



NORTHBRIDGE PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

Tuesday, April 22, 2014

Brett Simas, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. Barbara Gaudette, Janet Dolber, George Murray and Mark Key were in attendance; R. Gary Bechtholdt II, Town Planner was also present. Cindy Key, Associate member was absent.

The following members of the public were in attendance: Stephen O'Connell (Andrews Survey & Engineering); Henry Lane; Time Callahan (HAWK Consulting); Charlie Roberts (NexAmp); Allan Clapp (NexAmp); Joseph Leonardo (Terreno Realty); Scott Barnes; Kevin Turner; Bruce & Linda Lermond; Julie & Denis Davieau; and Vivian & John Kelley.

I. CITIZEN FORUM

Heritage District -Permitted uses, etc. -Planning Board met with Vivian & John Kelley of 1355 Quaker Street who are interested in purchasing the property at the corner of Hill Street and Cottage Street, located within the Heritage Zoning District. Mr. Kelley asked if a residential use would require a Special Permit; Mr. Bechtholdt indicated according to the town's zoning bylaw residential use is allowed within the Heritage Zoning District through the issuance of Special Permit of the Planning Board, suggesting they solicit a determination from the Building Inspector who administers the zoning for the town. Mr. Kelley sought the Boards direction for possible next step, Mr. Bechtholdt suggested they meet with the Building Inspector to review the proposed use (residential) and if they are to propose an addition to the building they would want to include such information as part of the special permit application to the Planning Board. Mr. Kelley indicated he has reviewed the Heritage District zoning provisions (§173-6 Purpose of Heritage District), regarding the 25% restriction for additions, noting they do not plan to alter the exterior of the building other than install new windows and doors (energy efficiency); do not plan to add an addition. Mr. Bechtholdt offered to arrange a meeting with the Building Inspector to sit down and review their proposal. Board noted the special permit application may be referred to the Historical Commission for advisory review as determined by the Building Inspector. Vivian Kelley asked if replacing the old roof would require review by the Historical Commission; Mr. Bechtholdt suggested would be up to the Building Inspector for a determination, suggesting they talk with the Historical Commission, noting they meet regularly and may have an informal discussion with them during an upcoming meeting. Mr. Simas asked if any Board member had concerns with the proposed use (residential); Ms. Dolber and Ms. Gaudette indicated they felt residential was a good use of the property given its proximity to other residential homes; consensus of the Board supported the proposed intended use of residential. Vivian & John Kelley thanked the Planning Board.

II. Form A's

None

III. GROUND MOUNTED SOLAR FACILITY –CONTINUED PUBLIC MEETING

Site Plan Review (AP 1 Parcels 97 & 98)

Stephen O'Connell (Andrews Survey & Engineering) and Henry Lane met with the Planning Board on behalf of Sutton Solar (NexAmp); Mr. O'Connell provided a brief update and overview of the status of the site development proposal (revisions to the plan) and their meeting with the Sutton Planning Board.

Mr. O'Connell noted the Sutton Planning Board shared similar concerns with the number of utility poles proposed along Oakhurst Road (Sutton)/Lasell Road (Northbridge) and explained National Grid (the utility) has since determined the solar facility does not need to be divided into two (2) separate systems as originally presented; noting as a result the number of above ground utility poles has been reduced from approximately ten (10) to about five (5) poles; two of which will be owned and maintained by the Sutton Solar facility with the remainder owned by National Grid. Mr. Simas asked what the rationale was for the change (from 2 systems to 1); Mr. O'Connell explained initially National Grid wanted the systems to be divided by town for SREC credit accounting and Department of Public Utility requirements, however after our initial screening National Grid has since issued a memo indicating they are happy with one system for this location.

Mr. O'Connell reviewed with the Board plan revisions; which included a reduction in equipment pads and the relocating of the access driveway and the above ground utility poles to the easterly side of the subject property, closer to the existing tree line to help camouflage the poles; based upon input from the Sutton Planning Board. Mr. O'Connell noted the four (4) comments raised by JH Engineering Group, LLC (Planning Board Consultant) have been addressed on the revised plan with confirmation from the Board's consultant; inclusion of a construction phase sediment basin (provided), the project will require a SWIP (Stormwater and Wastewater Infrastructure Permit) a pollution prevention plan, and added additional screening per the Sutton Planning Board.

Mr. Murray inquired about the grading of the site and the Board's consulting engineer comment concerning standing water; Mr. O'Connell acknowledged, noting residual effects of the earth removal operations of years past; added a note on the plan for contractor to maintain existing contours/grades and to prevent ponding onsite. Mr. Murray also inquired about the existing monitoring well onsite; Mr. O'Connell indicated the well is outside the proposed work area however they also added note to the plan for the contractor to provide protection of the monitoring well.

Mr. Simas sought other questions or comment from the Planning Board members; Mr. Bechtholdt reviewed draft conditions prepared by the Planning office with the Planning Board and the Applicant/Engineer. Mr. Bechtholdt noted he will add the requirement to provide the town with a copy of the SWIP filing.

Mr. O'Connell explained the financial surety (bond) was priced out for both towns (Sutton & Northbridge), noting the amounts included in the draft should be divided by two for the Northbridge portion. Mr. Bechtholdt asked if the Sutton Planning Board had any concerns with the methodology used to determine the financial surety; Mr. Lane indicated they did not voice any objections. Mr. Bechtholdt noted that he had Town Counsel review the draft condition concerning the financial surety and the minor changes will be reflected in the Board's decision.

Mr. Simas asked Board members if they had any additional questions or comments and then solicited input from the public in attendance; having none the Planning Board upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Dolber) voted 4-0 to close the Public Hearing.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Gaudette) the Planning Board voted (4-0-1 [Key abstained]) to APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS the site plan for a Solar Electric Generating Facility to be located at 25 Oakhurst Road (Sutton)/Lasell Road (Northbridge).

Conditions of Approval include: construction and operation of the solar electrical generating facility shall be consistent with all applicable local, state and federal requirements, including but not limited to all applicable safety, construction, electrical and communications requirements. All buildings and fixtures forming part of a solar photovoltaic installation shall be constructed in accordance with the State Building Code; Planning Board approval shall be subject to conditions, if any imposed by the Northbridge Fire Department and Northbridge Safety Committee; a Knox-Box, or similar shall be installed at the gated entrance as required and directed by the Northbridge Fire Department; Any illumination, including security lighting shall be arranged so as to reflect away from abutting properties; directed in a manner to limit the amount of light trespass. Lighting shall be limited as provided for in Article XX –Large Scale Solar Photovoltaic Installations [Section 173-136 G (5)] of the Northbridge Zoning Bylaw; signage associated with the site development shall comply with the Town of Northbridge Zoning Bylaw [Article VII –Signs] and otherwise provided for in Article XX –Large Scale Solar Photovoltaic Installations [Section 173-136 G (6)]; as part of the site development approval the Owner/Applicant (Operator) agrees to the following Financial Surety provisions and conditions to cover the cost of removal of the installation in the event the Town must remove it and remediate the landscape: prior to, and as a condition of, the ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT the Owner/Applicant and/or Operator (the “Owner”) shall provide the Town of Northbridge with an initial deposit of money in the amount of \$3,000.00, such fund shall be deposited into a special escrow account established to cover the cost of removal of the solar installation and/or remediation of the landscape; proceeds shall not become available to the Town unless and until the Owner/Applicant (Operator) defaults on the obligations outlined in Section 173-136 J of the zoning bylaw, an additional deposit of money in the amount of \$1,000.00 shall be provided by the Owner each successive year for a period of ten (10) years, & to account for inflation, for each year after the tenth year a deposit of money equal to 2 ½ percent of the balance held in the Financial Surety account on March 15 of that year shall be provided to the Town by the Owner. After issuance of the Building permit, funds to satisfy the Financial Surety shall be provided to the Town of Northbridge on an annual basis on or before April 1st; outstanding invoices for services rendered by JH Engineering Group, LLC (Review & Inspection) shall be satisfied prior to the ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMIT; prior to Planning Board ENDORSEMENT of the site development plan a notation shall be added to the plan referencing this Certificate of Approval (April 25, 2014) of the Northbridge Planning Board; as part of the Building permit applicant the Owner/Applicant (Operator) shall supply the BUILDING INSPECTOR with copies of the following: Site Control –documentation of control of the project site, sufficient to allow for construction and operation of the solar photovoltaic installations, Operation & Maintenance Plan –plan for the operation and maintenance of the large-scale solar photovoltaic installation, which shall include measures for maintaining safe access to the solar installation, stormwater controls and general procedures for operational maintenance of the solar installation; Utility Notification –evidence that the utility company that operates the electrical grid has been informed of and approves the planned solar photovoltaic installation; copy of interconnected customer-owned generator agreement shall be provided; and Stormwater and Wastewater Infrastructure Permit (SWIP) –copy of Mass DEP Stormwater Permit shall be provided to the Building Inspector and Planning Board; prior to issuance of a BUILDING PERMIT the Applicant/Engineer shall submit five (5) complete prints of the endorsed site development plan, two (2) fifty-percent (50%) reduced prints and one (1) electronic copy to the Northbridge Community Planning & Development Office; changes to the site development either prior to or during construction shall be administered through the Planning Board in accordance with Section 173-49.1 H of the Northbridge Zoning By-Laws; pursuant to Section 173-49.1 I (2) of the Northbridge Zoning Bylaw this site plan approval shall lapse in one (1) year, if a substantial use thereof has not commenced, except to good cause, which shall not include such time required to pursue or await the determination of an appeal;

and violation of any condition(s) noted herein or failure to comply with this site plan development approval shall subject the Owner/Applicant to zoning enforcement action in accordance with the remedies set forth in M.G.L. c. 40A and as otherwise provided in the Northbridge bylaws.

Based on its finding the Planning Board WAIVED the Development Impact Assessment, Section 173-49.1 E (2) (p) of the Northbridge Zoning By-Laws. As provided for in Section 173-49.1 E (3) of the Northbridge Zoning By-Law the Planning Board may waive any requirements if it believes that the requirement is not necessary based upon the size and scope of the project.

IV. LEONARDO ESTATES –CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

§222-9 Definitive Subdivision (603 Highland Street)

Mr. Bechtholdt explained to the Planning Board that the Applicant/Engineer has revised the proposed sewer service for the development (now to be gravity), noting a plan sheet [Drawing C-6.4] has been provided in their packets, as well as, a letter from Conservation Commission indicating they are agreeable to its proposed location. Mr. Bechtholdt also provided Board members with a copy of the Safety Committee meeting minutes from March 19, 2014 concerning waiver requests. Mr. Bechtholdt noted he added text on the copy of the plan drawing for sewer which he will review during the hearing.

Stephen O'Connell (Andrews Survey & Engineering) and Joseph Leonardo (Applicant) met with the Planning Board to review definitive subdivision plan entitled "Leonardo Estates". Mr. O'Connell provided the Board with an overview of the project review by the Conservation Commission; noting they have selected a consultant ESS Group, Inc of Waltham, MA. Mr. O'Connell also mentioned much of the delay in the review (Conservation) was due to the weather and amount of snow cover on the ground, noting the Commission has since conducted its site visit of the subject property (wetland resource). Mr. O'Connell noted he is currently looking to address comments received by ESS Group, Inc in time for the Conservation Commission's next scheduled meeting of May 14, 2014 and does not foresee any problems or disagreements.

Mr. Bechtholdt noted that the Conservation Commission is utilizing the services of a different consultant than that of the Planning Board for this particular project. Mr. O'Connell added, ESS Group, Inc has reviewed the delineation of the wetlands, regulatory aspects of the wetland crossing and proposed replications; items that may be specific to a wetland scientist.

Mr. O'Connell informed the Planning Board that the sight distances for the subdivision roadway have been added to the plan; noting sight lines are favorably and significantly improved versus the previous approval from 2005, roadway now located at the crest of hill (providing for approximately 500 feet of sight distance to the left of the subdivision entrance and 350 feet to the right). Mr. O'Connell explained traffic projection is proposed to be around 7.8 (or 8) per house; approximately 140 -vehicle trips per day with 20 vehicle trips during the AM/PM peak. Mr. O'Connell noted the existing travel lane widths along Highland Street from the Benson Road intersections have been added to the revised plan set noting the following widths: 20.8 feet, 19.3 feet, 20.1 feet, 20.0 feet, 25.5 feet, 18 feet, 19 feet, 16.7 feet, and 15.5 feet (narrowest) just beyond the entrance and widens up to about 18 to 19-feet.

Mr. O'Connell indicated they are not proposing any roadway widening at this point when they resurface (curb-to-curb) the roadway after the gravity sewer installation. Ms. Gaudette expressed concerns with the

15.5 foot width along Highland Street. Mr. Bechtholdt asked Mr. O'Connell what would prohibit someone from increasing the travel lane width, inquiring if there were any encumbrances or other obstacles to widen the roadway. Mr. O'Connell indicated it would be financial if the developer was required to widen the roadway; Mr. Bechtholdt suggested the Board not compromise safety over the potential profitability of a project. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested the Planning Board take this matter (increase traffic/pavement width) under advisement and consideration as a possible condition of its approval. Mr. O'Connell stated he understood however noted neither the Safety Committee nor the Police Chief indicated that there was a history of traffic/safety concerns within the area. Ms. Gaudette acknowledged, however suggested the subdivision build-out will create additional traffic to the area. Mr. Leonardo indicated there are other sections of Highland Street that are as narrow if not narrower. Mr. Simas asked Mr. Murray if the Safety Committee reviewed the street width; Mr. Murray indicated there was no concern, noting he could not speak for the DPW Director but recalled his main concern was to have core-samples taken where the sewer was to be installed and to pave curb to curb the roadway; Mr. Murray also noted the subject property had been previously reviewed and approved by the Safety Committee a number of years ago.

Mr. O'Connell advised the Planning Board that they are still awaiting input and confirmation from the Department of Public Works –Sewer Division concerning the sewer analysis. Mr. O'Connell mentioned he recently provided CDM-Smith (the town sewer consultant) with requested information; indicating initial feedback suggests no significant concerns. Mr. Bechtholdt noted the Sewer Superintendent will need to authorize the sewer extension before they can start any of the work.

Mr. O'Connell then reviewed with the Planning Board subdivision design change from a low-pressure force main (sewer) to a gravity line, noting the Conservation Commission has reviewed and consented to its proposed location (X-country easement) within its jurisdictional areas; reference to Conservation Commission memorandum dated April 14, 2014. Mr. O'Connell reviewed with the Planning Board the route of the proposed sewer line (gravity) -plan sheet [Drawing C-6.4]. Mr. O'Connell suggested the sewer easement from Highland Street may also serve as an access easement for the drainage pond for long-term maintenance.

Mr. O'Connell indicated that he has had conversations with the Town Planner about extending the gravity sewer to the subdivision entrance on Highland Street; something he and Mr. Leonardo feel is not necessary (300-feet of additional sewer work the project does not need). Mr. Bechtholdt disagreed, noting the two (2) proposed frontage lots on Highland Street would require municipal sewer as well; suggesting the plan should be revised to eliminate the last two (2) house lots at the end of the cul-de-sac (or others), noting the town's regulations limit development of a maximum of 18 lots on a cul-de-sac; the 2 corner lots could be counted in the total, equaling twenty house lots. Mr. Bechtholdt concluded stating one of the main concerns raised by the abutters in attendance at the first public hearing was not to shortcut the sewer; Mr. Bechtholdt felt terminating the sewer line (gravity) within the subdivision as currently proposed and not back out onto Highland Street would be shortcutting the sewer.

Mr. Simas asked if they ran sewer to Highland Street (subdivision entrance) if would it prohibit utilizing gravity; Mr. O'Connell noted it would not however stated the line at the location would be approximately 16 to 18-feet deep, not ideal. Mr. O'Connell talked about the added costs to install the gravity line, perform curb to curb repaving, etc. Mr. Simas asked if they could run gravity from the Highland Street entrance back to the proposed X-country easement; Mr. O'Connell informed the Planning Board that they

could do so and suggested as a compromise extending the sewer back to Highland Street from its current proposed terminus (within the subdivision) back out onto Highland Street, noting they could place a manhole with a lateral for future tie-ins in the roadway (Highland Street).

Planning Board agreed; the gravity line shall extend from Benson Road through the Highland Street intersection, extend through to the X-country easement, where it would then enter the subject property through to the subdivision roadway to service the proposed house lots and service the two (2) proposed frontage lots on Highland Street and to extend back to Highland Street, where a manhole and sewer lateral would be provided for abutting property (Chabot). Mr. O'Connell confirmed that they could make a provision for the existing house lot on Highland Street (Chabot) to tie-in to the gravity sewer line. Mr. Simas also confirmed with Mr. O'Connell that a future extension of the gravity line would be possible along Highland Street and that no properties along its proposed route; between Benson Road and the Highland Street subdivision entrance were past over (all existing house lots would be provided with a sewer lateral as required by the subdivision regulations); Mr. O'Connell confirmed.

Mr. Bechtholdt recapped stating, the sewer line proposed for the two (2) frontage lots (as shown on Drawing No. C-6.4) would be extended approximately 50 to 70-feet through to the Highland Street intersection where a manhole and service lateral would be provided. Mr. Murray asked if the manhole could be located in the center of Highland Street; Mr. O'Connell was agreeable and would defer to the Sewer Superintendent. Mr. Leonard and Mr. O'Connell, when asked by Mr. Simas if they were okay with these arrangements for the sewer line they both responded yes; the Board thanked them and appreciated the discussion.

Mr. O'Connell then reviewed with the Planning Board other revisions made to the definitive subdivision plan, including elimination of the open space lots; land previously designated has been incorporated into proposed house lots. Mr. Simas reviewed with Applicant/Engineer reasons for plan change; agreeing it was based on the understanding that the majority of the open space designated included wetland and resource areas, noting concerns of the town's ability to maintain and enforce potential encroachment if conveyed to the town. Incorporating proposed open space within the house lots will not compromise or negatively impact the resource areas, as the Conservation Commission will have jurisdictional authority as to what may and may not happen within the individual house lots within the proximity of the wetland areas, etc.

Mr. O'Connell noted as part of Conservation Commission review the plan has been revised specific to the wetland crossing; replacing the redi-rock retaining wall with a cast-in-place concrete wall (with a stamped textured wall). Mr. Bechtholdt asked if the Applicant/Engineer could provide examples of a cast-in-place concrete wall; Mr. Leonardo noted there is cast-in-place wall similar to what they are proposing in Uxbridge, MA on Rte 16 next to Lynches. Bechtholdt confirmed with Mr. O'Connell that the wall(s) would require separate review and approval (building permit) from the Building Inspector.

Mr. O'Connell indicated that the boulder retaining wall proposed along the subdivision roadway has been removed; to be replaced with a vegetated embankment of a 2:1 slope; noting regarding that took place for the sewer (now proposed to be gravity) allowed them to eliminate the need for a retaining wall along the roadway, noting it worked out well. Mr. Bechtholdt confirmed with Mr. O'Connell that a guardrail would be installed along the roadway. Mr. Simas asked if the slope would include rip-rap; Mr. O'Connell indicated no rip-rap just grass and other vegetation. Mr. Leonardo also noted that the access to the drainage pond

will be via the X-country easement from Highland Street, which will be a much easier route for the maintenance of the stormwater basin.

The Planning Board reviewed Safety Committee recommendations (meeting of March 19, 2014) concerning waiver requests. Mr. O'Connell noted the Fire Chief expressed concerns with the proposed street name of Valerie Anne Drive, as Valerie sounds too similar to Valley (Valley Parkway) and may cause confusion from a safety standpoint, as such Mr. O'Connell indicated the subdivision name is now proposed to be Windstone Drive which will need to be approved by the Police Chief and Fire Chief.

Mr. O'Connell reviewed with the Planning Board proposed curb-to-curb repaving of Benson Road, Highland Street intersection and portions of Highland Street; noting they are proposing to repave the areas where they disturb the roadway for sewer and other infrastructure installations. Mr. O'Connell explained curb-to-curb repaving would be more like edge-to-edge in this situation as there is no existing curbing; rather than repaving the trench (patching) they will perform a full-width repaving of the disturbed areas (if the roadway is 20-feet the roadway will be repaved 20-feet). Mr. Bechtholdt inquired on the timing of performing the off-site repaving; Mr. O'Connell indicated they may utilize two construction crews (one on-site and the other off-site) suggesting repaving would be completed once the sewer line is extended, finish with the off-site as soon as possible.

Mr. Bechtholdt asked Mr. O'Connell to review with the Board the addresses of those to receive sewer laterals; Mr. O'Connell listed property address, noting same to be included on the definitive plan set. Mr. O'Connell indicated all properties along the route of the sewer service will receive laterals as required by the town. Mr. O'Connell explained the laterals will be provided to the property line; the homeowners would need to obtain the connections with the town on their own.

Planning Board reviewed with the Applicant/Engineer waiver requests, agreeing to allow for the following: §222-9 C (14) a: Waive requirement to provide two (2) benchmarks on each Profile Sheet prior to plan endorsement; during construction, vertical and horizontal survey control markers shall be furnished; §222-9 D(9) b: Waive requirement to perform test pits, borings or soundings along the centerline of each street; test pits, borings and/or soundings shall be performed as noted herein; §222-10 B (3): Waive requirement for the projection of the right-of-way to adjoin property; as noted herein subdivision shall terminate in a cul-de-sac, future provisions for street extension shall not be required; §222-10 D (1): Waive requirement for 4-foot grass strip; grass strip shall be reduced to 2½-feet as shown on the approved definitive subdivision plan; street trees shall be located outside the right-of-way within a 10-foot wide "sidewalk and landscaping easement", as shown on the approved definitive plan; §222-10 E: Prior to Planning Board endorsement the approved street name shall be included on the approved definitive subdivision plan; §222-13: Waive requirement to show fire alarm system; fire alarm boxes shall not be required as per the Northbridge Fire Chief; §222-27 A: Allow sloped granite curbing along the entire length of the subdivision roadway, with vertical granite curbing at the wetland crossing, rounding at intersection, headers and transitions at each catch basin, as shown on the approved definitive plan; Table II, Standards for cul-de-sac: Allow reduction of landscaped island to increase travel lane (40-foot radius), as shown on the approved definitive plan; §222-10 D (1) -Table II: Waive requirement of dead-end not to exceed 500 feet unless water system is looped; and §222-10 D (1) -Table I: Allow sloped granite curbing at center of cul-de-sac island, as shown on the approved definitive plan.

The Planning Board reviewed with the Applicant/Engineer request to waive the landscape island; Mr. Murray indicated the Fire Chief is in support of eliminating the island; Mr. Bechtholdt also informed the Board that the DPW Director has also voiced his support in removing the islands within the cul-de-sac. Mr. Murray and Ms. Dolber were agreeable to waiving this requirement; Ms. Gaudette, Mr. Simas and Mr. Key preferred allowing for a smaller island with sloped-granite curbing over eliminating the landscaped island.

Mr. Bechtholdt asked Mr. O'Connell if they had anything else to present and if they were awaiting receipt of additional input besides the sewer analysis. Mr. O'Connell suggested they were in pretty good shape; indicating scheduled to meet with the Conservation Commission at its next meeting where he does not anticipate any problems and hope to issue the revised plans within the next few days to the various municipal departments and others for follow-up review and comment.

Mr. Simas asked the Board members if they had any additional comments or questions before he solicited comment from the public in attendance; having none the Board then considered continuing the public hearing to May 13, 2014. The Planning Board directed the Town Planner to prepare a set of draft conditions to be reviewed at its next meeting.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Dolber) the Planning Board voted (5-0) to continue the public hearing for Leonardo Estates to Tuesday, May 13, 2013 at 7:05PM.

V. 77-79 UNION STREET –CONTINUED PUBLIC MEETING

Preliminary Subdivision (AP 24 / Parcel 22)

Mr. Bechtholdt noted the following documentation was provided in the Planning Board packets: memorandum dated April 10, 2014 from Community Planning & Development, copy of the meeting notes of the Technical Review meeting (of March 12 2014), Safety Committee meeting minutes (draft) for March 20, 2014, and a draft Certificate of Action for the preliminary plan prepared by Community Planning & Development. The Planning Board briefly reviewed Planning memorandum dated April 10, 2014; including Retreat lot option. Mr. Bechtholdt noted he had provided same to Mr. Callahan and suggested the Board review with Mr. Callahan the draft.

Mr. Simas welcomed Tim Callahan, HAWK Engineering, Inc. on behalf of the Owner/Applicant (John & Nancy Gigarjian). Mr. Callahan explained to the Planning Board that he was hired by Guarantee Builders to work a subdivision for the property owners (John & Nancy Gigarjian); Mr. Callahan indicated the first time he met the property owners was at the first Planning Board meeting; Guarantee Builders has provided a subsequent contract to Gigarjians to provide deep hole tests and wetland flagging of the site; the contract has yet to be signed, suggesting he is caught in the middle.

Mr. Callahan explained he being told by Guarantee Builders to not do anything until the contract is signed; the Gigarjians he has not spoken to because he works for Guarantee Builders; admittedly he noted he has gotten himself into a mess in which he needs to extricate himself from one way or another. Mr. Callahan suggested Guarantee Builders and the Gigarjians will need to work out some sort of agreement to determine what they want to do next. Guarantee Builders through Mr. Callahan asked for an extension until the next meeting. Mr. Bechtholdt explained the applicant is not Guarantee Builders, it's the property owners (John and Nancy Gigarjian), noting the application is for a preliminary review, suggesting the Planning Board has done its preliminary review. Mr. Bechtholdt, noting the presence of abutters attending

the meeting suggested that the Planning Board take additional input from the public and Mr. Callahan at this time, after which if the Planning Board wants to continue the preliminary review they may choose to do so or they may conclude and review draft prepared this evening. Mr. Bechtholdt noted he did not see the need to extend the review, noting the arrangements between the property homeowner and others will need to be straighten-out at the definitive level but not necessarily at a preliminary level. Mr. Bechtholdt reminded the Board that the Gigarjians submitted the preliminary plan; signed as the applicant. Mr. Bechtholdt was not aware of Guarantee Builders involvement until Mr. Callahan informed the Board.

Mr. Simas asked if they Applicant wished to proceed; Mr. Callahan noted again that Guarantee Builders had submitted a contract to the Gigarjians to sign; agreeing with Mr. Bechtholdt that he is here representing the Gigarjians who submitted preliminary plans, noting he has answers to some of the questions raised, where others will need to be addressed prior to definitive process.

Mr. Bechtholdt reviewed with the Board the purpose of submitting a preliminary plan in this instance was to gain an understanding of what may be required of the town for the filing of a definitive subdivision plan for this particular property; noting a preliminary is not required; a preliminary filing helps anticipate what may be required for infrastructure improvements, identify abutter concerns, etc.

Mr. Simas suggested given the fact that residents were in attendance to offer input the Board should solicit additional comments from those in attendance. Mr. Simas also asked Mr. Callahan if he wished to answer any questions to which Mr. Callahan replied yes. Mr. Callahan noted a few of the issues that came up during the preliminary review was the possibility of a wetland resource area; to be reviewed and determined prior to the filing of a definitive.

Mr. Callahan indicated that the Conservation Commission through a letter indicated they will require a filing as part of the definitive subdivision application. Mr. Callahan suggested in all likelihood the proposed drainage basin will be relocated from Lot 9 to Lot 8 (proximity of). Mr. Callahan also indicated they will forego the 12% roadway slope and will design the roadway to meet the allowable slope of up to 9% per the subdivision regulations. Mr. Callahan suggested they will also look to address the 90°-curve on Union Street as best they can as part of the definitive; noting they cannot move the roadway but may be able to improve alignment within the right-of-way; better turning radius.

Mr. Simas sought comments and questions from the Board, having none the Planning Board opened up comments for the public in attendance.

Denis Davieau (53 Union Street) questioned how the drainage pond would work and if it could be located within a house lot. Mr. Bechtholdt explained that a drainage basin may be cited on a house lot within a drainage easement; if it is discharging into a wetland then the pre- and post-construction would need to be equal; that is they would not be allowed to increase the amount of stormwater to the wetland area (as part of the definitive review this requirement would be reviewed by the town's consulting engineer to confirm drainage calculations presented by the Applicant/Engineer). Mr. Davieau expressed his doubt and concern with meeting pre-construction conditions; would like to see that design plan, does not want excess water (mosquitoes, etc), would like his backyard and driveway to dry up sometime. Mr. Simas reviewed with the abutters the preliminary process, noting abutters will have an opportunity to review and provide comment

specific to proposed construction plans at the definitive subdivision review level, a plan that shows how they are not going to exceed the pre-development run-off, etc.

Scott Barnes (36 Cedar Street) reviewed once again concerns with proximity of home and existing well (40-feet deep) concerned with blasting, landscaping fertilizing, etc. Mr. Barnes inquired about a do not disturb buffer; the Board reviewed with Mr. Barnes the limited restrictions the Planning Board can place on subdivision lots (buffers), noting unfortunately not something the Board has the authority to impose or enforce for a by-right subdivision. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested the developer could (on its own) place a restriction on Deed(s) that could limit the amount of clearing within a given lot but not something the town (Planning Board) would have any jurisdiction or influence on. The Board briefly discussed blasting and the requirements to perform a pre-blast survey, noting blasting permits are issued through the Fire Department. Mr. Simas suggested Mr. Barnes may want to perform a water quality and flow rate test prior to any blasting to obtain a baseline. Mr. Bechtholdt noted that would be something done outside the Planning Board, not something the Board has oversight on. Mr. Callahan inquired about the quality and flow rates today. Mr. Barnes indicated that he has had his well tested twice since they purchased the housing, noting they were very good. Mr. Callahan asked if Mr. Barnes would be interested in connecting to town water as part of subdivision development; Mr. Barnes noted he would be curious and open to the idea of having town water provided.

Linda Lermond (63 Union Street) expressed concerns with the existing high groundwater, noting the last storm she had to pump water out of her basement; concerned with the amount of blasting, will it result in a better or worse situation; adding removal of trees will also impact the current water flows. Mr. Bechtholdt asked Mr. Callahan if there was an alternative to blasting; Mr. Callahan suggested there would be no alternative to blasting; however indicated controlled blasting performed today is less disruptive than the past. Mr. Bechtholdt asked what would happen if they blasted and exposed a vein (groundwater) how they would control that? Mr. Callahan explained that the water today is surface water that soaks down to the bedrock level where it then follows the bedrock and flows to the lowest point; with the increase in the drainage control on the subdivision they will capture, control and detain that water.

Mr. Bechtholdt asked Mr. Callahan if he had any idea where the water may be coming from; Mr. Callahan suggested it could be coming from the school fields but was not sure. Mr. Murray explained the upper fields at the High School have an extensive drainage system for all the fields which is directed back towards the wetlands near the high school.

Mr. Davieau explained once it rains the whole neighborhood can be underwater; it's a low point and a concern when we start talking about adding more houses, etc. Mr. Bechtholdt noted as part of a definitive filing they may need to submit a comprehensive hydrological study of the area, soil testing, etc. in much more detail than a two (2) sheet plan for the preliminary.

Linda Lermond reiterated her earlier concerns of the sharp-curve on Union Street; questioning how they would be able to improve alignment (widen roadway) without taking land from homeowners; Mr. Callahan acknowledged the curve as a problem and their intension would be to widen the roadway within the existing layout of the roadway. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested as part of the definitive filing the right-of-way of Union Street be stakeout in the field so the Planning Board, abutters and others can see the limits of the right-of-way to help determine what the best course of action would be to address concerns. Mr. Simas

suggested the Board may be asked to balance abutters priorities; do we leave the curve there which may elevate a known safety concern or do we require the roadway to be widen which will result in the roadway to encroach upon existing homes, something that will be discussed and reviewed by the Planning Board as well as the Safety Committee and others.

Ms. Lermond suggested the water issues have been evident long before the High School or the upper fields were built. Mr. Simas noted this is not an uncommon conversation for this area, there have been other conversations with residents with the fields, etc; there has been a lot of dialogue and investigation regarding the water situation there; the reality is you got a whole lot of land draining to a very finite area that is pool table flat; from this area to the Blackstone River it is basically flat so when water comes down off the hills (higher points) it sits. It seems it has always been that way; was an issue before the school was built and an issue that still exists; we have heard from folks that tell us they get flooding in your basements now. Ms. Lermond agreed however noted deforesting the land will increase the water run-off; Mr. Callahan indicated they do not intend to clear-cut the land. Mr. Simas added they will not be allowed to increase the water run-off onto private property.

Mr. Simas sought additional input and comment from the public in attendance, having none the Board reviewed with Mr. Callahan the draft prepared by the Town Planner. Mr. Bechtholdt reviewed the draft with the Planning Board, indicating a number of the items listed are considered boilerplate conditions, noting specific items such as 12% versus 9% roadway slope was included as the grade of the roadway would be a majority aspect of the subdivision design, as well as other items such as roadway geometry, groundwater concerns, etc.

Mr. Simas asked Board members if they had any additional questions or comments and then solicited input from the public in attendance; having none the Planning Board upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Dolber) voted to close the public meeting.

Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Gaudette) the Planning Board voted (4-0-1 [Key abstained]) to accept WITH CONDITIONS the filing of John & Nancy Gigarjian (77-79 Union Street) for preliminary plan showing up to eight (8) single-family house lots to be serviced by public water and municipal sanitary sewer.

Conditions of Acceptance include: Submittal of a preliminary plan enables the subdivider, the Planning Board, municipal departments and owners of property abutting the proposed subdivision to discuss and clarify potential concerns/requirements before a Definitive Subdivision Plan is prepared; Filing of a preliminary plan does not entitle the plan to recording at the Registry of Deeds nor secure approval of a Definitive Subdivision plan. Submittal of a preliminary plan, followed within seven months by a Definitive Plan, “freezes” the zoning in effect with regard to land shown on the plan for a period of eight (8) years from the date of the endorsement of Definitive Plan; Definitive subdivision plan shall be filed and submitted pursuant to Section 222-9 [Definitive plan] and as otherwise required in the Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Approval of a definitive plan may be subject but not limited to the Planning Board and Conservation Commission; Proposed house lots shown on a Definitive Plan shall conform to all the requirements of the Northbridge Zoning Bylaw including lot area, frontage, width, depth, and lot line front; reference is made to Town of Northbridge Zoning Bylaw Chapter 173 –Table of Area Regulations Section 173-19; Subject property contains an existing two-family dwelling, the existing residence (with detached

garage) is proposed to remain; the proposed subdivision would locate the existing two-family (21,416 square-feet with ± 145 -feet of frontage) on a corner lot where the minimum street yard and depth shall be the same as the front yard depths (see Note 2 of Table of Area Regulations). A variance of the Zoning Board appears to be required from the setback requirements for a corner lot. Owner/Applicant is directed to review setback requirements with the Inspector of Buildings for the proposed new lot (77-79 Union Street), as well as seek a determination whether or not a Special Permit would be required from the Zoning Board for altering the lot size/frontage of Assessor Map 24 Parcel 22 (existing lot), where the current Two-family dwelling may not be permitted by special permit (i.e. pre-existing non-conforming); Preliminary Plan of Land (77-79 Union Street) includes a bearing reference to Plan Book 295 Plan 35; which appears to be an Approval Not Required plan dated November 01, 1965 for property in the Town of Bolton, Mass; according to Worcester Registry of Deeds it appears the plan reference should read Plan Book 259 Plan 35. The metes and bounds shown on the Preliminary Plan differ (slightly) from the bearing reference plan (BK259/PG35); Preliminary plan shows a single-access roadway with a proposed 40-foot right-of-way terminating in a cul-de-sac; the roadway is planned to extend approximately 570-feet in length. Pursuant to Table II –Standards for Cul-de-sacs of the Subdivision Rules & Regulations, the maximum length shall be 500-feet unless the water system is looped or, in the opinion of the Planning Board, a greater length is necessitated by topography or local conditions. Prior to filing a Definitive Subdivision Plan the Owner/Applicant shall solicit comment and recommendations from the Department of Public Works and the Whitinsville Water Company regarding the proposed street length and the looping the water system; Proposed roadway may be classified as a minor street pursuant to Local Street Hierarchy -Table I [Street Design Standards] of the Subdivision Rules & Regulations; Preliminary Subdivision Plan shows two (2) proposed roadway profiles. Profile #1 includes slope/grade of 3.0% at the entrance and increases to 9% (from approximately Station 1+75 through Station 4+55) a length of ± 300 -feet transitioning to a slope/grade of 2.4% to its terminus (more or less). Road profile #2 includes slope/grade of 3% at entrance and increases to 12% (from approximately Station 1+75 through Station 4+50) a length of ± 280 –feet transitioning to 4% and 2.8% to its terminus (more or less). Pursuant to Table I –Street Design Standards the maximum grade of roadway is 7%; plus up to 2% for a distance not to exceed 300-feet; Pursuant to Section 222-10 B [Streets] -All streets in the subdivision shall be designed so that, in the opinion of the Planning Board, they will provide safe vehicular traffic and an attractive street layout in order to obtain the maximum safety and amenity for future residents of the subdivision, and they shall be in accord with the rules and regulations of the Board of Selectmen and the Director of Public Works; Definitive subdivision plan shall be prepared showing percolation test (perc test) and test pit locations for the subdivision roadway, drainage systems as described in Section 222-9 D of the Subdivision Rules & Regulations; An Environmental and Community Impact Statement (ECIS) may be required for this proposed residential development. Pursuant to Section 222-9 D (6) [Environmental and community impact statement], an environmental and community impact statement may be required for residential developments of 20 lots or more and all nonresidential subdivisions and as otherwise required by the Board. The ECIS shall clearly and methodically assess the relationship of the proposed development to the natural and man-made environment of Northbridge. Copies of the ECIS shall be filed with the Office of the Town Clerk with the Definitive Subdivision plan submittal. The ECIS shall include; Natural environment, Man-made environment, Public services, Aesthetics, and Planning as prescribed in the Subdivision Rules & Regulations of Northbridge; Pursuant to Section 222-10 C (2) [Adequate access from public way] -Where the street system within a subdivision does not connect with or have, in the opinion of the Board, adequate access from an existing public way, the Board may require as a condition of approval of a plan that such adequate access be provided by the subdivider and/or that the subdivider make physical improvements to and within

such a way of access, in accord with these regulations, from a street within the subdivision to an existing public way; As part of a Definitive Subdivision filing, Applicant/Engineer shall stake out the limits of the right-of-way of Union Street from the proposed subdivision entrance to Providence Road, a distance of approximately 250-feet. During the definitive review the Planning Board and Safety Committee may conduct site visit(s) to consider adequacy of public way pursuant to the Northbridge Subdivision Rules & Regulations; Pursuant to Section 222-10 C (3) [Adequate access from public way] -Where the physical condition of pavement width of a public way from which a subdivision has its access is considered by the Board to be inadequate to carry the traffic expected to be generated by such subdivision, the Board may require that the subdivider dedicate a strip of land for the purpose of widening the abutting public way to a width at least commensurate with that required within the subdivision and to make physical improvements to and within the subdivision. Any such dedication of land for the public way and any such work performed within such public way shall be made only with permission of the governmental agency having jurisdiction over such way, and all costs of such widening or construction shall be borne by the subdivider; Pursuant to Section 222-10 E [Street names] -To provide names in keeping with the character of the town, street names shall be subject to the approval of the Planning Board. Proposed street names shall not duplicate nor bear phonetic resemblance to the name of the existing public ways, paper streets or any other way qualified to afford frontage under MGL C. 41, § 81-L. A proposed street, which is in alignment with an existing street, shall bear the same name as the existing street. Street names must be approved by the Police Chief and Fire Chief; Storm drainage system shall be designed and constructed pursuant to Section 222-11 [Storm drainage] of the Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Drainage shall be designed to prevent impacts of downstream flooding. The stormwater system must comply will all applicable stormwater management regulations. Definitive plans shall include provisions for drainage that comply with all local and applicable Stormwater Management Regulations of the Department of Environmental Protection; Pursuant to Section 222-11 H [Storm drainage] -Lots shall be prepared and graded in such a manner that development of one shall not cause detrimental drainage on another; if provision is necessary to carry drainage to or across a lot, an easement or drainage right-of-way of adequate width and proper side slope shall be provided. The Planning Board may require that the applicant provide evidence as to any lot or lots that adequate provision has been made for the proper drainage of surface and underground waters from such lot or lots. As noted in the Preliminary Checklist; drainage ponds do not appear to be located adjacent to natural waterways; Pursuant to Section 222-12 [Utilities] –Required utilities include water, sewer, storm drainage system, telephone, electricity, gas, streetlights, fire alarm systems and cable television; unless otherwise specified by the Planning Board. The applicant shall submit evidence of complete financial arrangements with private utility companies prior to approval. All utilities shall be placed underground at the time of initial construction. The Planning Board may permit transformers, switches and other such equipment to be placed on the ground in approved locations, screened from view with evergreen shrubbery; Pursuant to Section 222-12.1 [Sewerage] –if a public sewerage system is located within 1,000 feet of a subdivision of single-family and it has been determined by engineering analysis there is sufficient excess capacity in the existing downstream collection system, including receiving pumping stations to accept the additional flow, all lots in the subdivision shall be connected to the public sewerage system by the developer. A sewer capacity analysis as directed by the Director of Public Works shall be prepared and submitted to the Planning Board as part of a definitive plan application filing; As discussed during the preliminary subdivision review the fire alarm boxes, as required pursuant to Section 222-13 [Fire alarm systems] may be waived by the Planning Board upon receipt of communication from the Northbridge Fire Department recommending same; Streetlights shall be required to be installed by the Owner/Applicant; locations to be reviewed and approved by the Northbridge Safety Committee pursuant

to the Board of Selectmen Streetlight Policy; Pursuant to Section 222-16 [Protection of natural features] – Due regard shall be shown for all natural features, such as large trees, wooded areas, watercourses, scenic points, historic spots and similar community assets, which, if preserved will add attractiveness and value to the subdivision. Outside of street rights-of-way, no trees over 15 feet inches in caliper, measured at four feet above the existing grade, shall be removed or have the grade level surrounding the trunk altered by more than six inches without the approval of the Planning Board after its consultation with the Conservation Commission; As part of a Definitive Subdivision approval, the Planning Board may require the plan to show a park or parks, suitably located for active and/or passive recreation purposes. The park or parks shall not be unreasonable in area relation to the land being subdivided and to the prospective uses of the land. The Board may, by appropriate endorsement on the plan, require that no building be erected on such park or parks without its approval for a period of three years. Each area reserved for such purpose shall be suitable area, dimensions, topography and natural character for the recreational purposes. The area or areas shall be so located as to serve adequately all parts of the subdivision. The Board may require that the area or areas reserved shall be located and laid out so as to be used in conjunction with similar areas of adjoining subdivisions or of probable subdivisions. The total amount of area to be reserved for park and/or playground purposes shall be no less than 10% of the gross area of the subdivision. Any land so reserved shall be graded to dispose properly of surface water and shall be left for the purpose intended, as required by the Planning Board. The town shall have the right to acquire ownership of the same by gift or as provided in MGL C. 41, § 81-Q. As part of Definitive submittal plans shall be prepared to accommodate this provision; Pursuant to Section 222-17 [Bikeways, walkways and trails] -Public bikeways, pedestrian walkways or bridal paths may be required by the Planning Board to provide circulation or access to schools, playgrounds, parks, shopping, transportation, open space and/or community facilities or for such other reason as the Board may determine; Pursuant to Section 222-27 [Curbing] –Vertical granite curbing shall be provided along each side of the roadway throughout the subdivision and along the full perimeter of all islands as shown on the definitive plan. Granite curbing shall also be used around all median islands, around all turnaround islands, and as headers for all catch basins. Granite curbing shall be Type VA4 and conform MHD specification M9.04.0 and 9.04.1 and in accordance with the requirements of Curb, Curb Inlets, Curb Corners, and Edging (MHD Section 501). Curbing design is subject to approval from the Department of Public Works. Granite curbing shall be installed at intersections of subdivision streets and existing public ways as follows: the curbing shall extend along the full length of the curb radius and then extend beyond that point for a minimum of six feet. When curbed intersections involve one or more streets having grassed shoulders, the curbing shall be placed at the edge of the roadway, and the pavement on the street or streets with such shoulders shall be widened to the full width of the roadway (thus meeting the curb) within 50 feet of the intersection, tapering down to normal width within 75-feet thereof; Pursuant to Section 222-29 [Sidewalks] -Sidewalks shall be constructed on concrete (such as Portland Cement) conforming to MHD specification M4.02.00, and in accordance with the requirements of Sidewalks, Wheelchair Ramps and Driveways (MHD Section 701). The cross slope shall be 1/4 of an inch per foot of width to provide for proper drainage. Sidewalks shall also conform to the requirements of the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board; Pursuant to Section 222-35 [Waivers] –Strict compliance with the requirements of the Subdivision Rules & Regulations may be waived when, in the judgment of the Planning Board, such action is in the public interest and not consistent with the Subdivision Control Law. Any such waiver must be made in writing by the Planning Board as part of its approval; otherwise all requirements contained in the Northbridge Subdivision Rules & Regulations are deemed applicable; At the time of filing the Definitive Subdivision application and associated submission fees as described in Section 222-40 [Fees] shall be satisfied by the Owner/Applicant; Pursuant to Section 222-41 [Review and inspection

account] -In accordance with the MGL C. 44, § 53G, as added to by Chapter 593 of the Acts of 1989, a separate account known as the "Planning Board's Review and Inspection Account" shall be established to be used to offset costs of hiring outside consultants to assist in the review of the application and to pay for Professional inspections of construction work. The Planning Board may request that additional funds be deposited into this special account by the applicant according to §§ 222-39 and 222-40 of these regulations. Moneys may be expended from this account by the Planning Board without Town Meeting appropriation. Any excess amount attributable to a particular project, including accrued interest, will be repaid to the applicant at the conclusion of the project; Pursuant to Section 222-42 [Review and inspection fees] –At the time of Definitive Subdivision application, a deposit for engineering review and inspection fees shall be paid by the applicant to the town in such amount as is required by the Planning Board. Such initial deposit will be \$750 for a subdivision of five lots or less and \$250 per lot for a subdivision of six or more lots. Said deposit shall be replenished by the applicant as required by the Planning Board before the amount of expenses equals in value the amount of deposit. Any portion of the deposit, which is not used, will be returned to the applicant. In the event any review or inspection fees are deemed to be insufficient the applicant shall satisfy such within seven days. In the event the applicant fails to do so, the Board may cease all review and shall deny the application as presented; Applicant/Engineer shall comply with all applicable laws, by-laws, rules, regulations, and codes of the Town of Northbridge and Commonwealth of Massachusetts and shall obtain all the necessary permits and approvals; including but not limited to water/sewer, street excavation, and/or access to public-way permits; Applicant/Engineer shall review and consider design standards detailed in the Town Northbridge "Best Development Practices Guidebook" (December 2009) specific to Site planning; Landscape design; Stormwater management; and Erosion & Sediment controls; Subdivision roadway design shall confirm to MassDOT standard specifications and as otherwise required by the Northbridge Department of Public Works Highway Division. Water service and municipal sanitary sewer shall be designed to specifications as required by the Whitinsville Water Company and the Northbridge Department of Public Works Sewer Division; A Request of Determination of Applicability (RDA) shall be filed with the Conservation Commission prior to the filing of a Definitive Subdivision plan; reference is made to memorandum dated March 18, 2014 from the Northbridge Conservation Commission; The subject property, AP 24 Parcel 22 abuts town-owned land (Northbridge High School); during the definitive plan review the Applicant/Engineer shall review with the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen (Town Manager) potential access to the upper ball fields, if agreeable and determined to be advantageous an access/utility easements, etc. may be dedicated for the benefit of the Town of Northbridge; A Traffic Impact Report may be required at the time of submittal of the Definitive Subdivision plan. The following intersections/roadways shall be considered: Union Street & Providence Road (north); Union Street & Providence Road (south); Union Street & Union Lane; Union Street & Nolet Street; and Union Street & proposed subdivision roadway; Definitive Subdivision plan shall be prepared in consideration of the issues presented by the Planning Board, municipal departments and abutters in attendance at the March 25, 2014 and April 22, 2014 public meetings; including but not limited to Union Street pavement width; geometry of Union Street (S-curve); drainage; groundwater; protecting existing neighboring wells; ledge; cut & fills; tree removal; roadway profile; blasting; seasonal flooding issues; buffer areas; and extending public water to existing home on Cedar Street; and As an alternative to a definitive subdivision plan filing the Owner/Applicant may consider application for a retreat lot pursuant to Section 173-18.1 [Retreat lots] of the Town of Northbridge Zoning Bylaw; reference is made to Community Planning & Development memorandum dated April 10, 2014.

OLD/NEW BUSINESSApproval of Meeting Minutes –March 25, 2014

Mr. Murray reviewed with the Planning Board minor changes in the draft provided. *Upon motion duly made (Murray) and seconded (Dolber) the Planning Board voted (4-0-1 [Key abstained]) to ACCEPT the meeting minutes of March 25, 2014, as revised.*

Community Planning & Development –Quarterly Report (January-March 2014)

Mr. Bechtholdt provided the Planning Board members with a copy of the Community Planning & Development's Quarterly Report for January–March 2014.

2014 Spring Annual Town Meeting –Tuesday, May 06, 2014 (7:00PM)

Point of information –no discussion.

OSRP Update Committee Meeting –Tuesday, May 13, 2014 (6:00PM)

Point of information –no discussion.

Planning Board Reports & Recommendations (Art. 18 & Art. 19)

Mr. Simas indicated that he would present the Planning Board zoning amendment articles concerning Registered Marijuana Dispensaries at the 2014 Spring Annual Town Meeting; Board received copy of (draft) report and recommendations for zoning articles 18 & 19.

Camelot & Hemlock Estates –Update from J&F Marinella Dev

Mr. Bechtholdt provided the Planning Board with a copy of the construction schedule prepared by J&F Marinella Development dated April 22, 2014 for Hemlock Estates, noting the Board was to meet with Joseph Marinella at its meeting tonight to review the status of the Camelot Subdivision and the Hemlock Estates subdivision. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested Mr. Marinella appears to attend meeting when he needs something from the Board and does not attend otherwise; something to keep in mind. Mr. Bechtholdt noted however that Mr. Marinella was the only developer to provide the requested construction schedule thus far. As a result of the absence of Mr. Marinella the Board tabled its discussion to the next scheduled meeting.

Rebecca Road Stone Wall (Right-of-Way) –Status/Update

Mr. Bechtholdt provided the Planning Board with copy of response letter dated April 18, 2014 from Attorney David Doneski of Kopelman & Paige (Town Counsel) concerning letter dated February 24, 2014 from the Community Planning & Development office regarding a stone wall constructed within the right-of-way of a subdivision roadway; the Planning Board tabled its discussion to the next scheduled meeting.

Linwood Mill (Pedestrian Crosswalks) –Status/Update

Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that he spoke with Jeff Howland (JH Engineering Group, LLC) and the Director of Public Works, who agreed that a comprehensive traffic engineer study is not required for locating a pedestrian crosswalk. After confirming this with the DPW Director, Mr. Bechtholdt noted he spoke with Matt Mittelstadt of EA Fish Development who is willing to do the installation as required by the Planning Board. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested the next step would be for the Safety Committee to review the proposed location and make a recommendation to the Board of Selectmen, after the location is approved

EA Fish Development will install the pedestrian crosswalk with the necessary signage under the direction of the Director of Public Works. Mr. Bechtholdt hoped there was enough room to locate the crosswalk directly west of the driveway entrance on Linwood Avenue to satisfy ADA standards, etc (noting crosswalk cannot end in the driveway).

Green Meadow Court –Status/Update

Tabled –no discussion.

Farnum Circle –MGL Ch 41 Sec 81U

Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that the Planning office issued letter to the Owner/Developer of Farnum Circle informing them that they have 45-days, pursuant to Mass General Law to complete the subdivision; failure to do so may result in the town (Planning Board) calling in the performance bond. The status of this project will be discussed at the Planning Board meeting.

Planning Board Initiatives –Discussion

Mr. Bechtholdt reminded Board members that Mr. Simas, Chairman had asked the individual Board members to prepare a list of initiatives they would like to work on this year. Board members agreed to table this discussion.

House Bill No. 1859 -Zoning Act

By way of update Mr. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that House Bill (Zoning Act) recently came out of committee with some proposed changes; Mr. Bechtholdt offered to share with members copies to track the zoning act bill under consideration. Mr. Bechtholdt explained to Mr. Murray that he was not able to find any standalone provision or general law that would allow impact fees, adding as part of the comprehensive zoning act impact fees has been included.

Mail –Review

In addition to the mail listed (see attached) the Planning Board noted receipt of the following communications: Planning Board agenda for April 22, 2014 & May 13, 2104 (draft); Zoning Regulations on Heritage District; Table of Use Regulations - Heritage District; Draft Certificate of Approval for Solar Electric Generating Facility Site Plan Review on Lasell Rd (Northbridge) and Oakhurst Road (Sutton); Site Plan Review Checklist for Solar Electric Generating Facility Site Plan Review on Lasell Rd (Northbridge) and Oakhurst Road (Sutton); Letter dated December 17, 2013 to Town Clerk from Attorney General regarding FATM Articles 8, 9, & 10 on Large Scale Solar Photovoltaic Installations; Memo dated April 14, 2014 to Planning Board from Conservation Commission regarding Leonardo Estates gravity sewer line; Topographic Plan showing Leonardo Estates and the proposed sewer line; Memo dated April 10, 2014 to Planning Board & Hawk Consulting from Town Planner concerning 77-79 Union Street Preliminary Subdivision Plan; Technical Review Meeting Notes of March 19, 2014 prepared by Town Planner regarding Ground Mounted Solar Photovoltaic Facility and 77-79 Union Street; Draft Meeting Minutes of the Safety Committee Meeting on March 19, 2014 concerning Leonardo Estates Definitive Subdivision (Highland St), Ground-Mounted Solar Photovoltaic Facility (Oakhurst/Lasell Rd), 77-79 Union Street Preliminary Subdivision, & Linwood Avenue pedestrian crosswalk & Prairie Street streetlights; Draft Certificate of Action for 77-79 Union Street Preliminary Subdivision; Email dated April 9, 2014 to Town Planner from DPW Director regarding 77-79 Union Street Preliminary Plan; Email dated March 18, 2014 to Town Planner, DPW Sewer Superintendent & DPW Highway Superintendent from DPW Director concerning 77-79 Union Street; Draft Planning Board

Meeting Minutes of March 25, 2014; Memo dated April 4, 2014 / April 7, 2014 to Town Manager & Board of Selectmen from Town Planner concerning the Quarterly Report (January – March 2014) for the Community Planning & Development Office; 2014 Spring Annual Town Meeting Planning Board Zoning Amendment Articles; Letter dated March 18, 2014 to J & F Marinella from Town Planner regarding Camelot & Hemlock Estates Subdivisions; Letter dated February 24, 2014 to Kopelman & Paige from Town Planner regarding Subdivision Street Acceptance stone wall within right-of-way; Email dated April 16, 2014 to Fire Chief and DPW Director from Town Planner regarding Safety Committee meeting site visit to Linwood Ave pedestrian crosswalk at Linwood Mill; Letter dated April 14, 2014 to Michael Lambert from Town Planner regarding Farnum Circle; Letter dated April 14, 2014 to Tricia Lambert from Town Planner regarding Farnum Circle; Farnum Circle plans; Letter dated April 10, 2014 to Town Planner from JH Engineering concerning Farnum Circle Engineer's Construction Estimate; Letter dated November 6, 2012 to Town Planner from JH Engineering concerning Farnum Circle Engineer's Construction Estimate; Letter dated May 9, 2013 to Town Clerk from Town Planner regarding Farnum Circle Subdivision Modification; Letter dated June 13, 2013 to Town Clerk from Town Planner regarding Farnum Circle Definitive Subdivision Modification; General Laws Chapter 41, Section 81U Approval, Modification or Disapproval of plan by Board; Prerequisites for Decision; Memo dated April 7, 2014 to Developers of Camelot, Farnum Circle, Green Meadow Court, Hemlock Estates, Hillside Garden Estates, Presidential Farms and Shining Rock Golf Community from Town Planner concerning subdivision status reports / updates; Email dated April 10, 2014 to DPW Sewer Superintendent, JH Engineering, J & F Marinella, Planning Board from Town Planner regarding Hemlock Pump Station and Fir Hill Lane; Email dated April 10, 2014 to Town Planner and JH Engineering from DPW Sewer Superintendent concerning Hillside Garden Estates and 77-79 Union Street; Email dated April 10, 2014 to Town Planner and JH Engineering from DPW Sewer Superintendent regarding Presidential Farms; Email dated April 8, 2014 to Town Planner and Planning Board from CMRPC concerning CMRPC 2014 Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts; Email dated April 8, 2014 to Central Region Town Planners from CMRPC regarding Central Massachusetts Regional Housing Planning Advisory Committee Invitation; Email to Blackstone Heritage Corridor Friends from Blackstone River Coalition concerning Amendment #739 to the budget for \$500,000 for all five of the MA National Heritage Areas; Open Space & Recreation Plan Update Committee Agenda for April 22, 2014; Calendar of Planning Board Meeting Dates for 2014.

Other

Mr. Bechtholdt noted that CMRPC (Regional Planning Agency) is looking for individual interested in participating on its Central Massachusetts Housing Advisory Committee, if so he will let Trish Settles from CMRPC know. Mr. Bechtholdt advised the Board that the Town Hall Restoration Project was selected by Mass Historical Commission to receive one of this year's Preservation Awards; Board members and Mr. Bechtholdt expressed support and congratulations. Mr. Bechtholdt noted Jeff Howland (JH Engineering Group, LLC) continues to provide excellent reporting for the Planning Board review of subdivision and site plan developments; Board members agreed. Ms. Dolber informed the Planning Board members that she has decided not to seek re-election (May 2014). Mr. Simas and others thanked Ms. Dolber for her time on the Planning Board, stating she will be missed and welcomed back at any time. The Planning Board noted there will be an opening (vacancy) of the Planning Board after the Town Elections of May 20, 2014. Mr. Key indicated that he failed to submit his intensions for re-election to the Town Clerk in time to appear on the ballot; members suggested he could do a write-in campaign. The next meeting of the Planning Board is scheduled for May 13, 2014.

Adjournment

Having no additional business the Planning Board adjourned its meeting of Tuesday, April 22, 2014 at or about 9:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by Planning Board –

R. Gary Bechtholdt II
Town Planner

Cc: Town Clerk