



NORTHBRIDGE PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

Tuesday, March 10, 2015

Recognizing the presence of a quorum Chairman George Murray called the meeting to order at or about 7:00PM with Mark Key, Brian Massey and Pamela Ferrara in attendance. R. Gary Bechtholdt II, Town Planner and Cindy Key, Associate member were also present. Barbara Gaudette absent.

The following members of the public were in attendance: Michael Wilkes; John Laney; Denis O'Brien; Robert Laflamme; Carol H. Brower; Brett M. Buma; Janet Jassmond; James Berkowitz; Whitney Hall; W. Robert Knapik; Nelson Widell; Tom Andrikowich; Cathy Andrikowich; Norman Pelletier; & Paul Hutnak.

I. CITIZENS FORUM

None

II. FORM A

None

III. DOUGLAS ROAD (Adjacent to 279 Douglas Rd) –CONT. PUBLIC MEETING

Food Composting Facility -§173-49.1 -Site Plan Review

Chairman Murray opened the continued public meeting for Site Plan Review for the proposed composting facility, etc. to be sited on subject property on Douglas Road. Mr. Murray noted receipt of response letter dated March 09, 2015 from the Law Office of W. Robert Knapik, PC and revised site development plans prepared by Andrews Survey & Engineering, Inc.,

Mr. Murray explained to those in attendance that the Planning Board will first take input from the Applicant/Engineer followed by initial comment and questions from the Board and then seek additional comments from the general public. Mr. Murray reminded everyone to be respectful and to raise their hands to be called upon, after which state their name and address before addressing the Board.

Robert Knapik on behalf of the Applicant, introduced Paul Hutnak (Site Engineer) of Andrews Survey & Engineering, Inc.; Whitney Hall (Solid Waste Engineer) of Structure Engineering; Nelson Widell (Solid Waste & Composting Consultant); and James Berkowitz (Operator).

Mr. Knapik explained that the site plan has been designed and presented to address any potential adverse impacts on abutters with regard to noise and odor, noting he feels the facility is well designed to completely mitigate any potential adverse effect of noise or odor. Mr. Knapik provided a brief summary of the first meeting (February 10 2015) concerning the site plan modification application, noting response to correspondence received has been addressed in a comprehensive and efficient manner in letter dated March 09, 2015, as well as reflected on the Revised Site Plan (3/3/15) prepared by Andrews Survey & Engineering, Inc. Mr. Hutnak indicated they are here to answer any remaining questions or concerns and he believes they have addressed all concerns raised and respectfully requests the Board close the public meeting afterwards and approve the project.

Mr. Murray stated that he felt there may still be a number of questions out there and that the Board needs to be thorough before moving on with the application, suggesting he will see how the discussions progress and what additional information may be necessary.

Paul Hutnak, PE (Andres Survey & Engineering, Inc.) briefed the Planning Board on changes to the Revised Site Plan (3/3/2015). Mr. Hutnak reviewed with the Planning Board site activity currently underway and permitted as part of the expansion project for the abutting property (WGM glass fabrication) noting the westerly side of the property will be graded to transition with the grades and slope of the new driveway for the abutter. Mr. Hutnak pointed out location of paved driveways within their site, reviewed internal traffic circulation, location of recycling center, snow storage area, placement of directional signage (alerting visitors to recycling center and the composting facility restricted access), proposed water line and electrical service, wall-pack lighting on the building (22-watt LED bulbs; 10-foot height with full cut-offs /security lighting), and an exterior woodchip storage area towards the back of the property.

Whitney Hall briefed the Planning Board on changes to the building plans based upon comments received; revised plans showed in greater detail additional components and specifics. Mr. Hall reviewed with the Planning Board leachate and how the leachate would be controlled from two different locations. Mr. Hall explained that leachate will be generated in the receiving building, noting that when the food waste is first dumped off a truck it waste will have high percentage of moisture in it. The food waste will be combined with woodchips to bring the moisture content down for composting; but when it's first dumped in the building it will have some liquid. Mr. Hall explained that the loading building is designed to have a drain in the center of the floor which will connect to a tight tank (leachate tank). The liquids that go into the tank, which Mr. Hall did not anticipate to be too much, would be reintroduced into the drum as part of the composting process or if there is too much of liquid it would then have to be hauled offsite to a wastewater treatment plant.

Mr. Hall explained under normal conditions the bio-filter allows airflow and tends to dry out the woodchips which cover the bio-filter, so you normally add water to it. Mr. Hall noted however during heavy rain the woodchip material can only absorb so much; in such cases the excess would leach to another drain at the bottom layer to the leachate tank. The bottom layer is an asphalt surface that slopes to two (2) drains at the ends of the bio-filter; a 4-inch drain connects to the leachate tank. The discharge building does not have a connection to the leachate tank; material coming out of the drum has a much lower moisture content.

Mr. Hall reviewed building layout plan (revised) suggesting the irrigation for the bio-filter was omitted from the previous plan, noting the irrigation system would be set on a timer to keep the woodchips wet which is essential for proper odor controls. Mr. Hall then reviewed the blower fans, noting three (3) in total. One in the receiving building (loading building) would be designed to take 4 air exchanges per hour in the building (4000 cfm blower). A second fan would be located in the discharge building, noting again designed to take 4 air exchanges per hour (1700 cfm blower) connect to the bio-filter. The third fan or smaller blower would be drawn through the rotary drum to draw air through the drum; essential to keep air moving to maintain the aerobic conditions for the material in processing.

Mr. Hall clarified that the project needs a General Permit from DEP and not a RCC permit (Recycling, Composting or Conversion Operation Permit, Modification or Renewal).

Chairman Murray sought questions from the Planning Board before taking additional input from the public.

Mark Key asked how the moisture in the bio-filter was regulated. Mr. Hall indicated it would be monitored by sight and by feel. Mr. Key inquired about what happens with material received (from haulers) that cannot

go into the composter (plastics, etc.). Mr. Hall suggested the amount would likely be negligible and would go into a garbage bag and disposed of as garbage. Mr. Key asked for additional clarification as to how the food waste is to be delivered to the facility; in a tote that's sealed, in a barrel that's loaded into a truck, is it dumped into a big tank, etc. Mr. Hall suggested it could be in a sealed truck, a packer-truck or a top load noting there are a number of different types of trucks that do it. Mr. Key asked what they anticipate the trucks to be. Mr. Berkowitz (the Operator) explained that there are a variety of trucks, however the two main types of trucks that they would use would be a completely sealed truck or a self-contained compactor made just for food. Mr. Key commented that it seemed the trucks used may depend on the size of the source where the food waste is generated; Mr. Berkowitz agreed.

Mr. Key asked what was in the sample (compost) provided at the last meeting; Mr. Berkowitz explained the sample was the food waste and wood chip product after 5-days in the rotor drum.

Mr. Murray inquired about the site plan layout asking the Applicant/Engineer to clarify and better define the recycling area, parking and unloading areas for recycling. Mr. Murray questioned the size and how the circulation within the site is proposed to work where both public access (to recycling center) and delivery of food waste will share one entrance & exit. Mr. Hutnak indicated the recycling area would be approximately 50-feet by 50-feet in area where bins will be located for the public to pull in and discard there recyclables at the bins. Mr. Hutnak reviewed turning movements of the food waste trucks and noted the distances between the buildings and the designated recycling center. Mr. Hutnak suggested with only 3 vehicle trips per day (composting facility) conflicts with the recycling center will be unlikely.

R. Gary Bechtholdt II, Town Planner asked if the location of the recycle bins (and any sheds) could be better defined on the site plan. Mr. Bechtholdt suggested if the recycle center is to be open year-round could the area currently defined on the plan as snow storage area also be utilized during the warmer months for recyclables, then this too should be noted on the plan, if needed. Mr. Berkowitz indicated the recycling center would be available year-round, noting they would remove snow and would not necessarily stockpile the snow on site.

Mr. Murray asked about the width of the driveway and if the sightlines at the location were sufficient along Douglas Road. Mr. Hutnak noted the driveway is 24-feet and confirmed the sightlines are favorable. Mr. Murray requested that the proposed lockable-gate be shown on the plan; Mr. Bechtholdt requested a Knox-Box or similar device be installed for the Fire Department in case of emergency after hours. Mr. Hutnak agreed.

Mr. Murray asked the Applicant/Engineer to review with the Planning Board proposed landscaping and screening. Mr. Hutnak explained there is currently fencing along entire frontage along with natural vegetation and an old stone wall, suggesting with the elevation change from the roadway the property is appropriately screened. Mr. Hutnak noted along the rear of the property there is also natural vegetation that remains (approximately 200-feet of wooded area) between the subject property and any abutting property to the back. Mr. Hutnak suggested there really is not a place to plant a tree on the site but in terms of buffering he feels they have that covered.

Mr. Murray inquired about traffic circulation for delivery trucks (food waste) noting the location of the weigh station (existing scale on adjacent Berkowitz Trucking) and how the trucks would maneuver between the

sites. Mr. Murray asked if the door(s) to the loading building would be closed when the material is dumped. Mr. Berkowitz explained that the buildings have been designed to fit the entire truck inside, noting the door(s) will be closed. In regards to weighing the food waste (location of the scale) Mr. Berkowitz explained the haulers could use either driveways on Douglas Road weigh it when their truck coming in and then after dumping before leaving the property. Mr. Berkowitz noted they recently purchased a new scale however have not paid to have it installed yet; location will improve site circulation. Mr. Murray asked where the new scale would be sited on the property. Mr. Berkowitz indicated vehicle traffic for Berkowitz Trucking will remain unchanged; as of now will not utilize new driveway.

Mr. Murray expressed concerns with not necessarily the amount of traffic but the overall circulation and potential mixing of traffic between Berkowitz Trucking, the composting facility and the recycling center; questioning how residents (public) would access the non-recyclable (white goods, etc.) drop off from the recycle center, etc. Mr. Berkowitz indicated there is signage in place to direct those dropping off white goods at the Berkowitz site, noting additional signage could be installed at the recycling center as well.

Mr. Bechtholdt asked if the vehicles for food composting would be owned by Berkowitz Trucking or would they be a third-party hauler; Mr. Berkowitz indicated they will use third party haulers for food waste deliveries but would utilize their own trucks for offsite transport of the finished compost.

Mr. Murray inquired about the (Massachusetts) DEP -Department of Environmental Protection approval process and the issuance of a General Permit. Mr. Murray asked if the Applicant/Operator have met with DEP since the last Planning Board meeting. Mr. Hall indicated that they met with MA DEP earlier in the day to review the project and to confirm what additional information, if any needs to be submitted for the General Permit. Mr. Hall agreed to provide the Planning Board with copies of the application, etc.

Brian Massey sought clarification on staffing and hours of operation specific to the recycling center; Mr. Berkowitz indicated the existing Blackstone Valley Recycling would staff and manage the recycling center which will is currently open on Wednesdays and Saturdays from 8AM to 2PM. Mr. Massey questioned the monitoring of the leaching tank; Mr. Hall simply indicated when it is full it will need to be emptied.

Mr. Murray questioned if the (newly) proposed leachate tank would require approval from the Board of Health or some other entity. Mr. Knapik did not believe the tank would require Board of Health approval, however will confirm for the Planning Board. Mr. Hall explained that the leachate tank would be emptied when it is full, noting the tank will have a high-level monitor alarm to signal operator. Mr. Murray asked if wastewater treatment plants would accept leachate material and questioned if the town (Northbridge) would. Mr. Hall stated through his experiences this waste water is considered benign and is normally accepted but would need to check with those receiving.

Mr. Murray sought additional input from the Planning Board and then asked the Town Planner if he had any additional comments. Mr. Bechtholdt noted receipt of response letter from Robert Knapik dated March 09, 2015 & Revised Site Plan (revised 3/3) received Monday, March 09, 2015. Mr. Bechtholdt indicated that the Planning Board is still awaiting receipt of a second review from JH Engineering Group, the Planning Board's consulting engineer, as well as additional comments from various municipal departments including Whitinsville Water Company (water service added), the Board of Health and others regarding the revised Site

Plan received. Mr. Bechtholdt also mentioned the Building Inspector/Zoning Enforcement Officer is to provide his zoning determination regarding allowable use (food composting facility).

Mr. Bechtholdt requested the Site Plan be further revised to show and locate the proposed 2,000 gallon leachate tank which is currently only shown on the revised Arch/drawing plans. Mr. Bechtholdt questioned where the tank will be situated in relation to the loading building and proposed site grading; concerned with proposed location being tucked behind building and the ability to access tank (empty as needed). Mr. Hutnak acknowledged that it was tight behind the building and will locate the (underground) leachate tank (fiberglass) on the Site Plan and will confirm access. Mr. Bechtholdt expressed concerns with possible sheet flow from the bio-filter: Mr. Hall indicated the bio-filter will have an asphalt base with a berm around its edge.

Mr. Bechtholdt asked about the negative pressure buildings and how potential odors within the discharge building will be addressed with a fabric building. Mr. Hall indicated fabric buildings are more air-tight than a typical metal building. Mr. Hall indicated utilization of a fabric building is a more economical option that is a proven application where in some instance steam released in the composting process may be corrosive to metal, the fabric cover holds up better in this type of environment.

Mr. Bechtholdt expressed concerns with the ability of the Operator to maintain and control odors when the overhead doors to the loading building and discharge building are opened for loading and unloading.

Mr. Bechtholdt reminded the Applicant/Engineer that he recommended as a result of the proposed increase of use to the site additional landscaping and screening along the entire frontage of Douglas Road such as a white-vinyl privacy fence or similar rather than chain-linked fencing, as well as landscaping such as bark mulch, shrubs etc. incorporated along Douglas Road. Mr. Bechtholdt asked the Applicant/Engineer to consider potential screening to the rear of the property as well. Mr. Hutnak indicated the back of the site has some wetland and has a large area of natural woodland, suggesting due to the amount of shade in the back it would be difficult to introduce additional plantings. Applicant/Engineer will look at additional opportunities for landscaping and screening along frontage and rear of property.

Mr. Bechtholdt indicated to the Planning Board that they should make a determination whether or not a Development Impact Assessment -DIA (pursuant to Section 173-49.1 E –Zoning Bylaw) was necessary based upon the size and scope of the site plan review application. Mr. Murray asked the Planning Board members if they felt based upon the scale of operation (understood to be a low traffic generator) if the Board would require this additional reporting for the proposal.

Mr. Massey noted the Planning Board previously approved the outdoor storage areas within the subject property suggesting adding 2 to 3 trucks per day (of traffic for the composting facility) does not seem to have much of an additional impact on traffic. Mr. Key asked about the components of the Development Impact Assessment; Mr. Bechtholdt noted he included a copy of the provision in his initial correspondence to the Planning Board (Traffic impact assessment; Environmental impact assessment; Fiscal impact assessment; & Community impact assessment). After a brief review Mr. Key suggested he did not feel the Board would get much additional information if they required the DIA for this project; Board members agreed. Chairman Murray sought a motion regarding the need for a Development Impact Assessment. Mr. Knapik explained to

the Board that they request the Board not require the assessment, noting the project did not trigger the thresholds listed.

Upon motion duly made (Key) and seconded (Massey) the Planning Board voted unanimously (4-0) to waive (not require) the Development Impact Assessment pursuant to the zoning bylaw based upon the size and scope of the project.

Mr. Bechtholdt reiterated that the Planning Board is still awaiting receipt of review comments from the Boards' consulting engineer, noting some changes to the site plan (revised) will require additional review and comment from JH Engineering Group, LLC. Mr. Bechtholdt asked Mr. Hutnak to verify that revised drainage computations, etc. were delivered to the Planning Board's engineer for review: Mr. Hutnak confirmed. Mr. Bechtholdt directed Mr. Hutnak to provide the Planning office with copies of the same for the file.

Mr. Bechtholdt reminded the Planning Board that they do not make determinations whether or not a use is allowed within a given Zoning District, noting they are still waiting for a determination from the Building Inspector/Zoning Enforcement Officer and suggested after taking additional public input the Planning Board should look to continue its review to the next available agenda.

Mr. Bechtholdt noted receipt of a follow-up letter from Shelley Buma on behalf of CPN -Citizens for the Preservation of Northbridge dated March 10, 2015. Mr. Bechtholdt noting Ms. Buma's absence asked if anyone in the audience was prepared to speak on the behalf of CPN; having no one Mr. Bechtholdt suggested the Board have an opportunity to review. Mr. Murray noted the Board just received it moments ago and he would like the opportunity for the Board to review.

Mr. Knapik indicated in the interest of thoroughness they are willing to address and respond to any and all comments, noting he too just received it however has read through it. Mr. Knapik suggested the essence of the letter is more or less summarized on the first page (#1 –facility will accept food garbage, animal manure and animal carcasses; #2 –request an ambient noise study & #3 –disapprove plan based upon lack of protection of abutting properties from undue disturbance caused by excessive or unreasonable noise and odors.

Mr. Knapik, stated in an effort to remove any remaining doubt regarding item #1, announced categorically that there is no intention for the proposed facility to accept manure or dead animals; not anything that this facility is designed for or intended to accept. Mr. Knapik suggested because of the food waste ban (established in October 2014) and the need for this (food composting) there will be more than adequate supply of food waste.

Mr. Knapik offered two points of comment regarding item #2, first suggesting the Planning Board has not required any supplemental studies such as an ambient noise study and secondly if there are DEP regulations that apply to the project then they will be subject to them. Mr. Knapik indicated they will comply or seek the appropriate approvals (DEP), suggesting if they do not, they would be subject to enforcement action. Mr. Knapik proposed to the Board that an ambient noise study is not necessary and offered to the extent the Board has further concerns about noise Mr. Hall can explain the nature of mechanical equipment and the anticipated low noise levels.

In regards to item #3, Mr. Knapik explained to the Board that the application is complete and has met all the standards for review and asks the Planning Board to approve the site plan with whatever reasonable conditions the Board may choose to impose.

Mr. Bechtholdt asked the Board to consider if an ambient noise study was to be done at this time what information besides baseline data a noise study would provide them; suggesting it is up to the Board. Mr. Murray felt a noise study could be treated as a condition, did not feel as part of the site plan review how useful it would be at this point. Mr. Murray felt requiring the study as a possible condition may be helpful to establish a benchmark, understands why one would be useful however there is some distance to go (additional reviews) before he believes the Board is in a position to make a decision.

Mr. Key asked what the decibel rating of a fan was. Mr. Hall did not know (off the top of his head) but indicated there are different types of blowers and fans that one can buy specific for low noise, noting the fans will be located inside the buildings and will be a low capacity; something they can address.

Mr. Key noted it was his understanding that the law (on food waste ban) will include (at some point) that all home food waste to also be processed and kept out of the landfills and asked how the proposed facility is positioned for increase in capacity. Mr. Hall explained that it is not, the facility proposed is designed as a single composting drum; that's its capacity. Mr. Key verified with Mr. Hall that the capacity is 15 tons/day (10 tons of food waste and 5 tons of woodchips); Mr. Hall confirmed its capacity.

Pamela Ferrara asked if seafood would be included in food waste. Mr. Hall stated yes; seafood from a restaurant or supermarket could be included; not from processing fish (not the by-product from a fish cleaning operation). Ms. Ferrara inquired about the estimated longevity of the fabric building. Mr. Hall suggested they have some fabric buildings nearing 15-years, noting at some point the UV light will affect the fabric but so far they have not had issues, suggesting if needed the fabric could be replaced.

Chairman Murray solicited additional input from the Board, having none Mr. Murray opened discussion to the general public in attendance.

Michael Wilkes, a direct abutter to proposal noted two comments/concerns: (1) lack of sufficient buffering during the fall and winter months; Mr. Wilkes suggested the existing buffer area is not as "wooded or thick" as one would first envision, especially when the leaves are off the trees. Mr. Wilkes would like to see some consideration in providing additional screening along the rear of the property. (2) Seconding, Mr. Wilkes expressed concerns with the potential for the food waste and woodchips to expand to include manure, animal carcasses and other material; Mr. Wilkes asked if the Board could impose a restriction limiting the composting facility to just food waste and woodchips. Mr. Bechtholdt indicated he was not sure if that type of restriction could be included in a Business Certificate and/or through the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Knapik suggested they (Applicant/Operator) would not be opposed to include as a condition to limit food material as defined by the applicable regulations and to not allow animal carcasses, manure, etc. Mr. Berkowitz agreed, noting he is not interested in taking in or processing animal carcasses or manure. Mr. Wilkes expressed concerns with potential future expansions based upon the original approval from two years ago. Mr. Murray suggested the Board could put such restrictions in its decision, noting if they were to

later look to modify they may be required to file another site plan modification which would be reviewed by the Planning Board.

Mr. Wilkes then noted his concerns with the school's recent proposal to eliminate/modify its busing policy (due to budget constraints) which may result in students walking (2 miles from Middle School & High School) along Douglas Road where currently sidewalks do not exist; with no buses adds a safety concern.

Tom Andrikowich, noted he cannot see the property however his 2 biggest concerns are noise and odor. Mr. Andrikowich suggested controlling potential odors comes down to the bio-filter and it does not seem there is any process control on the bio-filter, the woodchips, the moisture content, the weight, the temperature, if it gets cool at night and the woodchips have a heavy moisture content will have evaporation, this (water) phase change will carry the smell. Mr. Andrikowich asked if it begins to smell what the mitigation is; town has an opportunity at this point to look at things closely, review case studies from other similar types of facilities; does not want to be that town with foul odors; a huge concern.

Mr. Andrikowich also expressed concerns with noise levels, mentioning discussions about 4000 cfm fans (2 in one building) and a 1700 cfm fan in another. The noise pollution could be a real big issue, not to be taken lightly; the noise study should be conducted because residential neighborhood is only a couple hundred yards away. Mr. Andrikowich suggested a potential for disaster waiting to happen; with 10 tons of food waste per day who knows how much liquid is in a given delivery; how do they handle it, how do you contain it from leaching into the parking lot, etc. What happens with the bio-filter overtime, after a few winters, will it function correctly, will liquid start leaching out and oozing down into the soil. There seems to be a lot of things that could go wrong and probably will go wrong without a detailed process control plan.

Mr. Murray asked the Applicant/Engineer to address comments now and directed the Applicant/Engineer to provide written responses to the Board in writing.

Mr. Knapik offered a quick introductory comment and referred the Board (and abutters) to references cited in his letter dated February 25, 2015 on bio-solids, suggesting listing is only a fraction of the materials that are available; includes information published by government agencies and objective sources like the US CPA and the US Dept. of Agriculture with the title such as "Bio-Solids & Residuals Management Fact Sheet" an extensive scholarly paper on bio-filters by a professor; article discusses bio-filters at facilities that have capacity and do generate odors of magnitude stronger than what would reasonably be anticipated here mainly from livestock parts. Bio-filters are commonly used to control odors at livestock barns, etc. Mr. Knapik then referenced an article entitled "Bio-filter for Odor and Air Pollution Mitigation in Animal Agriculture".

Mr. Knapik believes if some reading is given to the references cited that concerns will be lessened; Mr. Knapik also noted that permitted in industrial zones are agriculture and sewage treatment facilities which are permitted as of right and have far greater potential for generating odors than this type of facility proposed. Mr. Knapik indicated they have done everything they can to control odor and will control odor contrary to the assertions that things will go wrong.

Mr. Hall noted one of the main benefits of a bio-filter is that they are very forgiving and operate under a wide-range of moisture conditions (rain, no rain); they just work and are highly effective as long as they

contain some moisture. Mr. Hall indicated no concerns with material leaching out onto new pavement, as unlike roads will be more durable without any traffic on them. Mr. Hall suggested we need to put things in perspective and stated as an alternative, which is another acceptable method, would be to have open air windrows on the ground (food and woodchips open on the ground left to compost), suggesting their proposal collects leachate and will have odor controls unlike an open windrows. Mr. Hall suggests they have taken things to another level to ensure some of those issues don't occur; to a level that is not always required for composting now. Mr. Hall noted in regards to contingency plans; if odor became an issue they could add wood-ash, an activated carbon to treat problems. Beyond that they would stop accepting food waste, suggesting they will only have 5-days of material, not like a huge facility that may have thousands of cubic yards, (a very finite problem) simply stop taking in food waste until you figure out what is wrong.

Denise O'Brien agreed with abutters concerns noted previously and inquired about the DEP meeting in Worcester and if the bio-filter will be sited within a building. Mr. Hall stated it would be outside; not enclosed.

Ms. O'Brien asked for clarification regarding whether or not the doors will be open for truck delivery of food waste and if the door on the fabric (discharge) building needs to be open as well; Mr. Hall indicated it would be cracked open, noting he has had the experience when drawing air out of the building some air has to come in to go out; suggesting fabric buildings are extremely tight and you actually have to create a vent to let air in so the door will be open 2 to 3 inches; Mr. Widell suggested 2-inches.

Ms. O'Brien understood that there was a fire at the Nantucket facility with the bio-filter (difficult to extinguish); Mr. Hall stated there was not, adding there was a fire on Nantucket with construction and demolish.

Ms. O'Brien asked for clarification regarding the Applicant's response concerning material to be accepted at the facility will be organic material, noting as defined in 310 CMR 16.02; organic encompasses both the food material and agriculture material which includes animal, manure and carcasses. Mr. Hall agreed, noting they refer to the 310 CMR 16.02 as that is how the facility will be regulated by DEP, however agreeing today to exclude those items.

Chairman Murray sought additional comments, having none noted the Board is still awaiting comments and suggested the Board look to continue its review.

Mr. Knapik asked the Chairman what specific information the Board was waiting for; Mr. Murray noted that Board is waiting for the engineer's follow-up review on the revised site plan, the Whitinsville Water Company regarding the added waterline service, as well as a determination from the Building Inspector (Zoning Officer) regarding the zoning.

Mr. Knapik indicated his preference would be to continue the review to April 14, 2015 as opposed to April 28, 2015.

Upon motion duly made (Massey) and seconded (Ferrara) the Planning Board voted (4-0) to continue its review to April 14, 2015 at 7:05PM (Town Hall).

IV. HEMLOCK ESTATES –CONT. PUBLIC HEARING

Subdivision Modification –Smith & Gendron Street Improvements

Chairman Murray noted as a result of the lack of a voting quorum (Gaudette absent) the continued public hearing for Hemlock Estates subdivision (modification of) will need to be postponed and rescheduled to the next available meeting. The Planning Board will consider this application Tuesday, April 14, 2015 at 7:35PM.

OLD / NEW BUSINESSApproval of Meeting Minutes – January 13, 2015, January 27, 2015 & February 10, 2015

The Planning Board tabled action to the next scheduled meeting.

2015 Spring Annual Town Meeting -Tuesday, May 05, 2015 (7:00PM)

No discussion –point of information.

Pine Knoll, Senior Living Development –Special Permit (pending application)

The Planning Board acknowledge scheduling of public hearing for Tuesday, March 24, 2015 (7:05PM); Chairman Murray noted that he would abstain from voting/discussing this application as he lives within the development. Cindy Key, Planning Board Associate Member was advised that she will be called upon to participate and act on this application (Special Permit modification).

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

Brian Massey informed the Board that it was his understanding that the indemnification agreement was recorded at the Worcester Registry and will provide the town with a copy of its recording once he gets it from Attorney Tom Wickstrom.

Subdivision/Site Developments –Status/Update(s)

Town Planner indicated that he has not heard from J&F Marinella regarding Camelot or Hemlock Estates subdivision; met with David Brossi regarding Presidential Farms, Mr. Brossi will meet with the Planning Board on March 24, 2015 to review Phase 5 construction (last phase of development) and potential option to modify subdivision approval regarding the bike and walking path within one of the designated open space lots of the subdivision (would require a formal modification). Mr. Massey asked if the streetlight installation issues within new subdivision(s) has been resolved; Mr. Murray indicated that he left a message for the DPW Director to contact him, however has not heard back from him; Board members expressed their ongoing frustration with the DPW Director in not following up on relatedly simple things such as installing new streetlights.

Green Meadow Court –Status/Update

Tabled –no discussion.

Farnum Circle –Status/Update

Tabled –no discussion.

Mail –Review

In addition to the mail listed (-see attached) the Planning Board noted receipt of the following communications: March 10, 2015 Agenda; March 24, 2015 Draft Agenda; April 14, 2015 Draft Agenda; Public Hearing Notice for Douglas Road (Composting Facility); Site Development Plan for 279 Douglas Road (Adjacent to); Memo dated January 8, 2015/February 13, 2015 to Planning Board from Town Planner regarding Douglas Road (Composting Facility) Site Plan Review; Letter dated February 6, 2015 to Building Inspector from Law Office of W. Robert Knapik regarding Proposed Compost Facility, Douglas Road; Blackstone Valley Micro-Composter presentation; Certificate of Approval dated November 12, 2012 for 279 Douglas Road (Adjacent to) Site Plan; Technical Review Meeting dated January 16, 2015 prepared by Town Planner; Letter dated February 3, 2015 to Town Planner & Planning Board from Denise O'Brien regarding Site Plan Review of Douglas Road proposed composting facility; Letter dated February 10, 2015 to Planning Board from William J. Cundiff regarding the Site Review Application for property adjacent to 279 Douglas Road with attachment of Decision on Application for Site Assignment Minor Modification of TJJ Development, Inc./Tom Berkowitz Trucking, Inc. from Northbridge Board of Health; Letter dated February 11, 2015 to Planning Board from the Citizen's for the Preservation of Northbridge regarding proposed composting facility at 279 Douglas Road and adjacent site with attachment Chapter 173 – Zoning information; Site Plan Review Checklist dated January 23, 2015 for Douglas Road Composting Facility; Memo dated January 14, 2015 to Planning Board from Conservation Commission regarding 279 Douglas Road (Adjacent to); Memo dated February 12, 2015 to Planning Board from Conservation Commission regarding 279 Douglas Road (Adjacent to); Letter dated January 22, 2015 to Conservation Commission from Andrews Engineering regarding Site Plan Review Application for Douglas Road Industrial Realty Trust; Letter dated January 26, 2015 to Town Planner from JH Engineering regarding Composting Facility 279 Douglas Road (Adjacent to) Site Plan "Peer Review;" Email dated January 16, 2015 to Town Planner from DPW Sewer Superintendent regarding Douglas Road Food Composting Facility; Email dated February 12, 2015 to Town Planner from Police Chief regarding Douglas Road – Composting Facility (site plan review); Letter dated February 2, 2015 to Town Planner from Whitinsville Water Company regarding Plan Review of Douglas Road - Food Composting Facility; Letter dated February 10, 2015 to Building Inspector from William Cundiff regarding Site Plan Review Application Adjacent to 279 Douglas Road with attachment entitled "Summary of Articles;" Letter dated February 16, 2015 to Building Inspector, Conservation Commission, Planning Board and Earth Removal Board regarding Adjacent to 279 Douglas Road with attached plan and cross section; Letter dated February 20, 2015 to Building Inspector from Citizen's for the Preservation of Northbridge regarding Site Plan Review Application at 279 Douglas Road and Adjacent site with attachment; Email dated February 27, 2015 to DPW Director with a cc to DPW Highway Superintendent, Planning Board Chair, and Planning Administrative Assistant from Town Planner regarding Douglas Road Site Plan Review; Email dated February 27, 2015 to DPW Director with a cc to DPW Highway Superintendent, Planning Board Chair, and Planning Administrative Assistant from Town Planner regarding Douglas Road Site Plan Review; Email dated February 27, 2015 to Town Planner from DPW Director regarding Douglas Road Complaint – Earth Removal (Building Permit Application / Review / Approvals); Letter dated October 22, 2014 to Town Clerk from Town Planner concerning Hemlock Estates Subdivision Modification – Smith and Gendron Street Improvement; Email dated February 11, 2015 to DPW Director with a cc to DPW Highway Superintendent; Planning Board Chair and Presidential Farms, Inc. concerning Streetlights – subdivisions; Blackstone Heritage Corridor, Inc. 2015 Partnership Program Grants; Memo dated February 25, 2015 to Board of Selectmen and Community Administrators and Managers from Central Massachusetts Metropolitan Planning Organization concerning Annual Development of the 2016 to 2019 TIP Project Listing; 2014 Planning Board Annual Report; 2015 Planning Board Schedule of Meeting dates.

Other

Mr. Bechtholdt noted that he will be submitting a grant to the Blackstone Heritage Corridor, Inc. for decorative plaster repairs within the Great Hall (Town Hall) as identified by McGinley Kalsow & Associates, Inc. Carol Brower offered to talk with Jack Walker, Chairman of the Northbridge Historical Society about providing a letter of support. The Town Planner provided the Board members with a copy of the RFP - Request for Proposals for Planning Design Services for the Blackstone River Bikeway (MA Segments 3, 4 & 5) as well as CMRPC memorandum regarding TIP Project Listing meeting (March 11, 2015); and copy of the Planning Board's 2014 Annual Report. Mr. Bechtholdt advised the Planning Board of site plan review submittal for Foppema's Farm (5,000 SF accessory building) scheduled for March 24, 2015. The Planning Board indicated based upon the scope of the project that a third party review (consulting engineer) would not be needed.

ADJOURNMENT

Having no additional business the Planning Board adjourned its meeting of Tuesday, March 10, 2015 at or about 8:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by the Planning Board – _____

R. Gary Bechtholdt II
Town Planner

Cc: Town Clerk