



NORTHBRIDGE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

Recognizing the presence of a quorum Chairman Brian Massey called the meeting to order at 7:00PM with George Murray, Mark Key, and Pamela Ferrara in attendance. R. Gary Bechtholdt II, Town Planner and Cindy Key, Associate member were also present. Planning Board announced the resignation of Barbara Gaudette after serving some 25 plus years, noting that they will look to get her a card a perhaps a plaque to recognize her years of commitment and accomplishments; the Board thanked Barbara for her service.

The following members of the public were in attendance: David Brossi; Eric Bazzett; Carol Gogolinski; Henry Lane; Edward Renaud; William Renaud; Russ Bertelsen; Thomas Wickstrom; Odisefs Tsimogiannis; Todd Frieswick; Alex Zorrilla; Valene Dean; Joseph Kadra; Mary Opocki; Kendall Stasinos; CJ Stasinos; & Shayne Picard

II. CITIZENS FORUM

Russ Bertelsen of Roosevelt Drive expressed safety concerns with one of the drainage ponds within the Presidential Farms subdivision where children within the neighborhood frequent the area and remove buckets of water & tadpoles; Mr. Bertelsen feels the drainage pond which often times is filled with water should be secured with a fence. Mr. Brossi, Developer will review and consider installing "No Trespassing" signs.

III. FORM A

HIGHLAND STREET -REVIEW/DECISION

81-P ANR plan (Map 15 Parcels 86, 634, 635, & 636)

Eric Bazzett of Heritage Design Group reviewed with the Planning Board ANR Plan entitled "Plan of Lots Highland Street Northbridge, MA" dated July 14 2015 for subject property identified as Assessors Map 15 Parcels 86, 634, 635, & 636. Mr. Bazzett confirmed for the Board that the comments included in the ANR Checklist prepared by Community Planning & Development had been addressed.

Mr. Bazzett provided a general overview of the locus area and planned conveyance of Parcel A (rear property) to the town. Mr. Bechtholdt and Mr. Murray asked Mr. Bazzett to revise the plan to also show the portion of land from Parcel A to Lots 2, 3 & 4. Mr. Murray noted the square-footage should also be changed accordingly.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Key) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to GRANT ANR ENDORSEMENT for the above referenced creating Lots 1, 2, 3, & 4 and Parcel A as shown and described on the ANR plan.

In taking such action the Planning Board voted to withhold endorsement until such time that the ANR plan is revised to illustrate the conveyance of land from Parcel A to Lots 2, 3 & 4 as described to the Board during its review.

Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that Parcel A, shown on the second sheet of the ANR plan may be considered for donation to the town.

IV. PRESIDENTIAL FARMS –CONT. PUBLIC HEARING

Subdivision (Modification) -Walking Trail & Bike Path

Chairman Massey provided a brief overview noting the Planning Board is in receipt of construction estimate for the bike path & walking trail from JH Engineering Group (letter dated July 24, 2015); Mr. Massey indicated that the estimate prepared includes and accounts for ADA compliance (per the approval), prevailing wage rates and a 15% contingency (approx. \$150,000.00), noting discrepancies from what the builder could build it for.

Mr. Massey explained that he and the Town Planner met with the Town Manager and Director of Public Works earlier last week to review the prospects of the town assuming ownership and maintenance responsibilities of the bike path and walking trail if it were to be built and conveyed to the town; there were long-term maintenance and safety concerns. Mr. Massey explained according to the DPW Director the town does not have the manpower or money available to take care of the bike path and walking trails.

David Brossi, Developer, met with the Planning Board to discuss the modification request to eliminate the bike path and walking trail. Mr. Brossi noted that he reviewed the construction estimate prepared by JH Engineering Group and concurred with the pricing however noted certain line items listed such as wood chips and other material are already on site and would not need to be purchased. Mr. Brossi mentioned that he is also aware of the conversations within the town concerning long-term maintenance.

Mr. Brossi noted there was a lot of discussion at the last meeting about the recreational lot (Parcel D) and is working with Normand Gamache (Guerrier & Halnon, Inc.) on preparing a conceptual plan to show some proposed improvements to Parcel D, the adjacent open space recreational lot located at the end of Roosevelt Drive; Mr. Brossi explained that he has also spoken with some of the homeowners about their concerns with parking, etc. Mr. Brossi suggested the following additional improvements which included eliminating the curb cut and off-street parking to promote a more neighborhood type recreation area; planting of trees (similar to the street trees) along the perimeter of the recreation lot to give shade and installing a couple of benches for folks to sit. He intends to leave the vast majority of the grassed area flat so kids play catch or just run around. Mr. Brossi would like to hear feedback from the Board and the public on their thoughts.

Mr. Bechtholdt explained that the original approval of the plan simply says parking; it does not define or say any specifics as to how many, the limits of the parking area or what type of surface; Mr. Bechtholdt also noted the unfortunate thing about the parking area is that it would occupy a majority of the parcel. Mr. Bechtholdt indicated that he would support Mr. Brossi's thought of eliminating the parking to promote a more neighborhood type setting where users would walk (sidewalk extends along the recreation lot). Mr. Bechtholdt noted if the lot was to be conveyed to the town it would be open to the public. Mr. Bechtholdt indicated that the size, location and features of the recreation lot was likely never meant to be a facility for the town to host say soccer games, etc.; he does not believe that was the intention. Mr. Bechtholdt also liked the idea of providing some greenery and landscape more than just what the plan showed, which again the 2000 plan only showed a delineation of a lot (Parcel D) with some proposed elevations (grading) and

91 markings for a parking area; there was not a lot of detail provided for this recreation lot. Mr. Bechtholdt
92 explained that there is to be a water lateral stubbed to the lot for future irrigation consideration; Mr.
93 Bechtholdt suggested the water service, if not already installed should be required. If the Board was to
94 eliminate the parking Mr. Brossi would need to extend the vertical granite curbing at the driveway location
95 reserved (remove curb cut) extending curbing and sidewalk; the designated parking area would also be
96 loamed & seeded with grass.

97
98 Mr. Bechtholdt mentioned at the last meeting there was some concern about the steepness of the grades
99 towards the back portion of the recreation lot (drops down significantly) and the proximity to the existing
100 gas line easement. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested the Developer give some consideration to install a split-rail
101 fence along the back edge of the recreation lot and the area running parallel to the gas line along with some
102 tree plantings and benches to provide some separation and help address some of the potential safety
103 concerns. Mr. Bechtholdt felt if the Developer also loamed, seeded and got grass growing in the recreation
104 lot it would be a good amenity for the neighborhood.

105
106 Mr. Bechtholdt, regarding the proposed bike path, suggested he was not sure if everyone was fully aware of
107 what that bike path truly is and if they had a chance to review the design plans. It is basically a path that
108 goes down a hill approximately 1800 feet and just stops prior to the railroad and then you turn back around
109 and go back up. It's a steep incline (portion 7% to 10% slope) through wetlands and some topography. The
110 walking trail it is also through wetlands. Mr. Bechtholdt noted in talking with the DPW Director they do not
111 have the capacity, staff or equipment to maintain the bike path and walking trail; the concern being if it was
112 built and conveyed to the town it would not be in a position to support and maintain the area. There are a
113 lot of instances where a homeowner will offer to maintain a cul-de-sac or they will maintain a grass strip; it's
114 unfair to rely on them or require them to maintain something. The reality is the town is not in a position to
115 maintain it at this point. Mr. Bechtholdt noted with that said, he mentioned that the Town Manager
116 suggested if the bike path and walking trail was not built at this time it could be considered at a later date
117 after the town accepts the recreation lot. The conveyance of the open space could include language such as
118 for passive recreation that may include a walking trail and or bike path.

119
120 Mr. Bechtholdt suggested if the Board is looking at the monetary donation proposed by the Developer that is
121 certainly something from which the town would benefit. It was mentioned at a previous meeting that the
122 town received similar funds in the past, an example being the Linwood basketball courts. The existing
123 baseball and softball fields are in rough shape (Linwood, Blamer facilities, etc.) if the developer is offering to
124 provide funding to help improve an existing facility Mr. Bechtholdt felt that would go a long way to help out.

125
126 Mr. Massey looked to the Board for additional comment; Mrs. Key inquired about what the original
127 recreation plan (2000) showed for improvements; suggesting not really a great amount of detail that would
128 show everyone exactly what the Planning Board at the time intended for what it was to look like, not a lot of
129 detail to go back and review.

130
131 Mr. Bechtholdt explained that Parcel D, the adjacent open space lot which the Developer has now indicated
132 he is willing to loam & seed and expand improvements beyond what was originally required, (the 2000 plan)
133 basically just showed some topo-line (elevations) and called for a parking area by simply noting so on the
134 plan "parking". The plan did not delineate the size of the parking area, what it is to be made of, etc.; the
135 open space lot (Parcel D) has an inclined slope; if the developer was to grade the lot per the plan it would

result in having a 3% grade (approximate), Mr. Brossi suggests he would level and make it more usable for recreation. As far as the bike path and walking trail there is some detail in the layout with topography and profile sheets. Also included are about a dozen signs to be installed warning riders of the steep slope and telling them to turn around at the end and not to use the designated walking trail at the bottom. There is some detail in the plan with approval for the walking trial and calling for a couple of designated rest areas that would require maintenance.

Mr. Massey agreed, noting unfortunately there was not a lot existing (shown) for the recreation lot; Mrs. Key asked for clarification as to where the split rail fence could be located; Mr. Bechtholdt suggested along the back portion (northeasterly portion) of the recreational lot (Parcel D) where the lots starts to grade down (steeper area per plan) and along the side where the gas line is located (southeasterly portion of lot); Mr. Bechtholdt indicated there will be a path to get to one of the drainage ponds that would need to be maintained for access. Mr. Brossi suggested fencing would go more or less along the right side of the recreation lot.

Mrs. Key confirmed that the intent would be to convey the lots to the town (if the town decides to accept) and suggested that the access to the back open space lot there would be nothing to prevent a community group to go back there and cut a trail or walking path such as what the town has in other locations for the public. Mr. Bechtholdt agreed, the open space would be available to the public, if conveyed to the town, and would be for passive recreation. Mrs. Key suggested if the parking was to be eliminated there was opportunity to park along the roadway; Mr. Brossi noted a majority of the people using the open space would walk; Mrs. Key agreed.

Referencing Community Planning & Development memorandum dated February 07, 2013 Mr. Murray noted the approval was specific with the conditions, where the conditions of the approval were spelled out. He was surprised that the Board is not following through with it; that was the sales pitch to the Planning Board and the people buying property over there. The approval says path is to be designed for ADA, it is up to the developer to satisfy the requirements.

Mr. Murray mentioned that the Planning Board is reviewing a modification for a senior living development where they may accept funds for an open space study; Mr. Murray felt allowing the modification for Presidential Farms is a contradiction to what we are looking to prepare in an open space study. H noted he has been on the (Open Space) committee for 2 ½ years and they have been looking for spaces to expand; we have a golden opportunity here. Mr. Bechtholdt explained, part of the discussions concerning the Open Space plan update and associated public workshops held has stressed the importance of and concerns with improving the town's existing ballfields and facilities, noting maintenance has been a main focus and identified as an Action Item.

Mr. Murray suggested the concerns (of maintenance) were brought forth only because we (the committee) asked others in town what their concerns are; the committee also asked people their concerns of having a walking path and bike path, noting a survey was done for that. Mr. Murray would feel remiss in not having the developer put this in. Mr. Murray did not want to hear the town keep saying we don't have the money, we don't have the personnel; until we (the town) do something in this town we are never going to get the money and or the personnel, so we just stay status quo and complain. This is a golden opportunity to have something for the town. Mr. Murray does not want to hear about the steep slopes and doesn't want to hear

about the signs at the end of the bike path that says turnaround and go back. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested he wanted people to know the reality of the planned bike path and walking trail.

Mr. Murray thinks the Board is missing a golden opportunity –period; and will not support a monetary contribution for this town, would support that the developer puts in what was proposed on the drawings and sold to the Planning Board at that time and to the people that bought their property over there.

Chairman Massey opened discussions to the public asking those to try not to rehash items discussed at previous meetings and welcomed new ideas or opinion on what has been discussed this evening. He would like to hear from the public, noting it will help the Board, the five sitting here to make a decision.

Russ Bertelsen of Roosevelt Drive had mixed feelings about the paths (bike path & walking trails) and the commitment from the developer but thinks it could be a win/win that can benefit the community from the perspective of having something of value that is pleasurable to everyone; that would be to enhance the recreational lot (Parcel D) from the original plan to include the items described by Mr. Brossi and the Town Planner.

Mr. Bertelsen suggested the recreation lot should be ADA compliant, low maintenance and include perhaps some sort of playground with a slide (similar to a school), where the residents in the community can take their kids to play. Mr. Bertelsen inquired if there was a way for the developer to put the funds back into the development not only to the town, noting development had its selling points. Mr. Bertelsen understands that he is not going to live there forever, however others have young children; his kids are grown. He knows from speaking to a lot of his neighbors that the recreation lot (Parcel D) was a selling point in their minds, not an overgrown lot in a year or two; if it is to be built hire a professional to come in and put in a low maintenance, safe recreation area; that would add a lot. Mr. Bertelsen supports not requiring parking, but was not sure how others feel. Mr. Bertelsen mentioned that he has spoken with some of his neighbors who take their kids to another town just to play on a swing or slide; the development has a lot of young families and young kids.

Mr. Massey mentioned that Mr. Bertelsen would like to see improvements made within the neighborhood if the original approvals were to be changed (modified), to improve the recreation lot (Parcel D): Mr. Bertelsen agreed with making it into something of a draw to the community and to the development.

Kendall Stasinos of Roosevelt Drive noted that she lives in 1 of the 3 homes at the end of the cul-de-sac and supports Mr. Bertelsen's thoughts (improve the recreation lot instead of requiring the bike trail and walking path), agreeing that one of the selling points was that it was going to be a recreation area. Mrs. Stasinos also shares the concern on parking, would rather have no parking to support and promote more of a neighborhood community recreation area. Mrs. Stasinos seconded Mr. Bertelsen's point to have some money put back into the development with the added improvements to the recreation lot.

Mrs. Stasinos indicated that she would not be affected by the removal of the bike path or walking trails, did not think it was a betterment to the town but respects the decision of the town; would like to Parcel D improved with no parking, plans on having a family and would utilize the open space recreation lot (Parcel D).

Mary Opocki of Roosevelt Drive mentioned that she also has a home at the end of Roosevelt Drive; has a concern with the proposed parking and the potential for additional traffic, one of the main reasons why they built in the cul-de-sac was they did not want to worry about traffic. She is starting a family and it is important to have the recreation area (Parcel D); it was a selling point and she agreed some money should go back into the development and town.

Mr. Massey asked about her thoughts concerning the bike path and walking trails; Ms. Opocki indicated that she was not looking to use them and was not sure about other neighbors. She did not feel it was an important selling feature; for her it was the recreation lot because there are so many young families with kids and to have the ability to walk down there is important; did not think the bike path or walking trail was a selling point.

Todd Frieswick of Roosevelt Drive noted that the Board heard his thoughts on the bike path and walking trails before; in his opinion if the town has no interest or the funds to maintain features such as an island cul-de-sac, “how in the world” are we going to maintain a bike path that goes downhill and a 3000’ long walking trail. It will not be maintained and will become another area where people congregate; it’s no big secret that there is a drug problem in society (Northbridge) today, instances of needles being found in parks, etc.

Mr. Frieswick noted that he has grown up in town and understands the need for these amenities but if we cannot maintain what we have why would we add more; if we can’t maintain what we have why would we make the problem worse by adding; we need to fix what we have first.

Mr. Massey asked Mr. Frieswick if he had an opinion on the recreation lot; Mr. Frieswick has a young child and he would love the ability to take his 6-year old across the street to a park; he likes the idea of fencing. Mr. Frieswick added that he supports Mr. & Mrs. Stasinos’ thoughts concerning eliminating the parking; which would allow for the expansion the of usable area with the recreation lot (Parcel D).

Mr. Bertelsen noted that he had mixed feelings and voiced his opinion based upon what he is hearing and also wants to enjoy the development; Mr. Bertelsen is in support of eliminating the bike path and walking trails, noting he abuts the open space area (walking trails). He really enjoys the undisturbed wooded area and as mad as those pesky critters chewing up his plants make him, he really enjoys knowing there is wildlife back there. He has seen deer, coyote and silver fox. He moved up from New Jersey so that is very enjoyable to him; he is concerned the bike path and walking trail would disrupt that.

Mr. Bertelsen questioned based an estimate provided by the Planning Board’s consulting engineer if the proposed donation of the Developer has also increased. Mr. Massey indicated the Board will need to take that into consideration, noting additional improvements may also be made to the recreation lot (Parcel D). Mr. Massey noted that he appreciates the thoughts and suggestions provided by the residents as well as their comments and concerns specific to the bike path and walking trail; it will help the Planning Board in making its decision.

CJ Stasinos of Roosevelt Drive asked if it was possible to create a trust with the funds to ensure that the landscaped island cul-de-sacs within the subdivision development and recreation lot are maintained. Mr. Stasinos also expressed concerns with construction material, etc. left at the end of Roosevelt Drive: Mr. Brossi will look to address this concern.

Alex Zorrilla of Lincoln Circle asked if the (landscaped) island cul-de-sac could be removed; Mr. Bechtholdt suggested that would be up to the developer to seek a waiver from the Subdivision Rules & Regulations, noting the town requires landscaped island cul-de-sacs. Mr. Brossi indicated his preference is to pave the entire cul-de-sac, indicating that the town regulations required the landscaped islands.

Mr. Massey sought additional input and comment from the public, having none looked to the Planning Board. Mr. Key noted he had two viewpoints; appreciates the residents coming forth saying “this is what we want” and in his mind that is what carries the greatest weight for him; what is best for the development and for the residents that live there. Mr. Key noted the concern he would raise which would not interfere with the vote dovetailing with what Mr. Murray said and that this is an approved plan and is bothered that the town can say “unless I change my mind”; Mr. Key suggested that the DPW Director signed-off on this plan; it’s a concern he has with the town; at some point we got to say you signed-off on it and that’s what we should do. Mr. Key continued stating however that he thinks the circumstances are different here because of the complexities, the grading and perhaps it was not a good plan to begin with; and it may not make any sense to have the developer build it. In the bigger picture Mr. Key hoped we are in a better position now as a town moving forward and as a voter pick up the phone to raise the concern (maintenance, etc.); until it is raised as a concern it probably will not change.

Mr. Massey offered his thoughts; agreeing with Mr. Murray and Mr. Key indicating that he has gone back and forth since the review began. Mr. Massey noted he met with the DPW Director and the Town Manager; if we can’t maintain it then why build it (bike path & walking trail); what is it going to end up to be? He is dealing with how to maintain it for the residents and what makes the most sense but does agree with Mr. Murray and Mr. Key regarding the approved plan. Mr. Massey appreciates the comments and suggestions provided by the residents as to what should be done with the recreation lot.

Mr. Murray questioned who would be responsible for maintaining the recreation lot (Parcel D); if they were to use it for some type of recreation area such as a playground as suggested by the residents and developer, which would be great for the neighborhood. Mr. Murray questioned as mentioned earlier about a possible trust and how such a trust could be set up. Mr. Murray felt if the Planning Board was to listen to the residents the developer should go back to his engineers to see what it would look like, what it will have on it (equipment), ADA compliance, etc. and who and how it would be maintained; Mr. Murray also suggested maybe have the developer put money aside (in a trust) for future maintenance and additional funds if at some point residents want to create walking area; it does not have to be as sophisticated as what is on the plan. Mr. Murray suggested looking into how a trust could be established. Mrs. Key suggested perhaps it could be part of the contribution to be provided by the developer (earmarked for maintenance, etc.). Mrs. Key asked if developer could mark in the field the planned location of the walking trail and bike path (flagging, etc.) so that when conveyed to the town there was a delineation as to where a path could go.

The Planning Board looked to Mr. Brossi to see if the suggested improvements to the recreation lot (Parcel D) was something he would consider; Mr. Brossi agreed and indicated that he would work with his engineer to put something together for the next meeting.

Mr. Bechtholdt suggested potential for some of the funds originally to be considered in lieu of to be earmarked and establish a maintenance endowment specific to the recreational lot. He cited the concerns noted by Mr. Murray and others that if the town is adding inventory it should provide some type of funding

mechanism short-term for maintenance and when the town perhaps is in a better position and has expressed a willingness to support the maintenance of these types of amenities would be a good starting point.

Mr. Bechtholdt suggested the developer put together a proposal for Parcel D; eliminating the parking, providing a more useable level-grass (loamed) area, with trees, landscaping, benches, split-rail fencing, and perhaps an ADA compliant play structure; the Planning Board agreed. Mr. Bechtholdt noted depending upon the thoughts of the Planning Board concerning the substitution the Board can talk with Mr. Brossi about specifics of any potential additional donation above and beyond maintenance finalized at the next hearing.

Mrs. Key stressed the importance of making the play structure ADA compliant and accessible from the roadway (it was noted that the sidewalk currently runs along the frontage of the recreation lot (Parcel D) on Roosevelt Drive). Mr. Massey noted once it's conveyed to the town it will be available to all of the public. Board members agreed on making sure that play structure is ADA compliant.

Mr. Murray asked Mr. Brossi to look at the potential for creating some type of trust other than having funds held with the town so the funds are used for maintenance and does not disappear. Mrs. Key agreed, asking about what is the maintenance plan, etc. The Planning Board directed the Town Planner to contact Town Counsel regarding potential maintenance fund.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Key) the Planning Board continued its public hearing to Tuesday, August 25, 2015 at 7:35PM.

VI. PINE KNOLL, SENIOR LIVING DEVELOPMENT -CONT. PUBLIC HEARING
Special Permit (Modification) -§173-112(F)

Mr. Murray explained that he would recuse himself from the hearing; Mr. Murray left the room and will not vote or participate on the matter. Chairman Massey acknowledged once again that Cindy Key, the Planning Board's Associate member will participate in the discussions and shall vote on the special permit modification.

Attorney Thomas Wickstrom and Odisefs Tsimogiannis, Owner/Applicant reviewed with the Planning Board modification request to convert the three (3) affordable units to market rate units; consistent with the variance issued by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Attorney Wickstrom, Mr. Tsimogiannis and the Board reviewed payment in lieu of the affordables.

Mr. Bechtholdt noted by way of update at the last hearing (June 23, 2015) the Planning Board agreed to have the Town Planner solicit price proposals for the preparation of a Housing Production Plan and proposals for the Open Space & Recreation Plan. Mr. Bechtholdt reminded the Board the purpose of which was to help establish and determine the amount of funds to be provided by the developer in lieu of, suggesting rather than having an excessive amount sitting in a potentially dormant account. Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that the amount of \$100,000 discussed at the last meeting would appear to be sufficient to cover the associated costs for both the Housing Production Plan and Open Space & Recreation Plan, as well as potential duplication (additional printings) and additional studies defined by the Planning Board.

Mr. Bechtholdt reminded the Board that the developer would also be responsible for amending the Deed Rider and other associated Pine Knoll condominium documents. Attorney Wickstrom was not sure if amending the documents would be required once the special permit modification was to be filed with the Registry. Mr. Bechtholdt also noted that there had been discussion and concerns expressed by Pine Knoll residents concerning the potential sale price of the 3-units under discussion, noting that the Planning Board has indicated in the past that they cannot set or dictate a sale price minimum, etc. and the Owner/Applicant had expressed a willingness to work with them on setting a sale price; Mr. Bechtholdt suggested if the Board was to include any reference in its approval it indicate that the Owner/Applicant look to establish and agrees to Covenant or provide some declaration to the other property owners regarding the sale price of units.

Attorney Wickstrom reviewed with the Planning Board his letter dated July 28, 2015 concerning the proposed \$100,000 one-time payment to the town to be used for the purpose of preparing a Housing Production Plan, an Open Space & Recreation Plan and/or other planning initiatives or studies the Board may deem appropriate.

Mr. Massey sought comment from the public in attendance, having none Mr. Massey looked to the Planning Board; Mrs. Ferrara felt the proposed contribution was appropriate for the initiatives identified. Mrs. Key felt the amount was a little light if you look at the market value for the units. Mr. Key indicated his number has not changed (\$210,000); Mr. Key feels the figure is too low. Mr. Massey did not have an issue with the \$100,000 figure; the Board could ask for a larger number but would likely have to wait for each unit to sell over the next 2-years, 3-years, etc. rather than a lump sum (a one-time donation). Mr. Massey did not want to manage (oversee the sale of the units) the next 2 to 3-years; Mrs. Key agreed, but thinks (approx.) \$33,000 per unit is too low and a disservice to the town.

Mrs. Key indicated there has to be a number somewhere closer to the appraisals (difference between affordable and market rate units); suggesting it does not have to be in the middle but more than \$33,000 per unit. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested if the Owner/Applicant was to provide the \$100,000 as an initial payment perhaps the Board would consider additional funds to be provided to the town for each unit once the sale(s) were complete. Mrs. Key and other Board members felt this option could address the concern of the number (\$100,000) being too low. Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that the City of Marlborough recently adopted a zoning provision where they established a cost amount in lieu of providing affordable units at approximately \$50,000 per unit.

After some discussions between the Board and Attorney Wickstrom regarding a potential formula (\$X per unit or % of sale, etc.) to establish the amount per unit (in addition to the \$100,000) Mr. Key suggested that he would be amendable to consider a reasonable amount proposed by the Owner/Applicant but the \$100,000 is too low.

Mr. Bechtholdt indicated he attempted to provide the Planning Board with some options as to how they may utilize the funds, believes the \$100,000 will be used; if the Board thinks it's too low, and why is it too low? Mrs. Key understood the questioning and suggested the amount was too low because it will take units out of the housing stock for low income, noting a need for low-moderate income housing in town (in Massachusetts); taking out three units that three families that could afford housing at \$167,000; the 167k is a way more affordable house (condo, etc.) than \$262,000. So taking that out if we are able to do something for the town perhaps there are other options left to help the town in other ways that also help our

community maybe we find others solutions; maybe it funds to rehab a house that becomes affordable for someone -this is a business agreement and it comes down to a business agreement. Not trying to abuse you but also don't think the Owner/Applicant needs to come in and lowball the town; we need an equitable and fair number that allows us to say to the town we gave up three affordable units but in exchange is an equitable and fair decision. Mrs. Key noted that she needs to look in the mirror and that she agrees and worked towards something that was equitable and fair to the town and be able to look at the voters. Mrs. Key continued noting that she understands that the Owner/Applicant is a businessman and yes you deserve to make a profit and hopes he can sell them all at \$290k or \$310,000 because that would help her and everyone in town but still taking 3 affordable units out of the housing stock; needs to be equitable; \$100k seems too light. Mr. Bechtholdt and Mr. Massey appreciated Mrs. Key's thoughtful response.

Mr. Key offered a thought on a different number, noting nothing scientific about it; suggesting the \$100,000 as discussed and instead of the \$36k as the three units are sold just for a way of saying let's get this done take 36 in half that 18 times 3 that's 54 and say its 154K; there's not a scientific way of arriving other than sort of split on what were are talking about; Mr. Bechtholdt asked what the timing of that would be Mr. Key suggested up front or could be per unit; not a lot a money to sit and wait on suggested if its doable up front would be okay; Mrs. Key suggested the \$100k up front and the \$54k when the first one sells; and that's an incentive to sell the first one for more if you can. Mr. Key noted he cannot calculate the discounted number but it's pretty large (30%) gets it done and we move on. Mrs. Key suggests putting the \$54,000 in a loan program or housing rehab program.

Attorney Wickstrom, after consultation with the Owner/Applicant, asked the Board to continue the hearing to review in greater detail discussions had. Attorney Wickstrom noted his client's concern with the risk in selling the over 55-units (current market) and without knowing what the market will be; suggesting they know they could sell them for the \$165k (affordable price) but unknown for market rate units. Mr. Key noted that's the decision to be made (keep them affordable or not); Mrs. Key noted if its decided to keep them affordable then its three (3) more affordable units for Northbridge which is not a bad thing, not a bad thing for the town. Attorney Wickstrom agreed, noting it's about the amount of risk; Mr. Key and Mrs. Key agreed and understood.

Before continuing the hearing Mr. Massey solicited additional comment from the Board members in hopes of having closure at the next meeting where the Owner/Applicant can provide the Planning Board with a proposal based upon the discussions; Mr. Massey reiterated that he would prefer a lump sum versus an initial amount and additional funds after the sale of units. Mrs. Ferrara agreed with Mr. Massey that it would be easier to receive a lump sum for the reason he noted.

Mr. Massey noted his opinion has not changed a lot; can see Mr. Key and Mrs. Key's perspectives and position on the matter, admitting that he had not given much thought about losing the affordable housing stock in a way Mrs. Key expressed it.

Mr. Massey noted the number Mr. Key came up with (\$154k), suggesting perhaps there is a happy medium somewhere and would like to see it as a lump sum; will look to the Owner/Applicant with their final offer to act on at the next meeting. Mr. Bechtholdt asked if it was a lump sum if he would be willing to consider a lower number than the \$154k; Mr. Massey suggested it would up to the Board but would consider; wants to do what is best for the town.

Mrs. Key understood Mr. Massey’s reasoning for wanting a lump sum, however noted the Planning Board has a record of tracking accounts in the past (performance bonds, etc.) and is capable; suggesting from a business standpoint it may be easier and more acceptable for the Owner/Applicant to provide certain amount of funds now and additional funds based upon when the units sell; Mrs. Key suggested the Board needs to take that in consideration.

Mr. Massey is agreeable to receiving certain funds now and additional after the sale of units as long as the initiatives identified by the Town Planner (Housing Production Plan and Open Space & Recreation Plan) are satisfied initially; not opposed to the alternative however would like to see a little bigger number and get it off the books.

Upon motion duly made (Key) and seconded (Ferrara) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to continue the public hearing to Tuesday, August 25 2015 at 7:45PM.

Mr. Murray returned to the Planning Board meeting.

V. SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS -CONT. PUBLIC HEARING

MGL CH 41 81Q (Amendments)

Upon motion duly made (Key) and seconded (Ferrara) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to continue the public hearing to Tuesday, September 08, 2015 at 7:05PM.

VI. MAIN STREET Assessors Map 2 Parcel(s) 36, 37 & 45 -PUBLIC HEARING

Site Plan [§173-49.1 –Site plan review by Planning Board]

Special Permit [§173-47 B.2 -Planned Business Development]

Chairman Massey looked to the Planning Board to open the Public Hearing. Mr. Massey acknowledged that Cindy Key, the Planning Board’s Associate member will participate in the discussions and shall vote on the special permit. Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that the notification requirements had been satisfied. The Board opened the public hearing.

Upon motion duly made and seconded the Planning Board voted to waive the reading of the Public Hearing notice for Main Street Commercial site plan review/special permit.

In accordance with the provisions of Mass General Laws & the Town of Northbridge Zoning Bylaw Chapter 173, the Northbridge Planning Board will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, July 28, 2015 at 8:05 PM in the Selectmen’s Chambers of the Northbridge Memorial Town Hall, 7 Main Street Whitinsville, MA, to consider the special permit (Planned Business Development) and site plan application of Main Street Commercial, LLC (Whitinsville, MA) for a proposed 4500 square-foot retail with gas station, drive-thru, carwash and other associated site improvements to be located on Main Street. The subject property identified as Assessors Map 2 Parcel(s) 36, 37 & 45 is located within the Industrial-One (I1) Zoning District and Flood Plain District of the Town of Northbridge. A copy of the Site Plan and Special Permit applications dated July 02, 2015 and site development plan entitled “Main Street Commercial –Planned Business Development” prepared by Heritage Design Group dated July 06, 2015 and other supportive documentation is on file with the Office of the Town Clerk (7 Main Street –Town Hall) and the Community Planning & Development Office (14 Hill Street –Town Hall Annex) Whitinsville, MA and may be reviewed during regular office hours. The purpose of the hearing

notice is to provide an opportunity for public comment. Anyone wishing to be heard should attend said public hearing at the time and place designated.

Mr. Bechtholdt noted receipt of the following: Special Permit Application [Planned Business Development]; Site Plan Review application; Site development plan entitled “Main Street Commercial –Planned Business Development” prepared by Heritage Design Group dated July 06, 2015; copy of Review Report Form sent to the various municipal departments; Community Planning & Development memorandum dated July 07, 2015/July 15, 2015 (initial comments); copy of site plan review provisions; copy of special permit –Planned Business Development provisions; copy of Floodway & Floodplain Districts provisions; copy of Technical Review meeting notes held July 15, 2015; Community Planning & Development memorandum dated July 15, 2015 (site observations); copy of Conservation Commission memorandum dated July 21, 2015; and letter dated July 28, 2105 from the Inspector of Buildings.

Mr. Bechtholdt suggested the Planning Board look to formally engage the services of JH Engineering Group, LLC to perform review of the submittal on its behalf.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Ferrara) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to engage the services of JH ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC of Worcester, MA to perform consulting services on its behalf for the above noted site development proposal.

The purpose of JH ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC services shall be to provide the Northbridge Planning Board with an independent assessment/review of the Main Street Commercial site plan review application; Chapter 173 [Site plan review]; traffic assessment; stormwater management & erosion controls pursuant to state/local bylaw regulations.

Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that arrangements have been made with the Safety Committee to review the proposed site development at its next meeting scheduled for Wednesday, August 19, 2015. Eric Bazzett (Heritage Design Group), on behalf of the Owner Applicant, provided an overview of the locus area, the subject property, the proposed site development, drainage and other design features. Mr. Bazzett indicated that the proposed location of the underground tanks will be relocated per the planned tenant’s specifications; to be shown on the revised plan.

Planning Board members offered initial comment which included concerns with proposed transition between the remaining layout of Water Street and the to be discontinued portion within the subject property; proposed gated access to/from the abutting Core Mark facility; the turning radius in and out of the site; location of the proposed curb cuts (driveways); screening & lighting; snow storage areas; the proposed queue lane for the drive-thru; Floodplain; and coordination with Conservation Commission review.

Mr. Murray explained that he would not be in favor of removing access to the remaining portion of Water Street for two reasons (1) snow removal/snow storage and (2) emergency access for fire, etc. would like access to remain open. Mr. Murray also noted concern with proposed location of the curb cuts on Main Street; access to/from the site. Mr. Murray would like to see turning radius shown on the plan.

Mr. Bechtholdt confirmed with Mr. Bazzett that a Traffic Study (traffic counts, sightlines, etc.) was being prepared and is to be reviewed by the Planning Board and Safety Committee; Mr. Bazzett noted the revised plan would also show turning movements.

Mrs. Key questioned the need for the island separating two of the proposed curb cuts on Main Street; Mr. Bazzett indicated the main reason was the fact that there is an existing utility pole located there (high cost associated to relocate), Mr. Bazzett suggested however the layout works well for vehicle movement (large trucks) rather than having a larger curb cut helps to direct the traffic in and out. Mrs. Key shared the concerns of Mr. Murray regarding turning radius. Mr. Bazzett noted the layout has been designed with the truck radius in mind and will provide the additional information to the Planning Board (perhaps on a separate sheet).

Mr. Massey shared concerns of turning radius to access the diesel pumps and questioned the vehicular movements utilizing Water Street; Mr. Murray suggested making that section of Water Street one-way from the site and two-way the remainder; allow cars to exit site via Water Street.

Mr. Key questioned the proposed heights of the canopy for the diesel pumps and also expressed initial concerns with potential backups in the event the gas station becomes very busy; Mr. Bazzett reviewed proposed queuing and additional areas if needed.

Mrs. Key inquired about the 3-bay carwash; Mr. Bazzett noted they have not finalized the designed at this time and have looked at an existing carwash in South Uxbridge as a possible model. Mrs. Key reviewed the proposed number of queuing and location of the pick-up window; Mr. Bazzett noted a minimum of twelve (12) vehicles.

Mr. Murray asked if the site is being designed for a Dunkin Donuts; Mr. Bazzett offered that it is proposed to have a drive-thru for a food & beverage not a restaurant. Mr. Murray asked if they will have booths inside the building like Cumberland Farms do now; Mr. Bazzett suggested given the size he imagined that they could but was not sure.

Mr. Bechtholdt asked Mr. Bazzett to mark in the field the location(s) of the proposed driveway curb cuts along Main Street so Planning Board members and Safety Committee could view them in conjunction with their reviews.

Chairman Massey sought comment from residents/abutters in attendance; Carol Gogolinski asked if the subject property included the parcel previously occupied by the West End School. Mr. Bazzett confirmed, yes. Mrs. Gogolinski questioned the practicality of modifying Water Street at that location (one-way). After seeking additional input and comment from the general public the Planning Board looked to continue the public hearing.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Key) the Planning Board voted (5-0) to continue the public hearing to Tuesday, September 08, 2015 at 7:35PM to afford additional time and opportunity for review and public comment.

584 OLD / NEW BUSINESS
585586 Approval of Meeting Minutes – April 14 & 28, 2015; May 12 & 26, 2015; & June 23, 2015

587 Mr. Bechtholdt noted that he received comment from Mrs. Ferrara for the draft meeting minutes of April 14,
588 2015; Board members indicated that they did not have the opportunity to review the drafts prepared for
589 April 14th & 28th or May 12th; the Planning Board tabled action.

590
591 2015 Fall Annual Town Meeting –Tuesday, October 27, 2015

592 No discussion –point of information
593

594 2015 FATM Warrant Closes –Friday, August 28, 2015

595 No formal discussion –point of information; Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that the Planning Board
596 currently has one meeting scheduled (August 25, 2015) prior to the closing of the warrant; if the Board
597 intends on sponsoring any article(s) they would need to do so on August 25, 2015.

598
599 Economic Development Strategies & Opportunities –Discussion

600 Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that he hosted another Economic Development Strategies &
601 Opportunities meeting on July 15 2015 where attendees discussed potential zoning designation changes
602 within the Plummerts Corner area of Providence Road/Church Street and along Providence Road (RT 122)
603 across from the Wastewater Treatment Plant, as well as possible zoning amendments specific to by-right and
604 special permit uses permitted within the Business zones. Mr. Bechtholdt noted that earlier he and the Town
605 Manager met with the Central MA Wetland Resource Circuit Rider to discuss what type of assistance may be
606 provided to help the town and Conservation Commission. Mr. Bechtholdt also noted discussion included
607 how municipal departments (Board of Health and Building Department) can streamline and expedite the
608 permitting process. A follow-up economic development meeting is scheduled for Wednesday August 26th
609 which Jon Golnik, Regional Director Central Massachusetts, Massachusetts Office of Business Development
610 (MOBD) plans to attend.

611
612 Granite Hill (Highland Street) Land Donation –Discussion

613 Planning Board noted receipt of letter dated July 14, 2105 from Mike Staiti of WRT Management
614 Corporation. Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that Mr. Staiti was unable to attend tonight's meeting; Mr.
615 Bechtholdt reminded Board members that the ANR plan reviewed earlier included the backland (Parcel A)
616 proposed to be conveyed to the town. After some general discussion concerning the open space value of
617 owning the land (habitat protection, corridor protection) and potential for contiguous open space (the Hills,
618 Camelot, etc.) the Board asked the Town Planner to contact Mr. Staiti to have him attend the next meeting
619 scheduled for Tuesday, August 25, 2015, at which time the Board will consider whether or not they wish to
620 sponsor the land donation article for the Fall Annual Town Meeting.

621
622 674 Church Street, Request to rezone property from Residential to Business –Discussion

623 Mr. Bechtholdt advised the Planning Board that he expected Edward Renaud to provide the Planning Board
624 with an overview of the proposal to rezone property on Church Street near Varky's Cleaners (across the
625 street from Koopmans Lumber driveway); Planning Board noted receipt of letter dated May 18, 2015 from
626 Reservoir Properties Realty Corporation requesting consideration to rezone the property at 674 Church
627 Street (and 4 plus acre back lot). Mr. Murray asked if additional information was available for the subject
628 property; Mr. Bechtholdt offered to provide the Board with a copy of the Assessor Map (AP14/59 & 14/214)

and will look to prepare additional information. The Board asked the Town Planner to contact Mr. Renaud to have him attend the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, August 25, 2015, at which time the Board will consider whether or not they wish to sponsor the zoning amendment article for the Fall Annual Town Meeting.

(2015FATM) Vote to Sponsor Warrant Articles –Discussion/Decision

Mr. Bechtholdt reminded the Planning Board that if they wished to sponsor a zoning amendment article they would need to vote to do so before the closing of the warrant (Friday, August 28, 2015); Mr. Bechtholdt also reminded Board members that any zoning article would require a public hearing of the Planning Board prior to consideration at Town Meeting (Tuesday, October 27, 2015) and will also need to be reviewed with the Finance Committee before they complete their packet for distribution to voters.

Open Space & Recreation Plan Update –Scheduling of next meeting

Planning Board tabled the scheduling of the next Open Space & Recreation Plan Update Committee meeting.

Mixed Use Bylaw (DRAFT/Model Bylaws) –Review

Mr. Bechtholdt provided the Board with a general outline, suggestions and considerations when drafting a mixed-use bylaw; arrangements will be made for a future meeting where the Planning Board will review and discuss.

Subdivision/Site Developments –Status/Update(s)

Mr. Bechtholdt explained to the Planning Board that he solicited comment/updates from the DPW, Sewer Superintendent and Whitinsville Water Company concerning the water/sewer installations within Leonardo Estates; Hemlock Estates; Camelot; Shining Rock Golf Community; & Presidential Farms. Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that the developer of Leonardo Estates plans to pave (binder) the portions of Benson Road and Highland Street disturbed for the installation of water/sewer performed under the Roadway Opening Permit issued by the Department of Public Works; Mr. Bechtholdt was happy to hear that the Developer was mindful of the concerns expressed by him, the DPW Director (and likely others) and has decided to repair the pavement this weekend under the direction of the Department of Public Works. Mr. Bechtholdt noted receipt of email communication from Whitinsville Water Company (July 27 2015) regarding status of Presidential Farms, Shining Rock and Leonardo Estates.

Farnum Circle & Green Meadow Court –Status/Update

Mr. Bechtholdt advised the Board that he has been in communication with Joyce Augustus (14 Farnum Circle) who has been in contact with Daly Bangma (Quarry Hill Construction) and a licensed electrician who may be willing to perform work associated with the underground utilities within the Farnum Circle subdivision; Mr. Bechtholdt noted that once a scope of work is proposed and presented the Board may look to authorize the work utilizing the remaining performance bond. Mr. Bechtholdt cautioned the Board that they will need to make sure the contractor is properly licensed and insured before entering into any type of contract agreement. The Board shall await additional information from Ms. Augustus

Mail –Review

In addition to the mail listed (-see attached) the Planning Board noted receipt of the following communications: Planning Board Agenda for July 28, 2015; DRAFT Planning Board Agendas for August 25, 2015 and September 8, 2015; Form A Application for Keystone Development Corp dated July 2015 for

property on Highland Street; Assessor's Map 15; ANR Checklist dated July 21, 2015 for Highland Street, Email dated July 23, 2015 to Keystone Development from Town Planner regarding Granite Hills Land Donation; Email dated June 24, 2015 to Presidential Farms, Inc. with a cc: to Planning Board Chair and DPW Director concerning Presidential Farms detention ponds; Letter dated June 24, 2015 from Edward Orazine regarding Presidential Farms Walking Trail and Bike Path Modifications; Memo dated February 7, 2013 to Planning Board from Town Planner regarding Presidential Farms; Letter dated June 24, 2015 to Town Clerk from Town Planner concerning Subdivision Rules and Regulations Continued Public Hearing; Memo dated May 29, 2015 to Planning Board from Town Planner regarding Subdivision Rules & Regulations Amendments; Subdivision Rules and Regulations Section 222-9 pages 1 – 5; Public Hearing Notice for Main Street Commercial; Special Permit Application dated July 2, 2015 for Main Street Commercial, LLC for a planned business development on Main St and Water St; Site Plan Review Application dated July 2, 2015 for Main Street Commercial, LLC for a gas station, retail store with a drive-thru and a car wash on Main Street and Water Street; Main Street Commercial Planned Business Development Plans dated July 6, 2015; Review Report Form dated July 6, 2015 to Town Manager/BOS, Board of Health, Conservation Commission, Building Inspector, Fire Department (Safety Committee), Police Department, DPW – Highway, D{W – Sewer, Whitinsville Water Company and JH Engineering from Town Planner concerning Main Street Site Plan and Special Permit for a Planned Business Development; Memo dated July 7, 2015 / July 15, 2015 to Planning Board and Heritage Design Group from Town Planner concerning Main Street Commercial Special Permit – Planned Business Development and Site Plan Review; Technical Review Meeting dated July 15, 2015 prepared by Town Planner from Main Street Commercial Planned Business Development; Town of Northbridge Chapter 173 Zoning page 32 – 36; Site Plan Review Checklist dated July 7, 2015 for Main Street Commercial; Memo dated July 15, 2015 to Planning Board from Town Planner regarding Main Street Commercial Site Visit Observations; Memo dated July 21, 2015 to Planning Board from Conservation Commission regarding Main Street Site Plan Review; Memo dated July 15, 2015 to All Town Departments, Committees, Boards & Commissions and Town Moderator from Executive Assistant to the Town Manager concerning Fall Annual Town Meeting and Warrant Article Submission Procedure; Email dated July 14, 2015 to Town Manager with a cc: to Planning Board Chair and Planning Board Administrative Assistant from Town Planner regarding Granite Hills Land Donation; Letter dated July 14, 2015 to Town Planner from WRT Management concerning Granite Hills Land Donation; Letter dated May 18, 2015 to Town Planner from Reservoir Properties Realty Corporation regarding 674 Church Street; Email dated July 23, 2015 to Town Planner from Joyce Augustus concerning the Farnum Circle Utility Pole Removal; Email dated July 23, 2015 to Town Planner from Joyce Augustus regarding Farnum Circle; Email dated July 23, 2015 to Town Planner from Joyce Augustus concerning the Farnum Circle sign; Mixed Use Bylaw – things to consider (when drafting); Email dated July 14, 2015 to Hillside Garden Estates, LLC with a cc: to Planning Board Chair from Town Planner regarding Fall Annual Town Meeting – Deane Way; Email dated July 20, 2015 to DPW Director, Hillside Garden Estates, LLC and DPW Highway Superintendent with a cc: to Planning Board Chair, JH Engineering and Planning Board Administrative Assistant from Town Planner regarding Hillside Garden Estates – Deane Way; Subdivision Walk-thru document dated July 22, 2015 prepared by Town Planner regarding Hillside Garden Estates (Deane Way); Email dated July 13, 2015 to Town Planner from Mike Baillargeon concerning Sale of Land – Warchol Property – South Tessier Street; Memo dated December 5, 2014 to Planning Board from Town Planner regarding Subdivision roadways; Email dated July 23, 2015 to DPW Sewer Superintendent, Whitinsville Water Company with a cc: to DPW Director, Planning Board Chair, Planning Board Administrative Assistant from Town Planner concerning Water & Sewer Installation (subdivisions); Email dated July 16, 2015 to Town Planner with a cc: to Planning Board Chair from DPW Director regarding Leonardo Estates Public Way conditions; Email dated July 22, 2015 to J & F Marinella with a cc: to Andrews Engineering, Planning Board Administrative Assistant and Planning Board Chair from

Town Planner concerning Hemlock Estates – Gendron St improvements; Letter dated July 21, 2015 to Town Planner from JH Engineering regarding Carpenter Estates Construction Observation Report; Email dated July 1, 2015 to Board of Selectmen, Planning Board, etc. from Assistant Town Clerk regarding Committee Reminders; Northbridge Planning Board 2015 Meeting Schedule.

Other

Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that he and the Chairman, along with John Barges (Developer) and Shelley Hultgren (JH Engineering Group) conducted a site visit of Hillside Garden Estate (Deane Way) in conjunction with the developer's intentions to have the roadway considered for street acceptance this fall. Planning Board received copy of site visit meeting notes; Mr. Bechtholdt noted that the DPW Director and Highway Superintendent were unable to attend however are to make separate arrangements with the Developer. Mr. Bechtholdt noted the Planning office had not received the necessary and required plans or conveyance documents, etc. that need to be provided 90-days prior to Town Meeting; Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Board that he has had discussions with the Developer concerning these deadlines. Mr. Bechtholdt will invite Mr. Barges to the Planning Board meeting of Tuesday, August 25 2015 at which time the Board will consider whether or not they wish to sponsor the street acceptance article for the Fall Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that he has reached out to J&F Marinella Dev. (Developer) regarding the roadway improvements to Gendron Street recently approved by the Planning Board noting per the approval such work is to be done by September 01, 2015; Mr. Bechtholdt indicated that he was unaware if the work had been completed; Mr. Murray noted that he has not seen any construction activity. Planning Board acknowledged receipt of the following JH Engineering reports: Carpenter Estates (Construction Observations –June 24, 2015), Leonardo Estates (Construction Observations –June 24, 2015), Camelot subdivision (Construction Observations –June 25, 2015), Leonardo Estates (Construction Observations –July 03, 2015), Carpenter Estates (Construction Observation –July 21, 2015), Carpenter Estates (Construction Observations –July 22, 2015), Leonardo Estates (Construction Observations –July 22, 2015), & Presidential Farms (Construction Estimates –July 24, 2015). Planning Board acknowledged receipt of letter(s) dated June 25, 2015, June 29, 2015, July 09, 2015, July 10, 2015, July 15, 2015 & July 25, 2015 from Shelley Buma on behalf of CPN –Citizens for the Preservation of Northbridge regarding Douglas Road Industrial Realty Trust (Douglas Road site plan review); copy of letter dated June 22, 2015 from the Inspector of Buildings regarding complaint for property adjacent to 279 Douglas Road; copy of letter dated July 01, 2015 from the Inspector of Buildings regarding complaint for property adjacent to 279 Douglas Road; response letter dated June 29, 2015 from the Town Planner to Shelley Buma (CPN) regarding Douglas Road site plan review; response letter dated July 27, 2015 from the Town Planner to Shelley Buma (CPN) regarding Douglas Road site plan review. Mr. Key thanked Mr. Bechtholdt for providing the Board with copies of all the correspondence suggesting it helps him keep track of the project and will assist him in his continued review of the site plan; Mr. Bechtholdt noted there have been a lot a communications received by him and the Inspector of Buildings and tries to keep everyone in the loop the best he can; Mr. Key felt Mr. Bechtholdt has handled it well, noting some of the comments seem more appropriate of the Inspector of Buildings. Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that he and the Inspector of Buildings met with a John Mullen of Landscape Depot who is interested in locating a yard waste composting facility in town to be located at 760 Providence Road; Mr. Bechtholdt cautioned the Board that the General Permit issued for a yard waste composting facility may be the same for food composting; Mr. Bechtholdt mentioned that the Building Inspector is to make a determination on whether or not it may be permitted within the zoning district, he was not sure but thought it may be deemed not allowed. Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that he met briefly with Reid Blute of Pulte Homes New England regarding property in Upton (formerly Noble

Vista) concerning a potential new development for up to 100-units of senior housing proposed to be adjacent and connecting to Shining Rock Golf Community in Northbridge; Mr. Bechtholdt noted the project (Upton Ridge) is still at the preliminary stage, Mr. Blute hopes to meet with the Town Manager, DPW Director and the Whitinsville Water Company to talk about the possibility of tying into the Northbridge systems.

ADJOURNMENT

Having no additional business the Planning Board adjourned its meeting of Tuesday, July 28, 2015 at or about 9:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by the Planning Board –

R. Gary Bechtholdt II
Town Planner

Cc: Town Clerk