



# TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Town Hall Offices • 63 Main Street • Northborough, MA 01532 • 508-393-5019 • 508-393-6996 Fax

---

Approved 7/26/16

## Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes April 5, 2016

**Members in attendance:** Fran Bakstran, Chair; Mark Rutan, Clerk; Jeffrey Leland; Brad Blanchette; Richard Rand

**Others in attendance:** Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Fred Litchfield, Town Engineer; Joe Atchue, Building Inspector; Elaine Rowe, Board Secretary; Mike Sullivan, Connorstone Engineering; Tim Shay, TShay LLC; Ian Gow; Ann Beckstrom; Bob Gleason; Nick Muskopf; Steve & Ann Champion; Paul & Jayne Mong; Eugene & Linda Kim

**Chair Fran Bakstran called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.**

**Public Hearing to consider the petition of AMERCO Real Estate/U-Haul Construction Department for a Variance/Special Permit, Special Permit, Groundwater Protection Overlay District/Site Plan Approval to change the use of an existing industrial building to a commercial self-storage facility and to construct a new warehouse building on the property located at 40 Bearfoot Road in the Industrial District and Groundwater Protection Overlay District Area 2**

Ms. Bakstran explained that the applicant has requested a continuance to the board's May meeting given that other boards have asked for additional information. Ms. Joubert noted that the project also needs to go before the Design Review Committee and the applicant has not yet presented any plans. She noted that both the Design Review Committee (DRC) and Groundwater Advisory Committee (GAC) have requested that the ZBA hearing be continued.

Mark Rutan made a motion to continue the hearing to May 24, 2016 at 7:00PM. Jeff Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

**Public Hearing to consider the petition of TShay LLC for a Variance /Special Permit, Groundwater Protection Overlay District/Special Permit with Site Plan Approval, to allow the use of a proposed commercial building with associated parking, driveway, utility connections, drainage, and landscaping for retail, professional/business offices, professional service establishment, or medical/dental office, on the property located at 113 West Main Street, in the Downtown Business District and Groundwater Protection Overlay District Area 3**

Ms. Bakstran noted that the board received a revised application packet. She also noted that guests from Boy Scout Troop 101 are in attendance to observe civic duty in action.

Mike Sullivan from Connorstone Engineering clarified the location of the site and provided a brief history. He noted that there is an unoccupied house on the .44 acre parcel, with the property sloping from the rear to the front. He explained that the parcel is located in the Downtown Business district and is within the Groundwater 3 district and the applicant is seeking a special permit to move the groundwater line or to allow an additional 50 foot area in the more restrictive area.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the original proposal showed the building perpendicular to Route 20 with parking in the rear, but plans were revised to locate the building at the rear of the site with parking in front at the DRC's request. He noted that, in doing so, additional variances are required. Mr. Sullivan discussed the location and orientation of the building, impervious coverage, drainage, and other pertinent details. He noted that the existing evergreen buffer will stay, and the landscaping plan calls for a series of arborvitaes, hostas, knock out rose bushes, Japanese Holly, pear trees, and morning light grass. He also indicated that a stockade fence will be installed along the entire property line and around the dumpster.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the applicant is seeking a special permit for groundwater, a special permit with site plan approval, a variance to allow parking in the rear, and a variance to waive the maximum front setback.

Mr. Sullivan noted that there will be no spread of light offsite. In response to a question from Ms. Bakstran, Mr. Sullivan explained that the proposed building will be larger than the existing house and located in basically the same place, with 9 parking spaces to be provided. Ms. Bakstran also asked about egress, which Mr. Sullivan explained will be via the front entrance and a rear doorway.

Mr. Litchfield explained that the GAC had met on March 22<sup>nd</sup>, prior to this latest version of the site plan being drafted, and was in favor of recommending approval as submitted at the time. He indicated that the GAC is in favor of granting approval to move the line 50 feet and has recommended conditions. He also noted that the applicant has agreed to come back before the board if a medical office or any business requiring hazardous materials will occupy the building. He also requested that the condition for the Stormwater Operation and Management Plan should be amended to include a requirement for annual reporting.

Mr. Litchfield noted that the drainage system is basically underground retention and confirmed that it does meet the bylaw. He explained that the driveway, traffic access, and drainage will all need approval from the Mass Department of Transportation (DOT).

Ms. Bakstran asked if the conditions requested by the GAC still apply, given the changes to the plan. Mr. Litchfield voiced his opinion that the proposed changes will not affect the GAC's approval.

Mr. Litchfield informed the board that the packet also includes a comment letter citing issues that the DPW and Engineering Department would like to have addressed by the applicant. Mr. Sullivan confirmed that the applicant has agreed to comply and the plans will be amended to address them. Mr. Atchue commented that moving the building to the back of the property is more appealing, and he has no issues with the proposal. Ms. Joubert noted that the board also received a comment letter from the DRC. She reiterated that the DRC had asked the applicant to consider pushing the building to the back of the site to allow the front façade to be parallel to the roadway. She voiced her opinion that the revised plan works much better with the site and expressed appreciation to the applicant for his willingness to redesign the plans. She also asked the board to include a condition that stipulates that she and the Building Inspector will have final approval of lighting and signage. Mr. Shay noted that the lighting will be similar to the project at 137 West Main Street.

Chris Benzes commented that, while the revised design is much more preferable, he is concerned about the location of parking in close proximity to his back yard though he is pleased to know that the tree buffer will remain. He asked if the areas shaded in green on the plans represent grass. Mr. Shay noted that the darker areas represent paved areas while the greener areas will be landscaping of some type. Mr. Benzes also expressed concerns about the location of the dumpster and questioned the type of refuse and potential for offensive odors. Mr. Sullivan noted that the dumpster will not be large in size,

and the use will be office/retail. Mr. Shay also noted that the dumpster will be screened, with a stockade fence around the back of it.

Ms. Bakstran explained that the property owner to the west is concerned about the parking lot and asked if it is possible to have stockade fence installed along his side of the property line to provide him some privacy. Mr. Shay noted that there is a good deal of screening already provided in the plan.

Mr. Blanchette asked if there is a sidewalk along the front of the parcel. Mr. Shay indicated that there is not. Ms. Bakstran asked if the town is requesting one. Mr. Litchfield noted that, based on previous experience with the project at 137 West Main Street, the sidewalk will not be completed but will be prepped so that it can be built later.

Jeffrey Leland made a motion to close the hearing. Richard Rand seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

**Public Hearing to consider the petition of Ian Gow for a Variance/Special Permit to allow the use of a proposed self-storage warehouse facility containing 6 buildings on the property located at 1 Lyman Street, in the Industrial District and Groundwater Protection Overlay District Area 1**

Applicant Ian Gow and Mike Sullivan appeared to discuss plans for a proposed self-storage facility on this site in the Industrial zone located in a Groundwater 1 area. Mr. Sullivan discussed existing conditions and the applicant's plans to construct five single-story 30' x 80' buildings, 9' to 10' in height and one two-story building 70' x 230', 26' to 30' in height. He explained that he had evaluated 2, 10 and 100-year storm events and designed drainage to mitigate runoff utilizing subsurface cultecs for infiltration. He noted that water from the roofs will flow to the cultecs and be collected in catch basins that will discharge to an infiltration basin.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the applicant wishes to make provisions for car storage, so two buildings were designed to include floor drains and tight tanks for that purpose. He indicated that there will be an alarm system within the tanks that will be pumped out and discarded as hazardous waste when necessary, and emphasized that there will be no discharge onsite.

Mr. Sullivan explained that plans include a fence along the perimeter of the property line on Bartlett and Lyman Streets, a small septic system, and lighting to include minimal pole lighting and walpac lights on the buildings. He noted that there will be no light infiltration to the abutters, and landscape plantings will be included along the fence (azaleas, inkberry, dogwoods and maple trees).

In response to a question from Mr. Rand, Mr. Gow indicated that the fencing to be installed will likely be chain link. Mr. Rand asked if trees are to be planted every 60 feet. Mr. Sullivan stated that, along Lyman Street, the proposal is to plant trees every 40 feet with a bed of perennials below.

Mr. Rand asked about the design and appearance of the buildings. Mr. Sullivan explained that the project needs to go before the DRC, so he is unable to address the question with any specificity except to say that there are to be no doors on the Lyman Street side. He also confirmed that the turning radius will allow for fire apparatus access without any difficulty.

In response to a question from Ms. Bakstran, Mr. Gow indicated that there will be 8 units in each of the smaller buildings. Mr. Rutan asked if the buildings will be concrete construction. Mr. Gow explained that they will be prefabricated steel.

Mr. Rand noted that the property has historically been used for used car sales and asked if this use will continue. Mr. Gow indicated that that particular tenant will not remain.

Mr. Atchue noted that, to date, he has not seen any architectural drawings and indicated that sprinkler systems will need to be incorporated into the plans.

Mr. Litchfield noted that the GAC still has a number of questions that need to be addressed. He expressed concerns about the sizing of the tight tanks and noted that he is not sure that 2,000 gallons is not big enough but he has not yet seen calculations to confirm that. He emphasized the importance of making sure that the tanks are appropriately sized. He also noted that one member of the GAC is concerned about the end unit being so close to the wetlands, especially given the proposed vehicle storage, and has asked for better safeguards. Ms. Bakstran asked if the unanswered questions will prevent the GAC from making a recommendation at this time. Mr. Litchfield noted that the GAC is scheduled to meet again prior to the next ZBA meeting. Ms. Bakstran asked if the DRC will be able to meet as well. Ms. Joubert explained that, if sufficient information is provided, the DRC will typically need a few meetings to get through the process. She also voiced her opinion that the proposed use of chain link fencing will not be acceptable to the DRC.

Ann Beckstrom, 152 Bartlett Street, commented that she has many questions and concerns, and is not happy about the idea of a chain link fence. She questioned what the buildings will be made out of and what they will look like, especially since she has seen some horrible projects throughout the area. She asked the applicant if he could reference an existing building in the area that is similar to what is planned. Mr. Gow presented brochures showing a representative design. He also noted that there is a new project on Route 9 in Shrewsbury that is similar. In response to a question from Ms. Bakstran, Mr. Gow indicated that the single-story buildings will be 9 to 10 feet in height. Ms. Bakstran commented that, regardless of the installation of the fence, the buildings will be visible. Ms. Beckstrom asked about signage, hours of operation, and noise impacts. Mr. Gow explained that he is proposing a sign on the corner, and anticipates that there will be virtually no noise. Ms. Bakstran asked if this is to be a locked facility and if there will be anyone onsite. Mr. Gow stated that the facility is to be accessible 24 hours per day, gates will be monitored, and staff will be onsite during normal office hours. Ms. Beckstrom voiced concern about light pollution, and asked how to prevent lights from being on all night and impacting her. Ms. Bakstran explained that, if approved, lighting will be conditioned in the decision.

Ms. Beckstrom expressed concerns about the close proximity to the wetlands and impacts to the wildlife in the area. In response to a question from Ms. Bakstran, Ms. Joubert indicated that the project will go before the Conservation Commission at their April 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, but noted that the application was incomplete so it is likely that the hearing will be continued pending additional information. Ms. Beckstrom asked how the community can be assured that there will not be any chemicals or hazardous materials stores in these units. Mr. Gow explained that there is a prohibition in the lease and he has the right to inspect a unit if there are any suspicions. Ms. Beckstrom noted that the existing building was built in 1830 and asked about the historic relevance. Ms. Bakstran explained that the application for a demo permit will trigger the historical component. Mr. Gow stated that he has already been through that process and, despite his efforts, he has been unable to find anyone interested in reusing the barn. Ms. Beckstrom voiced concern about these types of projects encroaching on residential neighborhoods. Mr. Gow reiterated that the site is located in an Industrial district.

Josh Gauthier (Boy Scout with Troop 101), 49 Moore Lane, questioned the location of the property in an Industrial zone and suggested that light pollution could be a problem for the residential abutters. He also asked if there is any fencing material available that might cancel out the noise. Mr. Sullivan explained that this type of business will generate a minimal amount of noise. Josh asked about storage in the large building and questioned where the cars will be kept. Mr. Sullivan highlighted the buildings where vehicles may be stored and noted that there will be no storage of cars in the large building.

Linda Kim, 127 Bartlett Street, asked if there will be a surveillance camera mounted on the exterior of the building. Mr. Gow indicated that his plans include onsite monitoring. Ms. Kim commented that, without closed circuit camera equipment, there is no way to know what types of activities are taking place. Mr. Gow noted that there will be personnel onsite during the day, with cctv monitoring at night. Ms. Kim asked about the camera locations. Mr. Gow stated that there will be cameras both indoors and outdoors. Ms. Kim indicated that she is not comfortable with plans for storage of cars in the facility. Mr. Gow indicated that this is typical for this type of facility as some people wish to store vehicles indoors, particularly during the winter months. Mr. Sullivan noted that there are two buildings designed to allow car storage and indicated that any lease will preclude storage of automobiles anywhere but within those two buildings.

Ms. Kim explained that she uses well water approximately 300 feet away and questioned how this facility will impact her water quality. Mr. Sullivan stated that there are floor drains that flow to a tight tank that must be certified that it is truly tight. In addition, the tight tank has an alarm system that will go off when the tank is  $\frac{3}{4}$  full so it can be pumped out. Mr. Sullivan also noted that the groundwater gradient flows in the opposite direction.

Ms. Beckstrom asked about post-construction upkeep on the perimeter of the building. Mr. Gow indicated that he will employ a landscaping contractor to maintain the property. Ms. Beckstrom asked about graffiti. Mr. Gow voiced his opinion that graffiti will not be an issue on the site. Ms. Beckstrom asked why it is necessary to extend the construction so far that the wetlands will be impacted. Mr. Sullivan noted that the wetland has been flagged by a wetland scientist and the applicant will maintain the no disturb buffer.

Ms. Beckstrom asked Mr. Sullivan to describe the drainage area to be located off to the side of the parking lot. Mr. Sullivan explained that water will be collected there but will draw down 3 hours after the storm ends. He noted that an Operation and Maintenance Plan will be drafted and compliance with the plan will be required by the town.

Ms. Kim asked about lighting on the building. She noted that her house is somewhat elevated and indicated that she would prefer not to have bright lights shining onto her property. Mr. Sullivan stated that the applicant is required to maintain a zero foot candle so that there will be no disturbance to the neighbors. Ms. Bakstran explained that the DRC will look extensively at the lighting.

Steve Stone, 152 Bartlett Street, asked about the disposition of a number of trees along Lyman Street that he assumes are on town property. Mr. Sullivan explained that trees within the 20 foot buffer can be removed without town approval. Mr. Stone asked about the tall pine trees on the site and voiced concerns about increased noise impacts. Mr. Gow stated that many of the pine trees within the site are dead and some have already been removed.

Ms. Bakstran explained that the hearing needs to be continued to allow the applicant to address concerns of other boards.

Mark Rutan made a motion to continue the hearing to May 24, 2016 at 7:00PM. Richard Rand seconded; motion carried by unanimous vote.

**Public Hearing to consider the petition of Abu Construction for a Variance/Special Permit/Special Permit, Groundwater Protection Overlay District, to allow the use of two 2-family dwellings on a lot of less than 20,000 square feet, on the property located at 357 Main Street, in the Residential C District and Groundwater Protection Overlay District Area 3**

Mike Sullivan discussed plans for the construction of two, 2-family dwellings with a common driveway on the 40,000 square foot lot located in the Residential C zone and in a groundwater protection zone. He explained that drainage has been studied and evaluated by the Town Engineer. He also noted that the septic system is to be located in the front.

Ms. Joubert confirmed that the Planning Board granted approval for the common driveway at their March meeting.

Mr. Blanchette asked how many stories the buildings will be and if they will include garages. Mr. Gleason noted that the units will be two stories with 2-car garages in the front. Ms. Bakstran asked about the height of the buildings. Mr. Sullivan stated that the height will be similar to that of a single family dwelling. Mr. Gleason indicated that the units will be similar to those in the Cyrus Brook development. Ms. Bakstran asked about the size of the units. Mr. Gleason stated that they will be 2,000 square feet, with 2 bedrooms in each.

Mr. Litchfield noted that the GAC has recommended approval with conditions, including a limit to the number of bedrooms going forward.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the applicant will be submitting an ANR plan. Ms. Bakstran explained that, were the applicant seeking approval for two single family homes, he would only need approval for the common driveway. Mr. Blanchette asked if the units will be sold or rented. Mr. Gleason indicated that they are to be sold. Mr. Rutan asked if the lots on Little Pond Road are graded above or below this lot. Mr. Sullivan indicated that they are considerably lower. Ms. Bakstran questioned the fence on the abutting property, which she understands was done jointly. Mr. Sullivan indicated that there is an agreement that there will be some protection of the abutters.

Mr. Litchfield stated that the applicant will be required to obtain a state highway permit as well as an earthwork permit from the town.

Steve Champion, 179 Little Pond, noted that he and his wife Ann are also representing their neighbors at 175 Little Pond Road who were unable to attend tonight's meeting. He explained that, if approved, this project will significantly compromise their quality of life and cited concerns about noise, lighting and privacy issues. He stated that the height of the buildings will encroach on their backyard privacy and, while he recognizes that the applicant has the right to build on his property, he wondered if the project really needs to 4 units. He reiterated his objection to the project in its entirety. He also stated that, if approved, he would like to see some natural screening in addition to a new fence.

Mr. Champion voiced concerns about water flowing down the hill, especially with the two buildings being placed closer to the property line than the existing house. She explained that, currently, water pools in the corner of her property and she is concerned that the situation will get worse. Mr. Sullivan explained that any increase in the impervious surface must be analyzed and mitigated. He also noted that the applicant cannot do anything about the hill, particularly since it is not on his property. Ms. Bakstran explained that the applicant could build two single family homes of the same size and height on the property.

Mr. Champion asked if it is possible to move the buildings closer to the street. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the Board of Health's requirement for the location of the septic system dictates the location of the buildings.

Ms. Bakstran asked about installing arborvitae along the fence line. Mr. Gleason stated that Mr. Abu had agreed to install the fence and would likely wish to speak to the neighbors before committing to anything further. Ms. Bakstran asked about the location of the fence. Mr. Sullivan noted that the existing fence is 20 feet into the property. Mr. Gleason explained that the existing fence will need to be taken down in order to get the new foundation in, so would likely not be able to be put back in the same location. He also noted that he will need to ensure that the new homes have some type of back yard. Ms. Bakstran explained that the fence issue is not within the board's jurisdiction. Mr. Atchue suggested that the fence be included on the asbuilt plan.

Mr. Rutan asked if some of the large trees will need to be removed. Mr. Gleason indicated that it might be possible to retain some of the larger trees.

An audience member asked if there will be decks off the back of the units. Mr. Gleason indicated that there will likely be patios. Ms. Bakstran asked if it might be possible to locate the patios further away from the property line. Mr. Atchue cautioned the board that any conditions in the decision need to be enforceable.

Brad Blanchette made a motion to close the hearing. Mark Rutan seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

#### **DECISIONS:**

**113 Main Street** – Mr. Rand asked if the board has a copy of the latest site plan. Ms. Joubert confirmed that there is one in the file.

Mark Rutan made a motion to grant a variance to allow off-street parking in the front of the building. Jeffrey Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Mark Rutan made a motion to grant a variance to allow a waiver of the 20 foot maximum front setback in the Downtown Business District to allow a setback of up to 90 feet. Jeffrey Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Mark Rutan made a motion to grant a special permit to allow the extension of the use 50' into groundwater area 3 with the following conditions:

1. In the event the Special Permit from section 7-07-010C(3) is granted, this project as submitted will not need to meet the requirements of section 7-07-0 10D(1) (c)[3] as the lot would be considered pre-existing non-conforming and therefore would not be required to contain the required 20,000 s.f. to allow the proposed use by right.
2. The applicant has submitted all items as required in section 7-07-010 D (4) (a) [1-5] which are required with an application for a Special Permit or Variance and has stipulated the building will not store any hazardous chemicals which should be included as a condition of approval.
3. The application also indicates that if a Medical Office is proposed in this building the applicant will provide the requested information needed for containment of medical waste/supplies and request a modification to the Special Permit. Any approval of this project should contain a condition requiring the applicant to

return to the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Groundwater Advisory Committee to amend the Special Permit prior to any medical office occupancy of the proposed building.

4. The application includes a “Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Plan and Long-term Pollution Prevention Plan” which indicates copies of all inspection reports, contracts and invoices for the work performed shall be provided to the Town Engineer annually, this statement should also be included as a condition of approval.
5. An as-built site plan shall be submitted to the Town Engineer for review and approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. The as-built plan shall include, at a minimum, and as applicable to the project, a permanent benchmark, elevation of all pipe inverts and outlets, pipe sizes, materials, slopes; all other drainage structures; limits of clearing, grading and fill; all structures, pavement; contours; and all dates of fieldwork. Upon approval by the Town Engineer one (1) mylar and three (3) paper copies of the as-built plan shall be submitted in addition to an electronic copy compatible with the Town’s GIS system and the Town’s vertical datum (U.S.G.S. Datum of 1988).

Jeffrey Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Mark Rutan made a motion to grant a special permit site plan approval based on the plans dated March 30, 2016, the DPW letter dated April 4, 2016, and the DRC letter dated April 4, 2016, and with a condition that the lighting and signage plan must be approved by the Town Planner and Building Inspector. Jeffrey Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

**357 Main Street** – Mr. Blanchette voiced his opinion that the proposal is excessive and does not fit the neighborhood. Ms. Bakstran agreed, and stated that she would prefer to see two single family homes on the property. She also commented that it is unfortunate that the abutters had a fence that benefited them for many years. Mr. Leland noted that the alternate of two single family homes with two driveways and two backyards would still not resolve the issue with the fence. Mr. Litchfield noted that drainage calculations would not be required for single family homes. Mr. Leland stated that, if approved, the board can include conditions to address the issue of drainage that would not be possible if the project were for single family homes. Mr. Rand noted that zoning allows duplexes by special permit, and indicated that he does not agree that this project significantly changes the neighborhood.

Ms. Bakstran reiterated the Building Inspector’s request for the fence to be included on the as-built plan. She also asked if there is anything that the board can condition to address the concerns about the water issue.

Mr. Blanchette reiterated his discomfort with the proposed duplexes. Ms. Bakstran agreed, but suggested that denying the application may result in more damage. Mr. Rutan recalled that the board had denied special permits for the project on South Street and was told that it could not defend that position. Ms. Joubert stated that she intends to bring forward some sort of driveway bylaw for duplexes at the 2017 Town Meeting.

Mark Rutan made a motion to grant a special permit to allow two, 2-family dwellings in the Residential C District on the property located at 357 Main Street. Richard Rand seconded; motion carries by a vote of 4 in favor and one opposed (Brad Blanchette opposed).



Mark Rutan made a motion to grant a special permit to allow two, 2-family dwellings in the groundwater protection overlay district with the following conditions:

1. This project as submitted includes all computations necessary to verify it meets the requirements of section 07-010 D (3) (c) [6]. Section 07-010 D (3) (c) [6] states a Special Permit may be granted for two-family and multifamily residential development on lots of at least twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, such that the increase in post development net runoff shall not exceed existing conditions by more than fifteen percent (15%) or such that the impervious cover of the building lot is increased over the existing conditions by no more than fifteen percent (15%). The application does indicate the impervious cover is increased over existing by more than 15% and recharge is proposed to offset that increase.
2. Section 07-0 10 D (3) (c) [6] also states a Special Permit may be granted for two-family and multifamily residential development on lots of at least twenty thousand (20,000) square feet provided any on-site sewage disposal is less than or equal to two hundred twenty (220) gallons per day per ten thousand (10,000) square feet of lot area. The plans and application indicate the project is proposing a total of 880 gallons per day and this condition should be included in any approval.
3. The applicant has submitted all items as required in section 7-07-0 10 D (4) (a) [1-5] which are required with an application for a Special Permit.
4. The application includes a “Stormwater Operations and Management Plan Final Commissioning and Long-term Maintenance Program” which indicates copies of all inspection reports, contracts and invoices for the work performed shall be provided to the Town Engineer and Groundwater Advisory Committee, this statement should also be included as a condition of approval and all of this information shall be forwarded annually.
5. An as-built site plan shall be submitted to the Town Engineer for review and approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. The as-built plan shall include, at a minimum, and as applicable to the project, a permanent benchmark, elevation of all pipe inverts and outlets, pipe sizes, materials, slopes; all other drainage structures; limits of clearing, grading and fill; all structures, pavement; contours; and all dates of fieldwork. Upon approval by the Town Engineer one (1) mylar and three (3) paper copies of the as-built plan shall be submitted in addition to an electronic copy compatible with the Town’s GIS system and the Town’s vertical datum (U.S.G.S. Datum of 1988).

Richard Rand seconded; motion carries by a vote of 4 in favor and one opposed (Brad Blanchette opposed).

**Minutes of the Meeting of January 26, 2016** – Mark Rutan made a motion to accept the Minutes of the Meeting of January 26, 2016 as submitted. Brad Blanchette seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

**Minutes of the Meeting of February 23, 2016** – Jeffrey Leland made a motion to accept the Minutes of the Meeting of February 23, 2016 as submitted. Richard Rand seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Mark Rutan made a motion to adjourn. Jeffrey Leland seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

**Meeting adjourned at 9:15PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Rowe  
Board Secretary