



NORTHBRIDGE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Tuesday, July 09, 2013

Brett Simas, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM; Barbara Gaudette, Janet Dolber and George Murray were in attendance. Cindy Key, Associate member and R. Gary Bechtholdt II, Town Planner were also present. Mr. Simas announced that Edward Palmer has resigned from the Planning Board; Board members acknowledged Mr. Palmer's many years of dedicated service (10-years) noting he will be missed and wished him well.

The following members of the public were in attendance: Mark Anderson (Heritage Design Group), Vincent Osterman, Normand Gamache (Guerriere & Halnon, Inc); Eric Bazzett (Heritage Design Group); Timothy Thomson (PARE Corp); Carl Adamo (PARE Corp); Jennifer DiStefano (PARE Corp); Judith Kaske; Robert Marseglia; Bette Marseglia; Jennie Berghuis; Roger Mathieu; Kelly Mathieu; Richard Cronin; Suzanne Cronin; Barbara Brochu; Brenda Hamel; Gerald Hamel; Ralph Barrows; Carolyn Barrows; Joyce Cassidy; George Cassidy; Susanne Grady; Jane Hallett; Mickey Mimichello; Laura Joyce; & Joan Jeffers.

I. CITIZEN FORUM

None

II. FORM A'S

2713 & 2741-2743 PROVIDENCE ROAD

Form A –ANR Plan Review/Decision

Normand Gamache Jr, (Guerriere & Halnon, Inc) reviewed with the Planning Board, on behalf of the owner/applicant Roger Mathieu, ANR plan entitled "Plan of Land" 2713 & 2741-2743 Providence Road Northbridge, Mass" dated June 28, 2013 for subject property identified as Assessors Map 19 Parcels 72 & 122 located within the Residential-Two (R2) Zoning District.

The Board reviewed the ANR plan; Mr. Gamache noted the lot size, frontage requirement and provided a brief history of the subject parcels.

Upon motion duly made (Dolber) and seconded (Murray) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to GRANT an ANR endorsement as presented, combining Parcel A & B, as shown on plan.

III. SELF STORAGE UNITS –CONT. PUBLIC HEARING

§173-49.1 -Site Plan Review (546 Providence Road)

Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that the Applicant/Engineer has requested a continuance from tonight's meeting to the next available agenda to afford additional time for the preparation of revised plans. Mr. Bechtholdt also noted, since the last review of the Planning Board the applicant has secured requested special permit/variance(s) from the Zoning Board for the proposed use.

Mr. Simas asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak in regards to the continued public hearing. Judith Kaske explained to the Board that issues she raised concerning existing lighting has been adjusted by the owner of the property; she thanked them for that and remaindered the Board that she also hopes they will revise their snowing plowing practices this winter.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Dolber) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to continue the public hearing to July 23, 2013 at 7:15PM.

IV. ST. CAMILLUS HEALTH CENTER –CONT. PUBLIC HEARING

§173-49.1 -Site Plan Review

Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that the Applicant/Engineer has requested a continuance from tonight's hearing to the next available agenda to provide additional time for the preparation of revised plans.

Mr. Simas asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak in regards to the continued public hearing – having none the Planning Board looked to continue the hearing as requested.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Dolber) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to continue the public hearing to July 23, 2013 at 7:25PM.

V. MARSTON HEIGHTS -DISCUSSION

Condo Lot #2 –The Hills @ Whitinsville

Mr. Simas welcomed residents of Marston Heights. Mr. Murray recued himself, noting he had worked for the developer, J&F Marinella Dev. as a consultant and as such did not participate in the discussion. Mr. Murray adjourned from the table and left the meeting room during the discussion.

Mr. Bechtholdt noted that he sent a letter to J&F Marinella Dev. after the June 11, 2013 Planning Board meeting and spoke with both Frank and Joe Marinella after the Planning Board meeting of June 11, 2013. Mr. Bechtholdt provided J&F Marinella Dev. with copies of the correspondences received from the residents including the photographs.

Mr. Simas explained that he and the Town Planner met with Joe Marinella on-site Wednesday June 19, 2013; had received the letter and all the documentation the residents shared. Mr. Simas begin noting clearly there are some site improvements that are in the purview of the Planning Board such as conditions of approval, street trees, sidewalks, roadway construction, and landscape design that the Board may have an influence over; other things like forms on the foundations, and patios and/or the differences in the trim treatments those types of things –we (the Board) understand your frustration and hopefully Joe can work with the residents to resolve those other types of issues. What we as a Board will focus on will be those included in the conditions of approval for that development. Mr. Simas is hopeful Joe is sincere and will complete the work as was indicated to him at the site visit. Since then Mr. Simas noted he has visited the site to observe progress; has seen some of the work is being done; it not necessarily as fast as one would have hoped but there is at least activity; if I had gone up there and seen no signs of life I would be very nervous. He is up there doing some work and that's a sign of good faith. In addition to meeting on-site Joe has provided a construction schedule with dates for some of the

remaining work (copies distributed to Board and residents in the audience). Mr. Simas briefly reviewed the schedule which included items such as grading and seeding back of units (July 12); installation of sprinkler system (July 26); streetlights (July 20); Street trees (after September 1 to guarantee survival); driveway, roadway & sidewalk (August 15); deck stain (July 12); reverse transoms (July 5).

Mr. Simas noted in order for the developer to guarantee the street trees they would need to wait to be planted after September 01, 2013; noting summer is not the best time to plant. Ms. Gaudette and other Board members agreed. Ms. Gaudette suggested the developer prepare the areas now so when it's time to plant the trees it is a simpler process.

Mr. Simas then solicited input and comments from the residents in attendance. Richard Cronin asked if the developer does not complete what is expected of him can the residents take him to small claims court; Mr. Simas suggested they (residents) would need to talk to an attorney to get legal advice. Robert Marseglia followed up asking, what if the developer does not satisfy improvements shown on a site plan. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested he (Joe Marinella) could be subject to a zoning violation from the Building Inspector/Zoning Enforcement Officer. The Building Inspector could find him in violation of zoning (approved site plan); Mr. Simas suggested, if needed, the Planning Board could write a letter to the Building Inspector regarding non-compliance with site approval.

Mr. Simas inquired if there was other leverage the Planning Board could use to inspire action on behalf of the developer. Mr. Bechtholdt noted there is performance bond (Lenders Agreement) in place however unlikely the town would call-in the bond for a private development. Ms. Gaudette suggested the Board write a letter to the Building Inspector regarding zoning violations. In addition to the bond a maintenance escrow was also established for this project.

Mr. Simas said he was willing to give J&F Marinella Dev. the month to address items included on their construction schedule; we asked for a schedule, he has provided us with a schedule, if after a month items are addressed that shows an effort of good faith to complete all the work. If not, then absolutely the Board may want to pursue the other avenue. Ms. Gaudette asked about the trees and reiterated that she would like to have the locations for the trees prepared in advance of planting.

Robert Marseglia noting he and Carl Morrison met with the Board (June 11, 2013) stated they would like the developer to do no more or no less than what was approved on the plan; that's all we want. We don't want water in our cellars; and that's happened. Mr. Marseglia mentioned they (J&F Marinella Dev) recently graded and seeded some areas (in front of 3 units) however have not installed the irrigation system, does not make sense. In regards to streetlights, the plan calls for seventeen (17) lights, there are now only 4 or 5 concrete bases; the developer should really take a look at that.

Mr. Marseglia also mentioned that the scheduled prepared by Joe Marinella does not include the fire box. Mr. Bechtholdt and Mr. Simas noted that the Fire Department may no longer use this type of system anymore and is looking for direction regarding this from the Fire Chief. Mr. Simas indicated if the Fire Department tells us they no longer utilize this type of system the developer will be directed to remove what is currently installed (the post). Mr. Marseglia explained ornamental planting around utility boxes, etc also need to be planted; more than just street trees.

Additional residents in attendance expressed concerns with safety and work already done, such as grading of backyards, etc. A group of residents have formed a committee and have been working (with R&R Realty) to coordinate transition in addressing other punchlist items before the common areas are turned over to the Home Owners Association.

Board members considered dates to revisit this matter (July 23/August 13, 2013). Board members agreed to review status at its meeting of July 23, 2013; after which if the developer has not completed items identified in the schedule provided the Planning Board will look to the Inspector of Buildings/Zoning Enforcement Officer concerning zoning violations. Mr. Simas noted it was fair to give the Marinellas until July 23rd before seeking potential violations.

Mr. Simas indicated that he would have a conversation with Joe Marinella regarding the Board's position in addressing outstanding issues. Town Planner will talk with the Building Inspector specific to the ability to find the developer in violation of the site plan approval.

Planning Board continued discussion to Tuesday, July 23, 2013 (7:15PM). Mr. Murray returned to the meeting room and participated in others Planning Board agenda items.

VI. OSTERMAN COMMERCE PARK –CONT. PUBLIC HEARING

Special Permit -Planned Business Development

Site Plan Review -Phase 1

Mark Anderson (Heritage Design Group) introduced Vincent Osterman (Applicant); Eric Bazzett (Engineer); and the traffic consultants from PARE Corporation: Timothy Thomson, Carl Adamo, and Jennifer DiStefano. Ms. DiStefano reviewed Traffic Impact Analysis prepared noting traffic study areas of Plimmers Corner, Church Street Extension & Quaker Street/Church Street intersection; traffic operations under existing, future no-build conditions and future build conditions (proposed build-out of site) also reviewed in terms of safety and any potential impacts. Collected traffic data (traffic counts conducted in September 2012); determined AM and PM peak hours; looked at crash data; sightlines at proposed driveway location (meets all ASHTO requirements).

Ms. DiStefano briefly reviewed the phasing of the overall project; Phase 1 & 2 and Phases 3 & 4. As part of traffic study looked at existing conditions and projected them out to 2014 at a 2% growth rate (conservative). Ms. DiStefano reviewed with the Planning Board methodology of traffic analysis noting in compliance with based on the ITE standards and procedures and the Trip Generation Manual. Medical Office building proposed will replace existing building on Church Street, as a result not expected to create new trips for the proposed new building; accentually existing trips will be redistributed. Overall the trips to the new medical office building will not be addition trips to the area. Ms. DiStefano continued to review estimate trip generation for each of the remaining phases (Phase 3 & 4). Additional studies will be done before Phases 3 & 4 is permitted locally (additional study to be submitted at that time).

Ms. DiStefano briefed the Board on the Level of Service (Capacity Analysis) for Plimmers Corner and Church Street Extension/Quaker Street. Phase 1 will not increase or impact current LOS at Plimmers Corner. Ms. DiStefano then reviewed potential mitigation measures for Plimmers Corner; signal

optimization, through coordination with MassDOT considered a dynamic signaling called Maximum-Green -extend time light stays green based upon demand. Further coordination with MassDOT would be required if Maximum-Green was to be implemented at Plummers Corner. Mr. Simas clarified whether or not changes or upgrades to Plummers Corner would be required by the state as part of the Phase 1 build-out. Ms. DiStefano stated no, not for the Phase 1 development. Ms. DiStefano clarified Phase 1 includes the maintenance facility (of Osterman Propane), the proposed medical office building and second general office building (tenant undefined).

For the Church Street Extension/Quaker Street intersection various options were considered – signalization was determined to be the most effective. Ms. DiStefano noted under current traffic conditions 2 of the 9 signal warrants are met (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices -MUTCD). A traffic signal could be installed as current conditions met Federal guidelines for signalization. Mr. Simas asked if installing a signal would require any reconfiguration of the intersection. Ms. DiStefano noted before introducing signal would need to review the geometry of the intersection; suggesting would likely need to be altered. As part of traffic study conducted for this project PARE Corp. collected data for 1 & 4-hour peak levels (traffic volumes); before considering signalization would need to perform an 8-hour traffic volume warrant (if peak hour and 4-hour met; would likely meet 8-hour warrant).

For the proposed site entrance on Church Street Extension looked at the installation of a left-turn lane on Church Street Extension as a potential mitigation measure, however did not offer any capacity analysis benefits and therefore not recommended by PARE Corp. In order to introduce turning-lane would need to add additional pavement width along Church Street Extension. Mr. Bechtholdt clarified whether or not consideration was for the full build-out of the project or just for Phase 1. Ms. DiStefano stated full build-out.

As part of study Ms. DiStefano noted they also identified several Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures that are introduced as potential mitigation actions; concepts the developer is willing to commit to, to potentially reduce trip-generation to the site. Commitments include onsite bike racks; shower facilities; work with tenants to develop potential flex-times to offset AM/PM peaks, and telecommute opportunities. In addition applicant has committed to performing a future monitoring program in order to assess the effectiveness of the TDM measures; will conduct traffic counts once per year for 5-years (beginning at the completion of Phase 1) –data would be shared with the town to determine if any other mitigation measures may be required at that time.

Mr. Simas asked if the signalization for Church Street Extension/Quaker Street intersection could be required for this project; Ms. DiStefano noted based upon the data collected a signalization would be warranted today; current volumes at the intersection are high enough to warrant a signal.

Board members reviewed traffic volumes (existing) and build-out of Phase 1 in regards to considering the installation of traffic signal at Church Street Extension/Quaker Street intersection. Residents in attendance discussed traffic backups along Church Street Extension; residents of Plummer Park expressed concerns of extended delays exiting neighborhood during peak hours commutes.

Ms. DiStefano suggested relocating existing signage (and cutting back some vegetation) at the intersection may improve sightlines; which in turn may help reduce delay. Ms. Dobler asked if, during

the traffic study it was determined what the distance of the backup on Church Street Extension was from the Quaker Street intersection (backup on Church Street or Quaker Street). Ms. DiStefano indicated delay study conduct was specific to the intersection; as an example under existing condition (for the east bound approach) there was 490-feet of delay (80-feet during PM peak) we estimate that one car length is approximately 25-feet.

Mr. Bechtholdt asked about the “dynamic-green” option and if implement what traffic impacts could result on Church Street Extension and specifically the intersection of Quaker Street. Ms. DiStefano did not anticipate a significant delay as a result.

Mr. Murray asked about status of the state’s review, noting a number of issues appear to be unresolved based upon the information received to date; such as crash rate data, and would like to see additional correspondence from state noting whether or not all their concerns have been addressed. Ms. DiStefano explained MassDOT comments will be addressed as part of final submittal; MassDOT would then submit a follow-up letter noting items addressed. Mr. DiStefano then clarified the crash rate data (Statewide average vs. District 3 average).

Mr. Anderson explained to the Planning Board that they have been working with the state for about a year; requested documents and revised traffic information has been submitted back to them (along with a copy to the Planning office) should hear back from the state in a few weeks; we anticipate receipt of a final letter from the state (specifically from MassDOT) indicating everything has been addressed.

Mr. Murray expressed concerns of traffic on Church Street Extension and at Plummers Corner; backs up to Plummer Park –wants to make sure the state is satisfied with this project as it relates to Plummers Corner. Mr. Anderson agreed that Plummers Corner has been a problem for a number of years; in talking with representatives from MassDOT (District 3), short of land-takings the traffic will not be fully corrected. Unfortunately, not something the state is willing to pursue at this time.

Mr. Anderson continued, noting in regards to Church Street Extension and the Quaker Street intersection he spoke with Jim Shuris, DPW Director (and perhaps the Board has received communication from DPW) who was to apply for a TIP grant three weeks ago; the grant included signaling of the intersection (and perhaps reconstruction of the road). When Mr. Anderson met with Mr. Shuris on-site last week he was informed that Mr. Shuris did submit the grant and has received positive feedback from MassDOT; project was worthy (could be a year or two out –but pursing). Mr. Bechtholdt noted that he has not received anything from the DPW Director regarding the grant.

Mr. Simas noted it’s important for the Planning Board to receive follow-up comments from the various departments noting whether or not concerns have been addressed. Mr. Bechtholdt mentioned, as far as the site plan; Heritage Design Group has indicated all necessary comments will be addressed on the revised plan, noting JH Engineering Group (the Planning Board’s consulting engineer) will provide a follow-up report once the revised plans are reviewed.

Mr. Simas asked Planning Board members if they had any additional questions and then solicited comment from the residents in attendance.

Mickey Mimichello offered his observations regarding traffic delays at the Quaker Street intersection (travelling east on Church Street Extension) suggesting drivers cannot see to make left because cars proceeding to make the right block visibility and traffic backs up (road at incline, road too wide & larger vehicles block smaller cars). Lights would help but may also need to address geometry. Mr. Mimichello also noted that turning out from Plummer Park (on occasion) has been problematic due to backup from Quaker Street intersection. Mr. Simas asked if Mr. Mimichello knew what may cause the backup to extend to Plummer Park and what time of day. Mr. Mimichello was not sure. Lauren Joyce explained if her daughter leaves for school at 7:10AM traffic backup not a problem, however if she leaves at 7:15AM it is very difficult to exit Plummer Park.

Mr. Simas sought additional comments from the residents specific to traffic; noting the Planning Board would also review the landscaping, lighting, etc. afterwards.

Mr. Mimichello questioned the methodology used to determine that no additional traffic impacts would result from the medical office building (as a result of relocating existing facility). Mr. Mimichello suggested based upon the traffic report there would be approximately 50 more vehicle trips -traveling east. Ms. DiStefano clarified methodology and AM peak-hour. Mr. Anderson noted the opening hours for the medical office would be after the AM peak.

Mr. Simas noted while he appreciates all the science and engineering that goes into the traffic reporting and understands the estimates and assumptions used, however reality tells him there is going to be more traffic; with that said the unfortunate circumstance with the status of Plummer's Corner is; we don't have options to mitigate that traffic (from the state's perspective).

Mr. Bechtholdt asked in addition to local reviews (site plan) would the state have an opportunity to review the proposed for Phase 3 & 4. Mr. Anderson suggested that the state would review Phase 3 & 4 (which may require additional traffic mitigation). As part of the Phase 1 build-out committed to perform traffic count/study once a year for the next five years.

The Planning Board then listen to additional discussions concerning further clarification on proposed dynamic-green and resulting additional traffic on Church Street Extension from Plummer's Corner. Mr. Simas suggests residents on Plummer Park unfortunately may be on the "bad end" of the traffic delays, as the dynamic-green would extend the time for those travelling northbound on Route 122 (Providence Road) resulting in longer lines on Church Street Extension. Potentially, if the town wanted to modify the dynamic-green (as proposed) would need to get Mass Highway (Route 122) to agree and make the change.

Mr. Mimichello suggested, in addition to northbound travel on Route 122 (Plummer's Corner) Mass Highway (state) should also consider implementing dynamic-green for westbound travel from Church Street Extension. Mr. Simas was not sure how much of an impact (positive or negative) the dynamic-green would have, however stated the Planning Board is willing to support any recommendation the abutters may want specific to implementation of the dynamic-green.

Carl Adamo of PARE Corp. suggests if implemented Mass Highway would evaluate new signal timing; the Department of Public Works on behalf of the town could work with Mass Highway.

Mr. Anderson noted a major factor in the AM back up (along Church Street Extension) is due to school bus stop locations, where 2 to 3 different buses pick-up students on Church Street Extension. Implementation of dynamic-green (northbound on Rt 122) may be offset as a result of the timing of the bus pick-ups (in the AM) on Church Street Extension.

The Planning Board thanked Ms. DiStefano for her traffic presentation and then looked to Mr. Anderson concerning lighting study; security/screening & fencing; landscaping plan; best development practices guidelines; land donation; and roof drains.

Mr. Anderson reviewed proposed gutter/downspout system for the roof drains; to be directed into infiltration system (underground). Mr. Anderson then presented Lighting Plan and briefly reviewed photometric study (foot-candle readings) prepared by a lighting engineer; lighting fixtures will be similar to those along Church Street (downtown Whitinsville). Lighting concerns raised by residents within Plummer Park neighborhood have been addressed; fixtures will include shields -no light trespass beyond rail tracks; some ambient glow -but no glare onto abutting properties. Mr. Anderson explained to the Planning Board comments received to date, will be addressed on a final set of plans. Mr. Anderson then reviewed revised Landscaping Plan; screening buffer, planting areas, street trees, retaining walls, etc. (may modify along roadway –don't want to plant trees where they may not survive). Mr. Anderson clarified elevation of proposed roadway vs. railroad (10-foot difference). Mr. Anderson reviewed proposed screening along railroad, provided Board members with a detail of retaining wall with screen fencing; providing privacy screening (and security) along the railroad. Mr. Simas noted copies of all plans will be available for review at the Planning office. Mr. Anderson reviewed Best Development Practices Guidelines, noting the entirety of the project has been design utilizing Low Impact Development (provided a number of examples). Mr. Simas asked if there was a maintenance plan for the Low Impact Development (included in Stormwater Management Plan). In regards to land preservation, Mr. Anderson explained that the applicant is donating 26-acres to the state and will be building a 1-acre turtle habitat area along Blackstone Canal.

Mr. Anderson continued, noting during his meeting on-site with Jim Shuris, DPW Director they discussed the idea of installing a sidewalk on Church Street Extension, which after reviewing in the field Mr. Shuris agreed to no longer suggest as a requirements; may include as part of TIP grant to the state. Additionally, the applicant has agreed to install a guardrail along Church Street Extension (as directed by the DPW Director); the applicant has also installed a cape-cod berm on Church Street Extension and will as part of the roadway (private drive) paving will repave a portion of Church Street Extension at the entrance of the site. Mr. Bechtholdt noted the DPW Director should provided the Board with a letter detailing improvements; Mr. Anderson mention he was surprised that he had not as of yet as Mr. Shuris told him the other day that he would. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested it would be important for the Board to receive written comments from the DPW Director; Board members stated they would require it.

Mr. Bechtholdt asked Mr. Anderson to review with the Planning Board and the need to provide a Development Impact Report in addition to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) filed with the state and provided to the Planning Board.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Gaudette) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to WAIVE the requirement to provide a Development Impact Assessment (as provided for in Section 173-49.1 E (2) p of the Zoning Bylaw and accept in lieu of the Environmental Impact Report -EIR filed with the state.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Gaudette) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to CONTINUE the public hearing to Tuesday, July 23, 2013 at 8:00PM. The Planning Board also directed the Town Planner to prepare draft conditions to be reviewed at the next meeting.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Approval of Meeting Minutes –June 18, 2013

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Dolber) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to ACCEPT the meeting minutes as amended for June 18, 2013. Correction -Pine Knoll/Discussion: “Mr. Murray recued himself, noting that he lives in the Pine Knoll development and had worked with the developer, J&F Marinella Dev. and as such did not participate in the discussion. Mr. Murray adjourned from the table and left the meeting room during the discussion.”

2013 Fall Annual Town Meeting –October 22, 2013

Point of information –no discussion.

2013 FATM Warrant Closes -August 23, 2013 (Noon)

Mr. Bechtholdt noted that it may be too late for developers to prepare all the necessary paperwork and documentation required for street acceptance consideration (90-days in advance). Mr. Bechtholdt also suggested if Board members had any thoughts specific to potential zoning amendment articles arrangements will be made for discussion/consideration at the next meeting scheduled for July 23, 2013.

Camelot Subdivision –Status Report (Phase I & II)

Mr. Bechtholdt explained that he sent letters to the various the developers in town (residential subdivision developments) requesting an updated construction schedule and overall status report. Mr. Bechtholdt noted some developers are better than others when it comes to providing the requested information. The Board noted receipt of construction schedule for the Camelot subdivision dated June 17, 2013. Mr. Bechtholdt indicated that he is awaiting a follow-up response from JH Engineering and confirmation concerning overall status and resent phone conversations with the developer regarding Phase II construction activity. Reference made to Community Planning & Development letter dated June 14, 2013.

Presidential Farms –Status Report (Phase III & IV)

Mr. Bechtholdt explained that he sent letters to the various the developers in town (residential subdivision developments) requesting an updated construction schedule and overall status report. Mr. Bechtholdt noted some developers are better than others when it comes to providing the requested information. The Planning Board noted receipt of a very detailed construction schedule for Presidential Farms received June 19, 2013. Reference made to Community Planning & Development letter dated June 17, 2013.

Hemlock Estates/Pine Knoll –Status Report

Mr. Bechtholdt explained that he sent letters to the various the developers in town (residential subdivision developments) requesting an updated construction schedule and overall status report. Mr. Bechtholdt noted some developers are better than others when it comes to providing the requested information. The Board did not receive any follow-up from the developer regarding the status and updated construction schedule for Hemlock Estates. Mr. Bechtholdt provided the Board with some documents showing the overall plan layout of Hemlock Estates and the Senior Living development (Pine Knoll) within the subdivision development as well as the phasing plan for the entirety of the project. Reference made to Community Planning & Development letter dated June 24, 2013.

Pine Knoll –Senior Living Affordable Units

Planning Board noted receipt of letter from the Inspector of Buildings dated June 24, 2013 regarding Pine Knoll –Senior Living Bylaw, stating the Board does not have the authority to waive the affordable unit requirement.

Hillside Garden Estates –Status Report

Mr. Bechtholdt explained that he sent letters to the various the developers in town (residential subdivision developments) requesting an updated construction schedule and overall status report. Mr. Bechtholdt noted some developers are better than others when it comes to providing the requested information. The Planning Board did not receive any follow-up from the developer regarding the status and updated construction schedule for Hillside Garden Estates. Mr. Bechtholdt expressed frustration with the lack of activity over the past several months. Board members inquired about the status/type of the performance surety held for the subdivision. Mr. Bechtholdt explained to the Board that of the 9 house lots approved approximately 3 of them remain. The Board shared this concern and directed the Town Planner not to sign-off on any building permit applications (new homes) until the developer addresses the outstanding issues associated with the subdivision development, which include sidewalks; final paving; cleaning stormwater system; and the abandoned waterline services. Reference made to Community Planning & Development letter dated June 17, 2013.

Linwood Mill Lofts –Crosswalk(s)/Linwood Ave

Mr. Bechtholdt noted that arrangements had been made for the Safety Committee to meet on July 17, 2013 to review/consider the proposed pedestrian crosswalk locations on Linwood Avenue –required as part of the Linwood Mill redevelopment project. Mr. Bechtholdt added that he prepared some additional aerials showing the approximate locations, noting the crosswalk proposed at the access driveway (Linwood Mill) appears to have good sightlines, however the second location proposed at the terminus of the Mumford Riverwalk may not provide for the best (optimal) sightlines due to the slight curve in the roadway (Linwood Avenue). Mr. Bechtholdt will provide Board members with a copy of the aerials and will update the Board on July 23, 2013 recommendation from the Safety Committee.

OSRP Update –Schedule Meeting Date

The next meeting of the Open Space & Recreation Plan Update (workshop) is scheduled for Tuesday, July 23, 2013 at 6:00PM (Town Hall).

Mail –Review

In addition to the mail listed (see attached) the Planning Board noted receipt of the following communications: memorandum dated June 17, 2013 to Mark Anderson from Town Planner regarding the Self-Storage Units Site Plan Review on Providence Road; Draft Certificate of Approval for site plan review of 546 Providence Road / Self Storage Units; Checklist for Self-Storage Units (Providence Rd); Memo dated May 22, 2013 to Planning Board, Mark Anderson and Cheryl Peterson from Town Planner concerning the self-storage units site plan review; Letter dated May 22, 2013 to Town Planner from JH Engineering concerning 546-566 Providence Road Site Plan “Peer Review;” Letter dated May 24, 2013 to Town Planner from Building Inspector regarding Self-Storage Units at 546 Providence Road; Memo dated May 13, 2013 to Planning Board from Conservation Commission regarding 546 Providence Road – Self Storage Units; Draft Certificate of Approval Site Plan Review for St. Camillus Health Center; Checklist for St. Camillus Health Center; Memo dated March 7, 2013 to Planning Board & Mark Anderson from Town Planner concerning the St. Camillus Health Center Site Plan Review; Letter dated March 7, 2013 to Town Planner from JH Engineering regarding St. Camillus Health Center Site Plan “Peer Review;” Memo dated March 7, 2013 to the Planning Board from the Conservation Commission regarding the Review for Wetland Disturbance for St. Camillus Health Center; Letter dated June 17, 2013 to J & F Marinella Development Corp. from Town Planner concerning Marston Heights; Letter dated June 11, 2013 to Planning Office from the Residents of Marston Heights concerning the required improvements at Marston Heights Condominium Development; Completion of Marston Heights; Analysis of Marston Heights Approved Site Plan vs. Current Status on June 8, 2013; Email dated June 21, 2013 to Town Planner from Carl Morrison regarding an update on Marston Heights; Letter dated June 24, 2013 to Town Planner from JH Engineering concerning Osterman Commerce Park Special Permit, Site Plan and Notice of Intent “Peer Review;” Traffic Impact Analysis for the Osterman Park prepared by Pare Corporation dated February 2013 and revised March 2013; Email dated June 25, 2013 to James Shuris from Town Planner regarding Osterman Commerce Park; Draft Minutes of the June 18, 2013 meeting; Letter dated June 14, 2013 to J & F Marinella Development Corp. from Town Planner concerning the Camelot Subdivision; Letter dated June 17, 2013 to the Planning Board from J & F Marinella Development, Inc. concerning the Updated Construction Schedule for the Camelot; Letter dated June 17, 2013 to Presidential Farms, Inc. from Town Planner concerning Presidential Farms Subdivision; Presidential Farms Construction Schedule; Letter dated June 24, 2013 to J & F Marinella Development from Town Planner concerning Hemlock Estates Status Report; Hemlock Estates Overall Layout Plan; Pine Knoll Senior Living Development Plan; Hemlock Estates Overall Phasing Plan; Letter dated June 24, 2013 to Town Planner from Building Inspector concerning Pine Knoll – Senior Living Bylaw; Letter dated June 17, 2013 to John Barges from Town Planner regarding Hillside Garden Estates Subdivision; Email dated June 21, 2013 to Matt Mittelstadt from Town Planner regarding the Linwood Mill pedestrian crosswalks; Letter dated June 25, 2013 to John Galvani from Town Planner regarding Shining Rock Golf Community Subdivision; Letter dated June 25, 2013 to JA Taylor Construction from Town Planner concerning Green Meadow Court Construction Schedule / Status Report; Letter dated June 25, 2013 to Michael Lambert from Town Planner regarding Farnum Circle; Memo dated May 24, 2013 / June 10, 2013 to Planning Board, Mark Anderson and Eric Bazzett from Town Planner regarding Osterman Commerce Park Special Permit – Planned Business Development and Site Plan Review Phase I; Letter dated June 20, 2013 to Town Planner to JH Engineering regarding Osterman Maintenance Facility Site Plan Revisions “Peer Review;” Email dated June 24, 2013 to Planning Board, Jim Shuris, Rob Van Meter, Randy Swigor and Mark Kuras from Town Planner regarding June 24 site visits; Department of Housing &

Community Development Chapter 40B Subsidized Housing Inventory as of April 30, 2013; NPDES Stormwater Permit Program; Notice of Public Presentations Relating to the Milford, MA Casino Project.

Other

Planning Board (re)endorsed Special Permit Certificate of Approval for Shining Rock Golf Community. Special permit (dated January 27, 2011) is specific to the conversion of the 6 single-family house lots to the 14 townhouse-units approved in 2011. As a result of a scribe's error (in referencing a deed) the permit was not accepted by the Registry of Deeds for recording (now dated July 09, 2013). Mr. Bechtholdt noted that he included information from the Department of Housing & Community Development (DHCD) on the Subsidized Housing Inventory (SHI) percentage for Northbridge (7.4%); information on NEPDS permit regarding stormwater; and provided the Board with a notice regarding public presentations (during the month of July) specific to the proposed Milford Casino project.

Adjournment

Having no additional business the Planning Board adjourned its meeting of Tuesday, July 09, 2013 at or about 9:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by Planning Board –

R. Gary Bechtholdt II
Town Planner

Cc: Town Clerk