

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF MARCH 7, 2011
AT THE JESSE SMITH LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM
SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING**

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m., Jeff Partington, Chairman, presiding.

Members Present: Jeff Partington, Marc Tremblay, Leo Felice, Bruce Ferreira, Michael Lupis, Dov Pick, Christopher Desjardins and Jeff Presbrey.

Members Absent: James Libby.

Others Present: Joseph Raymond, Building/Zoning Official, Thomas Kravitz, Planning & Economic Development Director, and Christine Langlois, Deputy Planner.

II. ATTENDANCE REVIEW:

The Chairman acknowledged that Mr. Libby was unavailable this evening.

III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:

The **minutes of the Planning Board meeting of February 7, 2011** were read. *A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Ferreira, seconded by Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously by the Board.*

IV. CORRESPONDENCE:

- Zoning Board March 8, 2011 Agenda

V. OLD BUSINESS:

Major Land Development:

Comprehensive Permit: Pascoag Village Development, South Main Street, Reservoir Road & George Eddy Drive, Pascoag; Map 210, Lot 23: *Informational Meeting/Master Plan Review (cont'd)*: Attorney William Landry, Terri Barbosa, of Neighborworks Blackstone Valley, Scott Moorehead, of SFM Engineering, John O’Hearne, of O’Hearne Associates, and Diane Soule, of Soule & Associates, were all in attendance to represent the request. Attorney Landry informed the Board that since the January meeting with the Board, the questions that arose were addressed by the changes submitted with the revised plan. The first change is to the number of units on the Fernwood portion of the project, which has been reduced by 15 units, down to 30 units from the previous proposal of 45, as requested by the Board. The original proposal was for 75. In regards to whether the land would be taxable, Attorney Landry stated that research had been conducted which concluded that the land will be taxable just like any other property. He noted that a sample copy of the proposed ground lease agreement was provided for the Board’s review. The property owners will be leased for the land and still be responsible for property taxes assessed with the land. There is no subsidy on the part of the Town provided as part of the land tax on the ground lease situation. The last item that was investigated was whether additional school capacity would be required. A school impact study was provided to the Planner and the School Department as to the impact of additional students from this development. It may require some re-allocation of students within the system but there is definitely capacity within the system to handle the additional students. He further noted that they have proven that approximately 90% of the occupants of the development are expected to come from within the Town –

students who are already within the system. He then turned the floor over to Scott Moorehead to update the Board on the changes he made to the plan based on the previous discussions.

Mr. Moorehead told the Board that because they were able to reduce the Fernwood portion by 15 units, the roadway length has been reduced by approximately 900 feet and ends in a cul-de-sac. The lot sizes have also been increased from 75 feet in frontage and 7,500 feet in area to 80 to 120 feet in frontage and 12,000 sq/ft in lot area. This change makes the lot sizes sufficient to accommodate any future building additions or garages. The five-acre lot with the existing farmhouse and barn will still remain; the open space has been increased, and they have been able to keep a private recreational area that will be cleared, accessed from the water department's gravel pathway, and reserved for a neighborhood playground. He then asked if there were any questions at this point from the Board.

The Board did not have any questions; however, an abutter, Bruce Rylah, asked if he could address Mr. Moorehead. Mr. Rylah asked if it was necessary to provide a walkway in the open space area adjacent to the farmhouse, which is his property, and voiced concerns with residents of the development constantly walking past his property. Mr. Moorehead said that it was to serve mostly as a vegetated buffer that clearly delineates between the property owners of the development and Mr. Rylah's property. Mr. Rylah then asked if that was the case, he would request a split-rail fence be placed along that strip. Mr. Moorehead stated that the plan has not gotten to that type of detail at this level, but it could be something that could be considered. Mr. Rylah then asked for some type of a hedge to screen the farmhouse from the lights of cars entering the development. Mr. Moorehead noted that the driveway for the farmhouse and the entrance to the development were one in the same and that the details of access would have to be discussed privately with Mr. Rylah at some point in the future. Mr. Rylah then stated his opposition with the proposed roadway name of Rylah Drive, adding that both he and his son are builders who might possibly propose a subdivision in the future, which they would like to name after themselves and would not be able to if this development roadway remains as Rylah Drive. Mr. Moorehead told him that the naming of the road was as a tribute to Mr. Rylah, but it could be changed to accommodate his request. Finally, Mr. Rylah commented that he felt proposed lot 1 was too close to his farmhouse, being only 45 feet away. Mr. Moorehead said that he believed it was substantially more than 45 feet pointing out that there is also a buffer strip proposed.

Continuing with the Greenridge portion, Mr. Moorehead noted that the plan has been modified to show the realignment of Lapham Farm Road into a "T" intersection by removing an amount of pavement which would close up the intersection. This modification would be included when the plan seeks approval from RIDOT for a PAP permit. In regards to the movement of the dumpster that was close to an abutting property, he said that the parking lot had been shortened up and the dumpster moved further away from the property line. The area can now be graded in order to provide appropriate buffering. He noted that the parallel parking that was proposed along the roadway had been discussed with the maintenance supervisor for Neighborworks and it has been changed to angle parking along the common area, the common area having been reduced slightly to allow for this type of parking but allowing for the addition of a green

strip on the outside of both sides. This change has allowed for the addition of five more parking spaces. Tenants will not be allowed to park in any of the parallel parking spaces in front of their homes during a snowstorm. They must either park in their driveways or in the angle parking areas to allow for ease in plowing. He noted that the radiuses have been flattened at the intersections with the commons to allow for nicer turns when entering into the one-way intersection. He then turned the floor over to John O’Hearne.

Mr. O’Hearne told the Board that they were asked to provide more detail on the proposed duplex units in the Greenridge portion of this project as at the last meeting they had provided information on just the three-family units. Originally Greenridge units were all proposed as three-family units but the plan has been modified to provide 18 two-family units and 12 three-family units. He presented to the Board a typical layout of a proposed two-family duplex with the layout having a kitchen, dining and living rooms on the first floor and three bedrooms on the second floor. The color illustration he provided displayed one of several different types of façade treatment, with a streetscape image of a typical single-family subdivision with several builders over a period of time. In regards to the Fernwood portion, Mr. O’Hearne presented an illustration of an “aging in place” home, having a typical Cape Cod style, with a kitchen, living room, dining room, bathroom and bedroom on the first floor, with two bedrooms on the second floor. The second illustration displayed a typical 34’x34’ bungalow style dwelling, which could be ADA adaptable for a handicapped individual, or for single-level living. The final illustration displayed a typical streetscape of single family homes with differing lot widths.

Mr. Partington then asked if there were any questions from the Board members.

Mr. Ferreira asked if there would be an impact on the construction and sale of the homes that are proposed with the current economy and the median-income dropping. Mr. O’Hearne asked him if he meant as far as cost wise or design. Mr. Ferreira said both. Mr. O’Hearne stated that in regards to design wise, it has been pretty consistent through the years – on the square footage of the house and the amenities – whether the economy goes up or down. Mr. Ferreira then asked if the houses would have full basements or be slab on grade. Mr. O’Hearne said that most of the units would be slab on grade because of the water table and in keeping the houses affordable. A few would have walk-outs. Terri Barbosa then explained that all of the units would be income-based and will adjust accordingly. The original proforma listed price ranges from \$145,000 to \$165,000 as the basis; now everything is based on an average. If it goes at 60%/80%/120% of median, then the spread of allocation will have to be redefined for the 30 units of Fernwood as it gets closer to construction. With a land lease in place, the affordability of the units will remain in place for 90+ years and future generations. The value remains with improvements made and the owner is allowed a fair increase in value should the property be sold but always be within the affordable group. The land lease also places lots of restrictions, which would require approval from the association.

Mr. Pick asked if the design and size as well of a house would have to be approved. Ms. Barboza stated that an individual would be able to choose from a selection of units based on size and design. Mr. Pick asked if Mr. O’Hearne would have a template of the units. Mr. O’Hearne said there would be a template with a selection to choose from.

Mr. Tremblay voiced concerns with the Board approving the plan tonight and not knowing whether the applicant's agreement with Mr. Rylah would be affected by this approval. Mr. Moorehead stated that he was involved in the negotiations with Mr. Rylah and that any modifications that would be necessary as a result of the agreement would require the Planning Board's re-review and approval – a modification to the Master plan approval.

Mr. Presbrey commended the applicants on the changes that had been incorporated into the revised plan. He noted that he agreed with Mr. Rylah's request that the walking path be removed from the area adjacent to his home as he felt that was enough open space area for residents to traverse. Mr. Moorehead said that the intent was to provide a 30-foot buffer area so that the residents' backyards would not extend to Mr. Rylah's property line. He noted that most of this area is a cleared field at the moment. It can be labeled as a "no cut area" to allow the vegetation to re-grow and can be landscaped with a plan they will work on at the next submission. Mr. Presbrey then requested that the applicants consider providing access to open space parcels 2 & 3 for Town residents. In regards to the Greenridge portion, Mr. Presbrey suggested some type of arborvitae be planted to further buffer the dumpster from the abutting property. Finally Mr. Presbrey, noting that the project is at the Master plan submission level, stated that he would like the Board to reserve the right to require outside consultants at the later stages.

As there were no further questions or comments, *a motion was made by Mr. Presbrey to approve the Master Plan submission for the Pascoag Village Development, as presented, in accordance with RIGL 45-23-60, with the following Findings of Fact which shall serve as the decision of record by the Planning Board:*

1. *The development plan is consistent with the Community Comprehensive Plan particularly:
Chapter V, Housing & Affordable Housing Strategy, Summary Table 11, Housing Goal V.1 "To encourage a range of housing opportunities to meet diverse individual and family income needs for purposes of achieving the 10% State Affordable Housing goal established by RICL 45-53".*
2. *The plan is compliant with the general purpose and intent of the Town's Zoning Ordinance, particularly Section 30-2 Purpose.*
 - (1) *Promoting the public health, safety, and general welfare;*
 - (2) *Providing for a range of uses and intensities of use appropriate to the character of the town and reflecting current and expected future needs;*
 - (3) *Providing for orderly growth and development which recognizes:*
 - a) *The goals and patterns of land use contained in the Town's comprehensive plan adopted June 20, 2005, pursuant to G.L. 1956 §45-22.2-1 et seq;*
 - b) *The natural characteristics of the land, including its suitability for use based on soil characteristics, topography, and susceptibility to surface or ground water pollution;*
 - c) *The values and dynamic nature of coastal and freshwater ponds, the shoreline, and freshwater and coastal wetlands;*
 - d) *The values of unique or valuable natural resources and features;*
 - e) *The availability and capacity of existing and planned public and/or private services and facilities;*

- f) *The need to shape and balance urban and rural development; and*
- g) *The use of innovative development regulations and techniques.*
- (4) *Providing for the control, protection, and/or abatement of air, water, groundwater, and noise pollution, and soil erosion and sedimentation.*
- (5) *Providing for the protection of the natural, historic, cultural, and scenic character of the town or areas therein.*
- (6) *Providing for the preservation and promotion of agricultural production, forest, silviculture, aquaculture, timber resources, and open space.*
- (7) *Providing for the protection of public investment in transportation, water, stormwater management systems, sewage treatment, and disposal, solid waste treatment and disposal, schools, recreation, public facilities, open space, and other public requirements.*
- (10) *Promoting a high level of quality in design in the development of private and public facilities.*
- (11) *Promoting implementation of the Town's comprehensive plan adopted June 20, 2005, pursuant to G.L. 1956 § 45-22.2-1 et seq.*
- 3. *The effort to cluster the development away from environmentally sensitive areas will minimize the potential for significant, negative environmental impacts.*
- 4. *The plan will not result in the creation of unbuildable lots.*
- 5. *The subdivision will offer all units and/or lots permanent physical access to both Route 100 and Reservoir Road.*

With the condition that open space parcel 3 include the upland area enclosed within the open space parcel 2 as shown on the plan, be owned by the association and provide access to Town residents of Burrillville; all recreational improvements, including maintenance and costs for development and maintenance within the development lie with the association; and that the Board grants the applicant a waiver from the cul-de-sac length require to allow the roadway length of 2,200 feet for Greenridge development. The motion received a second from Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously by the Board.

VI. NEW BUSINESS:

Minor Subdivision:

Calvary Episcopal Church, Broad & Church Streets, Pascoag; Map 174, Lot 24: Preliminary Plan Review: Mr. Norbert Therien, of National Surveyors-Developers, Inc., and Mr. Brian Carpenter, applicant, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Therien told the Board that the plan represents a minor subdivision of property which is located at the corner of Broad and Church Streets in Pascoag within the R-12 zoning district. The parcel currently contains two existing structures – a former church and associated rectory. The proposal is to separate the two structures by subdividing the parcel into two lots. The first parcel would contain the rectory, with the proposed lot line starting on Broad Street, running between the two structures, and wrapping around the back of the church. He noted that there is barely 10 feet of space between the two buildings. Variances would be necessary for the rectory lot because of the reduced amount of frontage (33.12 feet); the side lot line would require relief of 6.08 feet; however the lot area would meet the zoning requirement with 12,000 square feet. The balance of the property would go with the church lot, which would bring the lot area to 14,918 square feet. The church lot would require two variances: side yard setback relief of 4.31 feet; rear yard setback of 11.14 feet. He also noted an additional variance in

regards to the height of the ridge line – which would require relief of 6 feet. He stated that the main reason for the requested subdivision is that there is no real market for the sale of two structures on a relatively small piece of property. He noted that there is public sewer and water in the area with both structures connected – the sewer by a single line connection. Easements will be necessary for the continued use of the existing utility lines. There is a parking area that is currently available for the church structure; a two-car parking area will be made available for the rectory lot off of an adjacent right-of-way (Michelle Drive). He told the Board that the plan was being heard by the Zoning Board tomorrow evening for the necessary variances, and he hoped that the plan would receive a favorable recommendation from the Board this evening. He then asked if there were any questions from the Board.

Noting that it had been stated the church would be converted into a single-family dwelling, Mr. Partington questioned whether there was any possibility that it could become a multi-family building. Mr. Therien stated that because the property is located in the R-12 there was no possibility of it becoming a multi-family unit. Mr. Partington then pointed out that Mr. Kravitz had advised the Board that the application could pursue a condominium type of ownership, which could alleviate a few problems. He asked if the applicant had considered this option. Mr. Therien said that in his conversations with Mr. Carpenter, it had been discussed that there was absolutely no interest in the purchase of both structures – it was either one or the other. This is the reason why the plan was developed to separate the buildings.

Mr. Tremblay voiced concerns with conflicts between neighbors with the extremely limited amount of buffer between the buildings. He pointed out a similar situation in Greenville with existing structures being extremely in close proximity to one another. Mr. Partington suggested that the buildings could be sold separately if it was a condominium association. Mr. Therien stated that it was an option but it was not the way the applicant had asked him to proceed. In regards to maintenance issues, he noted that each property owner could grant the other easements for access, between the two structures, to conduct maintenance on the buildings.

Mr. Felice stated that he wished to echo the previous comments being very familiar with the property having done significant work there in the past as a member of the church. The zone between the back of the church and the side of the house is very tight. He suggested the applicant give this some serious thought before proceeding with this proposal and eliminating any other possibilities. The condominium option should be viewed with an open mind.

Mr. Therien then asked Mr. Carpenter how he felt the area between the two structures should be handled. Mr. Carpenter stated that he felt more comfortable with having an easement for egress as well as for maintenance between the two parcels/buildings than having a condominium situation.

Mr. Ferreira voiced concerns with the amount of relief necessary for the proposed subdivision into two lots. He added that providing an easement, for access or maintenance, does not eliminate property disputes between owners. He suggested they seriously consider the condominium option.

Mr. Raymond, in his capacity as Zoning Official, questioned at what period of time was the latest addition to the church constructed. 1895? Mr. Therien said that the church was built in 1895; Mr. Carpenter said the building addition took place in 1965. Mr. Raymond stated that he felt the hardship with this submission was created by the owner. The church was allowed to put on this addition, in 1965, because there was no lot line to deal with. It is obvious that the property could support a condominium association, as there have been numerous condo associations put together within a half-mile of this particular site over the past ten years. Mr. Therien responded that he felt the Town was pushing the condominium association option, but that was not what the applicant wants. Mr. Raymond said that the applicant may not want it, but it may be the only option as it is the applicant's hardship to prove that the 1965 addition had nothing to do with the requested creation of two substandard lots. He further questioned if the applicant were to pursue the condominium option, would any zoning relief be required? Mr. Therien said no, none would be necessary. Mr. Raymond responded that there is no reason to seek relief with the other option available.

Mr. Pick questioned the square footage of the church and the rectory. Mr. Carpenter said the church structure has 4,656 square feet and the house has 1,848 square feet. Mr. Pick said there could be other options, such as knocking down the small building to alleviate having to create a separate lot, or just going forward with the condo option. He added that he did not see too many potential buyers of a church. Mr. Carpenter mentioned that in his experience he has seen several types of buildings that have been converted into residences. Mr. Pick pointed out that the creation of an easement now could prove to be a hardship to eliminate in the future. He added that he was also looking at the historical aspect of the structures.

Mr. Felice then asked Mr. Carpenter if he had any definitive objections to pursuing the condominium option. Mr. Carpenter replied that if the Board rejected the subdivision proposal, he would then have to pursue the condominium situation.

Mr. Desjardins stated that if the applicant is open to a condo association, and to avoid having to go before the Zoning Board for relief, that is the option he would choose. He voiced concerns with other applicants in the future with the same scenario. He noted that it would end up being the same situation with the condo association, but legally seemed the better way to go in his opinion.

Mr. Presbrey, noting that it was unfortunate that the church disbanded, stated that it is an existing situation – two structures on one lot – and needs to be addressed in the best manner so that the properties are marketable vs. abandonment and disrepair. It does not make any difference whether it is a condo association or subdivided into two lots. The proposed easement for the common area would be fine, in his opinion.

Mr. Lupis questioned the closest distance between the two structures. Mr. Therien stated that it was just a hair shy of 10 feet – 9.92 feet. Mr. Lupis pointed out that clearly there are two different opinions that have come out with this discussion. But he said as Mr. Presbrey has pointed out, the buildings will still be close together, the only difference is

there will be some formal easements and a property line. He stated that he did not have a problem with the proposed subdivision.

As there were no further questions, a motion to grant approval of the Minor Subdivision Plan for Calvary Episcopal Church was made by Mr. Partington, in accordance with RIGL 45-23-60 with the following Findings of Fact:

- 1. The development, existing as The Calvary Episcopal Church and Rectory Building is not inconsistent with the Community Comprehensive Plan.*
- 2. The proposed minor subdivision does not meet the minimum zoning standards, listed in Zoning Section 30-111 "Table of Dimensional Regulations" and will need necessary variances from the Zoning Board of Review with the Planning Board's favorable recommendation.*
- 3. Due to the fact that the property is already developed, we do not foresee negative environmental impacts as a result of this attempt to pursue a minor subdivision.*
- 4. A subdivision plan such as this will result in the creation of lots that are highly constrained by existing buildings, whereby future renovations may warrant additional zoning relief.*
- 5. Map 174, Lot 24 has permanent physical access to both Broad and Church Streets.*

The motion received a second from Mr. Presbrey. Upon a roll call of the Board, Mr. Presbrey, Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Pick, Mr. Lupis, Mr. Partington, Mr. Felice and Mr. Tremblay voted in favor of the proposal; Mr. Ferreira voted in opposition. The motion of approval carried.

A motion was then made by Mr. Tremblay to include the condition of an easement for access and maintenance for the common area between the two structures, which would carry the same effect as a condo arrangement, in the Board's recommendation to the Zoning Board. The motion received a second from Mr. Desjardins and carried with seven in favor and Mr. Ferreira opposed.

Pascoag Cemetery Association, Pascoag Main Street, Pascoag; Map 158, Lot 29: Conceptual Plan Review: Mr. Norbert Therien, of National Surveyors-Developers, Inc., Mr. Bruce Rylah and Mr. Mark Brizard, of the Pascoag Cemetery Association and Mr. Marc Cote, realtor, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Therien stated that they were here tonight to discuss potential options for development of their property located off of Pascoag Main Street in Pascoag. The property comprises of approximately 19.7 acres, is wooded with different types of pine and hardwoods, and contains several wetland areas, including a portion of the Clear River with an associated 200-foot riverbank setback. The soil types are Hinkley gravel, and the property has been reviewed by Scott Rabideau on a conceptually basis to identify the wetland areas. The property is zoned R-12 with all three of the aquifer designations: A-80; A-100; A-120. Public sewer and water are available. He told the Board that he has prepared three different conceptual plans for the Board to review and comment as to whether any could potentially be considered.

Mr. Therien then displayed the first plan entitled, "Conceptual Plan A-100" which represented a four-lot subdivision on a public road ending in a cul-de-sac in conformance

with the A-100 aquifer overlay district. Approximately 8.78 acres of land is under the jurisdiction of the wetlands, leaving approximately 9.31 acres of upland area that could be developed. The second plan was entitled, "Conceptual R-12" which represented a 25-lot subdivision, in accordance with the R-12 zoning district, on a public road with two access areas off of Pascoag Main Street. He noted that this scenario would ignore the presence of the aquifer overlay designations. The third plan entitled, "Conceptual Plan Multi Units" represented a private development of 30 units with a private roadway retaining a portion of the property as open space. Based upon the three proposals, Mr. Therien requested the Board's input and inquired as to whether they were receptive to allow some relief from the stringent requirements of the aquifer overlay districts.

Mr. Presbrey stated that unless the regulations regarding the aquifer overlay districts change, the Board must adhere to its requirements. In other words, the only option for this property would be the Conceptual Plan A-100 and he said that he would have an issue with granting anything above what is allowed by zoning. Several members of the Board agreed with Mr. Presbrey. Mr. Presbrey also said that he would also like to see the new LID standards incorporated into this plan.

Mr. Tremblay questioned the adjacent parcel that is owned by the Pascoag Utility District and whether it was a wellhead site. Mr. Brizard told the Board that the Pascoag Cemetery sold this parcel to the Pascoag Utility District when the contamination of their wellhead took place to give them a larger buffer zone for protection. Originally Pascoag Cemetery's parcel was around 40 acres and in 1997 when the contamination happened, they were approached by PUD to purchase the adjacent parcel. Mr. Tremblay asked where the actual wells were located. Mr. Brizard said that the wells are located on the PUD property on Silver Lake Avenue, just off North Main Street. Mr. Tremblay then stated that there must be a wellhead protection area within close proximity and how would that impact this property. Mr. Therien stated that with his experience of filing with the RIDOH, you must show control within 75% of a wellhead, which is about 400 feet. The cemetery property is well past the required 400 feet.

Mr. Brizard told the Board that the reason for this exercise is to find the potential for this lot so that it could be marketed for sale in order to help the cemetery association stay solvent. Mr. Therien stated that they were hoping that the Board would grant them consideration in light of the fact that they sold the adjacent property to PUD for protection of the wells. Mr. Pick questioned what would be the number of units that would help keep the association solvent. Mr. Brizard stated that with the four lot plan, perhaps the association could stay solvent for about 10 years; with the one of the other options, maybe longer. Mr. Kravitz noted that if they require a variance, they should prepare an operating proforma that substantiates the action is not for economic gain. We or the Zoning Board of Review will need a snapshot of solvency. Mr. Felice suggested the cemetery association consider establishing a strategic financial plan to determine the correct number of units for the association to survive for another 50 years. Then come back to the Board with an accurate number of units needed for the Board to consider.

Mr. Lupis stated that whenever a plan calls for development over the aquifer, he becomes very cautious. He noted that with all three proposals, there seemed to be a large amount

of disturbance. Perhaps they could consider one four-unit structure with limited disturbance within the center of the property with a single driveway access.

Mr. Tremblay said that he would be willing to allow for a small bonus above the four lots allowed by zoning because of their previous action of the assisting the PUD; perhaps six lots.

Mr. Kravitz suggested the applicants investigate whether there was any type of soil contaminants as a result of the property having been a former landfill site.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Report from Administrative Officer:

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the month of February the following Certificates of Completion were issued: **Pascoag Cemetery Association, Pascoag Main Street, Pascoag** (requested advisory from Planning Board) (2nd submission); and **Calvary Episcopal Church, Church Street, Pascoag** (Preliminary Minor Subdivision – two lots) (2nd submission). The following plans were rejected as incomplete: **Pascoag Cemetery Association, Pascoag Main Street, Pascoag** (requested advisory from Planning Board) (1st submission); and **Calvary Episcopal Church, Church Street, Pascoag** (Preliminary Minor Subdivision – two lots) (1st submission). There were no plans endorsed.

Planning Board Discussions: A suggestion was made by Mr. Presbrey that the Board members' annual stipend be applied directly to each member's property tax bill instead of receiving a check each quarter. He noted that volunteer firemen are exempt from fire taxes in lieu of service. Mr. Partington stated that it probably was the difference between income and expenses. Mr. Tremblay said it could become an accounting nightmare for the Town. Why not hold the check and apply it when the taxes are due.

Mr. Kravitz requested that the Board consider moving the April meeting from the regular date of April 4th to the second Monday, which is April 11th as he will not be available on the 4th. Mr. Partington noted that Mr. Kravitz would be away as he is getting married. A motion was made by Mr. Ferreira to change the April Planning Board meeting to April 11th. The motion was received by Mr. Felice and carried unanimously.

The Board congratulated Mr. Kravitz on his upcoming nuptials.

Having nothing further for discussion, a motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Ferreira at 9:27 p.m. The motion received a second from Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously.

Recorded by: _____
M. Christine Langlois, Deputy Planner