-00002

Map 41 Lot 10-245

PJ KEATING COMPANY – 2 Bridge Street - Proposed improvements to the site and storm water management facilities.

Mr. McNamara announced the Board received a request to continue the case, which he felt may be partially due to things discussed during the recent site walk. This will provide the applicant to address items raised by Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm).

Mr. Gowan commented that the applicant was also seeking a special permit because their proposed drainage structure would have a portion of it contained within the Wetland Conservation District. The applicant needs to go in front of the Conservation Commission before the Planning Board can take action.

The plan was date specified to June 15, 2015.

NEW BUSINESS

PB Case #PL2015-00006

Map 22 Lot 7-259

BOUTWELL, Nathan - 57 Old Bridge Street – Seeking a Conditional Use Permit to change the use of an existing dwelling from residential to business. The property is within the Town Center Mixed Use District ('MUZD') which requires a Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Dadak read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

The applicant Nathan Boutwell came forward to discuss the Conditional Use Permit request. He provided a brief description of the property located at 57 Old Bridge Street that contained 42,689SF. The property is rectangular in shape with 369ft of combined frontage between Old Bridge Street and Woodbury Avenue; the majority being on Old Bridge Street. The current property contains an existing 1172SF residential home along with a one-car detached garage; both were built in the year 1896. Mr. Boutwell indicated the proposed use could be a real estate/book keeping office. There will be no expansion or modification to the existing

property or structure. The existing parking can accommodate up to eight average sized vehicles. There is also a horseshoe driveway on the south side of the property. Proposed hours of operation would be standard business hours Monday-Friday with some weekend hours. Signage will be consistent with the area (i.e. Beauty Cottage, Pelham Funeral Home) and within the guidelines of the MUZD being no more than 25SF, all wood constructed either hand painted or raised lettering.

Mr. Boutwell stated the intent was to operate in the same capacity as an in-home business, with one to three people occupying the property at any given time. There will be minimal septic loading; no laundry, no dishwashing etc. thereby having considerably less impact than residential use. He thanked the Board for hearing the case and welcomed any questions.

Mr. Gowan noted this was the first MUZD application before the Board. He believed it to be unusual as it was basically a change of use. He didn't believe there were any plans to add any impervious surfaces or extra parking. He noted office space would have the lowest demand on the well and septic systems. He commented a typical application showing expansion would require a full review by the Board's engineering consultant; however, in this case there was an existing building that would be used as professional office space. He suggested stipulating the maximum number of employees. Being there would be no change to the building or in the density; Mr. Gowan didn't see a need for in-depth review that a typical application would go through.

Mr. McNamara asked if the photograph of the structure was a current representation. Mr. Boutwell answered yes. Mr. McNamara confirmed there were no plans for exterior changes to the structure. Mr. Boutwell replied they were restoring the look of the property to how it was when built in 1896. He explained he had always admired the property and felt it would be a beautiful addition to the down town area. Mr. McNamara questioned if the representation of the sign was accurate. Mr. Boutwell indicated it was a conceptual of a colonial sign consistent with other businesses in the down town area. He noted the size would probably be smaller than the maximum 25SF size. He wanted it to be dimensionally correct with the house structure.

Mr. Dadak inquired about the hours of operation. Mr. Boutwell replied they would have normal business hour, still to be determined, between either 8am-5pm or 9am-5pm with some weekends. Mr. Dadak asked if there would be any changes to the exterior lighting. Mr. Boutwell preferred to keep the property the way it was in 1896. There may be light shining onto the sign. Mr. Gowan told the Board he previously explained the MUZD signage requirements to Mr. Boutwell.

Mr. McNamara wanted to know when Mr. Boutwell anticipated the building would be operational. Mr. Boutwell stated he had been working on the property for several months and hoped it would be operational by the end of the month.

Mr. McNamara opened the hearing for public input. No one came forward to speak.

Although there were no changes to the site, Mr. Gowan suggested that the Board set the precedent of accepting the plan for consideration anticipating future applications would have site review.

MOTION: (Montbleau/Dadak) To accept the plan for consideration.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Gowan wanted to know what hours to stipulate as normal business hours. Mr. Boutwell was agreeable to 8am to 5pm Monday thru Friday with some weekends. Mr. McNamara asked if the Board was agreeable to stipulating the number of employees would not exceed four. The Board agreed.

Mr. Culbert questioned if the depiction of the sign was accurate. At this time Mr. Boutwell wasn't sure of the exact wording. He was changing their branding in the real estate business.

Mr. Dadak wanted to know if the building's access would have to be modified to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Mr. Boutwell indicated that the existing back access contained a long walkway that would have a small ramp accessing the back entrance and exit.

Mr. Culbert asked that the final sign be approved by the Planning Director. Mr. Boutwell agreed to do so.

Mr. Gowan spoke to the public and informed if Mr. Boutwell's plans changed to be something other than a professional business/office space, he would have to come back in front of the Planning Board.

Mr. Doherty noted the application was pretty much what the committee envisioned when they were working on the ordinance for the center of Town. He noted that the location could have been appropriate for a 'mom and pop' operation where the people that own the building could run the business and reside in the building at the same time. He felt the proposal was a great fit for the building.

MOTION: (Montbleau/Passamonte) To approve the Conditional Use Permit.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

INTERVIEW FOR MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE

Mr. McNamara stated an application had been received for the Master Plan Committee. He invited the applicant forward.

Ms. Jennifer Cote came forward to discuss her volunteer application. She told the Board she had been in the real estate business for approximately fifteen years. She likes living in a small town and her hobby is urban development. Ms. Cote told the Board she was a member of the conservation commission in Milford, where she lived previously.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To appoint Jennifer Cote as a member of the Master Plan Committee.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

DATE SPECIFIED PLAN – June 15, 2015

PB Case#PL2015-00002 - Map 41 Lot 10-245 - PJ KEATING COMPANY – 2 Bridge Street

MINUTES REVIEW

April 20, 2015

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve the meeting minutes of April 20, 2015 as written.

VOTE: (6-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Sherman abstained.

PLANNING DIRECTOR UPDATE

Mr. Gowan reported that the former 'A' frame BP / Getty Station (next to Enterprise Bank) had all the gas tanks and piping related to fuel removed. The area was repaved. That property along with many other Getty properties was being auctioned off at what he understood would be a minimum bid of \$252,000. Mr. Gowan noted any project wanting to be located there would have lots of issues to address as the property was within the Wetland Conservation District and subject to the Shore Line Protection Act. He stated that the location would never become a gasoline station again.

Mr. Montbleau questioned if a site assessment had been done to determine if there were any contaminants. Mr. Gowan replied the Department of Environmental Services ('DES') and the Environmental Protection Agency ('EPA') were all over the site. He noted the site had monitoring wells around it for quite some time. He suspected if there were any residuals they would have been from years back. Mr. Montbleau asked who owned the site. Mr. Gowan replied Getty Realty. He said they were selling properties all over the country. Mr. Dadak noted if any contaminants were found they would have removed piles of soil and shipped it out for further review. Mr. Gowan told the Board he was impressed by the beautiful erosion controls that were installed.

Mr. Gowan then reported about the status of the property at the corner of Route 38 and Main Street formerly Preston Fuel. Pelham Lumber purchased the property. He signed a demolition permit for the building to be torn down. He commented that the metal tanks had been removed and cleaned to the satisfaction of DES and EPA. The tanks will be cut up for scrap.

Mr. Montbleau asked what was planned for the site. Mr. Gowan believed for the time being Pelham Lumber wanted to control the site; it gave them more visibility from the road. He will make the Board aware as soon as he hears what they want to do.

Mr. Culbert noticed some work had already been done in the rear of the property. Mr. Gowan replied it was all associated with the tanks.

Mr. Montbleau recalled the Preston site being approved for used cars. He questioned if the approval transferred with the land. Mr. Gowan didn't believe so, but would need to review the records. He also didn't think the owner was interested in that type of activity. Hypothetically, Mr. Montbleau questioned if used cars were still permitted if the owner were to lease the space out. Mr. Gowan replied he would have to review the variance to see if there were any conditions placed on it. He felt it may be a better question for legal counsel. Mr. Culbert recalled that the applicant in the case only received a permit for five vehicles. Mr. Montbleau commented if there was a permitted use an applicant could request an expansion from five vehicles. Mr. Culbert replied they could. Mr. Gowan said he would have to look at the specifics. Given the owner was taking down a building; they may be seeking visibility and improvement.

Mr. Gowan told the Board that the Tractor Supply project was moving along. Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) was constantly providing updates. He believed the target opening would be in June.

Mr. Dadak spoke about the high school project, specifically the tennis courts and recalled residents voiced concerns about water and screening. He saw there was no screening between the tennis courts and the nearest neighbor. Mr. Gowan replied he had a conversation with a well-known landscaper in Town who mentioned they were doing work to put in some screening.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Montbleau/Passamonte) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary