

SEEKONK PLANNING BOARD
Public Hearing and Regular Meeting
April 12, 2016

Present: Ch. Abelson, M. Bourque, R. Bennett, S. Foulkes, L. Dunn, J. Roach, D. Sullivan

Ch. Abelson opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and introduced the Planning Board Members

Reorganization of the Planning Board:

(A motion was made to move the reorganization of the board to the end of the meeting in order to continue with Public Hearing of Curt Street Extension)

M. Bourque made a motion to approve, D. Sullivan seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: 7-0 Approved

Chair: Neal Abelson

Vice Chair: Dave Sullivan

Clerk: Ron Bennett

Vice Clerk: Sandra Foulkes

SRPEDD Representative: James Roach

Alternative SRPEDD: Phoebe Lee Dunn

CPC Representative: Dave Sullivan

Continued Public Hearing for Definitive Subdivision Curt Street Extension

(Public hearing continued from the February 9, 2016 and March 8, 2016)

Alex Gorodetsky the engineer representing Joseph Vieira from Gorodetsky Engineering was present. His office is located at 422 North Main Street in Fall River, MA, telephone number 508-617-4678. Mr. Gorodetsky addressed the comments made in Woodard and Curran's report.

- 1) They are in accordance with our Rules and Regulations so there are no concerns regarding the stormwater regulations;
- 2) A letter was provided by the BOH stating the percolation tests are still valid and no additional tests are required;
- 3) The Water Department provided procedural comments that will be addressed when the water is connected; and
- 4) There are no concerns from the Fire Chief at this time.

Mr. Gorodetsky advised that he met with Mr. Agostini to address his concerns regarding his property. While Mr. Gorodetsky was viewing Mr. Agostini's property, he also paid close

attention to what was happening on Chelsea Drive. He concluded that a lot on Chelsea Drive that abuts Mr. Vieira's property is built up 3-4 feet and is graded towards Mr. Vieira's property. Additionally, there is a 6-8" drainage pipe several feet short from Mr. Vieira's property. He is not sure what the pipe is used for, possibly for a sump pump or rooftop runoff. Mr. Vieira took some pictures of the pipe for documentation. It was determined that the runoff goes from this lot to Mr. Vieira's property to Mr. Agostini's property. To alleviate potential runoff from Mr. Vieira's property, the swale width was increased from 6' to 10'.

L. Dunn asked if the flow would go into the brook.

A. Gorodetsky demonstrated the flow on the plans. The capacity of the swale is equivalent to about 3.5' wide. It will go into a retaining area and when the water fills up, there is a control structure that regulates how fast it will go into the brook.

L. Dunn asked if it will be lined with stone.

A. Gorodetsky said the swale will be grass. He referred to page 3 of the plans and highlighted the area on the plans.

J. Aubin advised the latest plans were reviewed at the last TRC meeting and met requirements.

A. Gorodetsky stated the bridge was designed by a bridge engineer and meets the requirements for emergency vehicles.

D. Sullivan requested the bridge certification.

J. Vieira said it was provided to the Building Inspector's office before the bridge went in.

J. Aubin said the Building Official recommended the certification as to the installation of the bridge itself.

J. Vieira replied okay.

S. Foulkes asked Attorney Gorodetsky about the 42" pipe that is able to take 60 acres of water.

A. Gorodetsky said he made that comment as a comparison.

S. Foulkes asked if it would be able to handle the one hundred year storm.

A. Gorodetsky answered yes and he ran the calculations.

D. Sullivan asked if the depth had changed at all.

A. Gorodetsky replied only slightly. He referred to the plans since it does change due to the grading of the land.

M. Bourque asked if the driveway at the last house should be a hammerhead because it does not look like the same design as the other hammerhead.

A. Gorodetsky said the fire code allows for a Y-shaped or L-shaped design as long as it has enough room for fire apparatus.

M. Bourque requested "No parking" signage be required because he is concerned that if parking is there, there will not be enough room for emergency vehicles.

A. Gorodetsky said whatever it needs. The Fire chief did not object to the L-shaped design.

M. Bourque referred to the design of the swale. He asked if the swale in the plans was gathering water only from their land.

A. Gorodetsky said no it will gather runoff from Chelsea Drive (referred to plans).

M. Bourque said his concern is for creating problems for residents on Sykes Road. He asked to hear comments from Mark Pereira (engineer with Woodard & Curran)

M. Pereira explained Woodard and Curran has been reviewing this project for approximately 6 to 8 months and have gone back and forth with the Applicant since August. The majority of the remaining comments were relative to the stormwater design. The applicant has sufficient information to demonstrate they're compliance in with the stormwater regulations for Massachusetts and Seekonk.

M. Bourque asked if Woodard and Curran are comfortable with this project.

M. Pereira said they have no major concerns at this point.

Ch. Abelson asked if they would be supervising some of the work being completed.

M. Pereira said if the Town would like them to supervise the work being done, they can supervise construction of the stormwater management feature. Typically it would be the retention basins and also the swale.

J. Aubin advised to make sure this was included in a motion since this is not the normal operating procedure, however in this instance, it makes sense that Woodard & Curran do the inspections since they are familiar with the project.

D. Sullivan reiterated that monitoring the construction is imperative.

J. Aubin said when the developer is ready to move forward with a certain stage of construction they will notify our office, as well as the engineering firm. The engineering firm coordinates someone to witness the work and then provides a report to us advising what was or was not done, and if it was done in compliance and/or provides us with a list of items that need to be remediated.

Mr. Agostini said there is a mess on Chelsea Drive, this project should not been approved, and the \$95,000 in surety should not have been released. He thinks the swale should be fine as long as it is maintained. He also recommended a retention basin on Chelsea Drive, take that water and pipe it to the brook. There is 3' of water on Lot 12. He accused the board for letting the developer get away with it and created the problem for Chelsea Drive and Sykes Road.

Ch. Abelson explained that surety is released when certain stages are met.

Mr. Agostini said the money was released in 2007 when the water problems were already noted.

A. Gorodetsky said he noticed the problem on Chelsea Drive, however, those problems on Chelsea Drive have nothing to do with the Curt Street Extension. He suggested looking at draining Chelsea Drive via a large enough pipe into the brook. It would have to be looked at, but conceptually it can be resolved.

R. Bennett asked for ramifications or legalities of trying to alleviate the problems on Chelsea Drive going through someone else's property.

Attorney Ilana Quirk from Kopelman and Paige said it would require permission through either an easement or a fee to whoever owns the land for a pipe or a trench to put in and it sounds like it's not within the jurisdiction of the board right now and is outside this particular project. But there would be a way if the parties were willing, all got together to try to solve the problem, and they had the necessary ownership interests, then they could do it.

Greg Gauthier, 100 Chelsea Drive, advised the PB that he reviewed documentation at the Town Hall. The development started somewhere around 2005 and in 2008 InSite Engineering conducted a drainage remediation plan. He said he does not know what the outcome was, however, in May 2009 the Town of Seekonk engaged CEI to conduct an investigation into the characteristics and causes for the reoccurring drainage issues. In the report there were recommendations for further actions. Homes Engineering were the original engineers and advised in order for the drainage design to be effective, the original grading of the lots must be adhered to. Apparently they were not adhered to due to all the problems. Mr. Gauthier explained he was personally familiar with the surety process and feels that it was not properly managed during the Chelsea Drive development. Therefore, he has great concern that there will be problems with this project as well. According to the report from CEI, it stated the design of the lots were not adhered to, ponding of water on lots continue, recharge system failed, and the drainage improvement plan done by InSite did not adequately consider the soil conditions of the

plan when they put in their recommendation. Mr. Gauthier reiterated that the existing issues continue and ducks were in his yard last week from the last rain storm. He asked how the town can allow continued development of the surrounding land before the existing issues are rectified or addressed. The developer has made offers to try to help with the existing residence that abut the land, however, this needs to be done in a formal manner, in writing, with specific instructions. If this subdivision is allowed while there are existing and outstanding concerns, then the lines can be blurred as to what happened and who is the cause of the problems. He said the town has a fiduciary responsibility and possibly a liability if they do not incorporate some type of solution with the abutting property.

D. Sullivan asked for counsel Kopelman and Paige to speak on this matter

Attorney Ilana Quirk answered the question of whether the developer of the particular parcel of land is required to address a problem outside of the developer's land. In her opinion, a developer is not required to address a problem that preexists and is outside of the developer's land. The only jurisdiction that the board has, with respect to the development before it, is as to the development before it. As mentioned earlier, in the event that all of the property owners who are concerned about an existing problem, if they can come together and cooperate, and give the necessary easements, and get the permissions to do the drainage a different way and to create a different mechanism to deal with existing problems, then that can certainly can happen, but that would not be before this board this evening.

D. Sullivan asked if moving forward and taking this development aside, how can the town facilitate that type of a correction.

Ch. Abelson said the board cannot make Mr. Vieira take the water or have the water go on his property. The drainage system on Mr. Vieira's land is going to be taken care of by the homeowner's association. We can work with them to come to some sort of resolution with Mr. Vieira after the fact, but we can't

D. Sullivan said so basically the residents on the street need to come up with funding to do what is suggested.

Ch. Abelson explained the board can't tell Mr. Vieira that he has to do this or the subdivision will not be approved. The board cannot make that a legal condition.

M. Bourque asked if an easement can be put on the property now for potential drainage work.

Ch. Abelson said only if he was receptive to it.

R. Bennett asked if it would be similar to a right-of-way.

Attorney Quirk explained the easements on the plans serve the development. If the applicant wished to give a drainage easement to an adjacent development, they could do so. But when she mentioned that they all could get together and cooperate (all the people with the necessary property interest), there are a couple of things that would have to happen. First, all the people would have to get together and do a design of the system. Then there would be permitting of the system to make sure that whatever infrastructure is put in satisfies all of the criteria for putting drainage in. So there is the design and implementation.

M. Bourque asked if that would have to be handled by Conservation.

Attorney Quirk said that it would also be an issue for this board with respect to the subdivision approval you are being asked to give. If you were to give it now, it would be based upon very specific calculations that relate to all the different drainage calculations for this development. In the event another drainage easement is given and water would come in from off-site that might be possible, but you would need to do drainage calculations to make sure there was no overburdening of the land. There are a number of things that you would have to consider.

Ch. Abelson said if you put in a pipe and the water is running fast, you'd have to have some type of barrier to keep water from running full rampid into the stream. Similar to a detention system on it. I don't think Mr. Vieira's detention area is large enough to handle a different subdivision in addition to his.

Attorney Quirk said if Mr. Vieira was willing then there would have to be a determination that putting it into the land you are talking about right now will work.

J. Aubin said that is a modification of any approval that might be granted.

S. Foulkes referred to the memo provided by the BOH. She remains concerned since the percolation tests from 10 years ago are still considered in compliance even though the land has been disturbed.

Attorney Quirk said she is not familiar with various specific regulations regarding to the age of testing but they will have to satisfy Title V when they come in for individual septic systems.

J. Aubin said inspections will be done on each septic system so if the soil has changed to such a degree, it will be determined at that time. Without speculating, had Chelsea Drive been constructed as approved by this board, there probably would not have a drainage problem because the water would be getting to where it is supposed to be. The drainage system for the roadway appear to be working since there were not any puddles in the roadway during the most recent rain storm. However, puddles were certainly noted in the residents' yards. Mr. Aubin also took a ride to Sherman Avenue and thinks this is not a problem just pertaining to Chelsea Drive. A broader look should be taken and this is somewhat of a first step in addressing some of the issues in the Chelsea Drive area.

D. Sullivan thinks it's all related to the Runnin's River Water Shed. Similar to the storm from 3 years ago when it flooded, the back tributary washed out the bridge on Woodward Avenue and came downstream to this area we are talking about now and continued on down the Runnin's River across Arcade Avenue, through the golf course, and out to Barrington Cove. Considering this development is sitting in the middle of the watershed for the Runnin's River and for all the drainage that comes into the water shed and into the river, not only do we have a problem with this area but it could possibly affect Sherman Avenue, Papino Road, Woodward Avenue, right along all the way through to where the Runnin River starts.

J. Aubin said Mark has indicated that this design achieves a zero net increase in runoff from the site.

D. Sullivan asked if it has the potential to do something further upstream. Realizing this is only 4 houses and Mr. Vieira is trying control what he can, but you can only control so much. He reiterated his concern for the Runnin's River, drainage issues, and how the new development can affect the existing problem on Chelsea Drive. He asked if they can guarantee that this development will not cause more issues.

(In audible - too many people from audience speaking at one time)

Attorney Quirk responded to the drainage concerns. As time goes on and with smaller houses, more cars, and more impervious surfaces this creates drainage concerns. There are a number of causes of drainage issues when development occurs; 1) was the testing appropriate; 2) was the design appropriate; 3) or was the installation not appropriate. What she is hearing tonight is that there were post infrastructure installation issues at Chelsea Drive perhaps with respect to the way it was contemplated. She recommends that the board consider what they do have jurisdiction over tonight. Consider adding a condition to the HOA that they will be required once a year (perhaps in the spring) to go out and inspect the drainage to make sure it hasn't been filled in, trees haven't been planted, it has been mowed properly, etc. and then give a certificate to the town once a year. Under Chapter 41, 81Y there is the ability of the Planning Board as the enforcing authority for subdivision conditions, if there is a violation of one of these conditions to undertake enforcement, you have to do it within a year of knowing or one year of the violation occurring and that is when the certificate would come into play. So you have the condition to potentially say the HOA needs to go out and make sure it's inspected, it's in good condition, it's been maintained or repaired, whatever is necessary and give the certificate to the Town Planner or Building Inspector to go out and inspect it. That should be a condition as well. And once a year you would have this check and balance to make sure that the drainage that's out there is working appropriately.

A. Gorodetsky refers to the plans to demonstrate the total run off (background noise) for the site itself is 120 acres. The site itself is 8 acres. Of this 8 acres we are disturbing about 3-4 acres.

The change in runoff is minimal. He said his designs are generally very conservative and stands behind his work.

M. Bourque referred to the front page of the plans regarding the requirements for maintenance of stormwater system and if it requires a yearly inspection from a certified engineer?

A. Gorodetsky answered no it is not a certified engineer. It is (inaudible).

M. Bourque asked if it was a maintenance program. He also recommends that the board is provided with proof the maintenance was done.

A. Gorodetsky explained that the way it is done is through the HOA... There are many ways that this be done (i.e. surety) but that is for you to decide.

M. Bourque said we just need to make sure this is completed yearly.

A. Gorodetsky also said Mr. Vieira will be living here and maintaining his property.

J. Aubin advised the board does have a letter signed by a number of residents to be entered into record. Also, the FEMA flood maps notes that the area is in a minimal flood hazard notwithstanding the existing drainage issues will be entered into the record.

Ch. Abelson asked if the board has a copy of the HOA.

J. Aubin said one has not been provided since we have not gotten to that stage yet. That can be required as part of any decision that may be issued.

M. Bourque asked Mark Pereira if they only looked at this particular property or if they looked at surrounding properties as well. If they did, did they note any concerns this development may cause for neighboring residents?

M. Pereira said he did do a site visit of the surrounding areas (mainly to check to see if the information that was provided was consistent with the conditions) and he said there were no concerns at this time.

M. Bourque asked if we can confirm this will not create a backup further upstream with any water issues.

M. Pereira explained this is sitting at the bottom of the watershed so as water moves downhill, this property is the last thing it sees. Right now there isn't anything on the property that would indicate any sort of blockage from water moving the 8 acres if it were not for the site of the tributary that is running through it. So that would be the only way that it would have a detrimental impact upstream as if there was a blockage and there is currently no blockage.

Ch. Abelson asked if the retention area keeps the flow of water consistent with how it goes off the property now.

M. Pereira answered yes. The Massachusetts Stormwater Standards are fairly strict and not every single state in the US requires these types of standards, but in Massachusetts, given the density of development, they do have stricter standards and the standards are essentially geared towards when you put a project in place that the project will not have detrimental impact post conditions. They have to meet preconditions standards and that is from a quantity and quality standpoint.

Mr. Agostini asked if it will be setup where the homeowner's will be responsible for maintaining the swales.

Ch. Abelson answered yes.

M. Bourque asked Mr. Aubin what will be the town's enforcement of the swales/stormwater management will be going forward if they fail to maintain it.

J. Aubin referred to Attorney Quirk's statement regarding taking enforcement action, such as, issue a violation, send a notice, and take enforcement action as laid out in the Mass General Laws.

Attorney Ilana Quirk said it falls under Ch. 41 Section 81Y.

M. Bourque informed the public that there is an avenue for the town if the HOA does not do their due diligence.

Ann Borah said her home is next to lot 4 which is the opposite end of the bridge. She asked if the new owners will be informed of what they will be responsible for. She also said that the area is swamp land.

Ch. Abelson said it will be on the deed.

Sandeep Sodhi, 110 Chelsea Drive, said oversight of the development was mentioned but would like to know who will pay for the oversight during the construction.

Ch. Abelson the developer pays for it.

L. Dunn reiterated the letter that was signed by 43 abutters should be part of the record.

D. Sullivan made a motion to close the public hearing at 8:15 p.m., M. Bourque seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: 7-0

M. Bourque asked for final thoughts or recommendations from Mr. Aubin.

J. Aubin recommends the HOA adhere to the maintenance and the inspection provisions of the stormwater management plan and designate Woodard & Curran to be the inspecting engineers.

S. Foulkes reiterated that the developer will be paying for that.

J. Aubin said that is the process.

Ch. Abelson asked to entertain a motion to approve the 4 lot Subdivision - Curt Street Extension with the following conditions;

1. Final Board of Health approval of the proposed wastewater treatment systems;
2. Final approval of all proposed utility extensions by the Seekonk Water District, Columbia Gas, National Grid and any other utility provider as appropriate;
3. The turnaround area on the eastern portion of the shared driveway shall be marked "No Parking";
4. Proper address and directional signage is to be provided at the start of the shared driveway at Curt Street directing responding emergency vehicles to subdivision lots 2 and 3;
5. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for subdivision lots 2 and 3, certification from a registered engineer shall be submitted to the Building Official with regard to the adequacy of the bridge, as designed and installed, to carry emergency vehicles and other heavy equipment;
6. All construction within the development shall strictly adhere to the drainage patterns and site grading as shown on the final, endorsed definitive subdivision plan;
7. Final resolution of any outstanding comments on the design of the stormwater management system between the Planning Board's consulting engineer and the project engineer;
8. Barring modification of this decision as provided for in **Section IX of the Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land in the Town of Seekonk** and Chapter 41, General Laws Section 81Q; there shall be no further subdivision of the subject parcel than shown on the approved definitive subdivision plan, resulting in new lots for development;
9. Any such other conditions the Planning Board may deem necessary to ensure compliance of the application with the applicable provisions of the **Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land in the Town of Seekonk**; and
10. The HOA be responsible to provide yearly inspection and yearly certificate to the town for the drainage swale and drainage system. This inspection will be supervised by Woodard and Curran.

M. Bourque requested there be one correction be made. He requested the turnaround must be conformed and be in compliance with the fire code.

Attorney Ilana Quirk said the HOA is to be provided for review before the plan is endorsed and be recorded before building permits are issued.

Ron Bennett made a motion to approve the 4 lot Subdivision - Curt Street Extension with the aforementioned conditions, Lee Dunn seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 7-0

Form A: 1058 & 1080 Fall River Avenue

AP 7, Lots 15 & 16 located in a Highway Business Zoning District.

Paul Carlson from InSite Engineering was present representing the applicant Harry Leiser Revocable Trust and 1058 Leiser, LLC. The location is on the northeast side of the section of Highland Avenue and Route 6 and 114. The current site has Five Guys Pizza, West Marine, etc. within that commercial area. Mr. Carlson summarized the proposed Form A. A 3,000 sq. ft. doctor's office pad is being proposed on the existing property. The building will be 42x76 on the north side and adjacent to the miniature golf course. He advised a zoning variance for the front side setbacks was granted. The island and parking will be reconfigured within the existing site, more spaces will be created, a new access on the western side of the property will be created and traffic will not be able to cross over to gain access to the southern section. Drainage has not been compromised and there will be separate utilities.

S. Foulkes asked if all the current businesses were staying.

P. Carlson answered yes.

M. Bourque made a motion to approve the ANR, D. Sullivan seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 7-0

Site Plan Approval: 1058 & 1080 Fall River Avenue

AP 7, Lots 15 & 16 located in a Highway Business Zoning District.

Paul Carlson from InSite Engineering was present representing the applicant Harry Leiser Revocable Trust and 1058 Leiser, LLC. The location is on the northeast side of the section of Highland Avenue and Route 6 and 114. The current site has Five Guys Pizza, West Marine, etc. within that commercial area. Mr. Carlson summarized the proposed Form A. A 3,000 sq. ft. doctor's office pad is being proposed on the existing property. The building will be 42x76 on the north side and adjacent to the miniature golf course. He advised a zoning variance for the front side setbacks was granted. The island and parking will be reconfigured within the existing site, more spaces will be created, a new access on the western side of the property will be created and traffic will not be able to cross over to gain access to the southern section. Drainage has not been compromised and there will be separate utilities.

John Aubin addressed items identified during the staff review; 1) existing condition - the reserve area that is currently servicing the existing commercial plaza does contain a catch basin. The reserve will need to be relocated. However, it does not impact the proposed development on Lot 15; 2) posting of the building numbers; 3) ingress and egress located on lot 15 will be noted as right in and right out so large emergency vehicles will be able to do a U-turn.

D. Sullivan asked if there was a restriction of loading/unloading stock for the front of the building or if it is restricted to the rear only.

Ch. Abelson said we try to encourage that but due to the age of the development it may not be applicable.

P. Dunn asked if a curb cut was needed.

P. Carlson said yes and a packet was submitted to Mass Highway. The new ingress and egress is located to the north of that lot. Mr. Carlson referred to plans to demonstrate the traffic pattern.

S. Foulkes asked if the building will be two stories.

P. Carlson answered it will be one story only.

R. Bennett asked Mr. Aubin if this proposed site plan meets all parking requirements.

J. Aubin referred to parking calculations on page 4 of the Site Plan.

P. Carlson verified parking requirements and reconfiguration.

L. Dunn asked about the proposed landscaping.

P. Carlson said certain trees will be transplanted and the trees that can't be transplanted will be replaced.

D. Sullivan made a motion to approve with the Site Plan with the following conditions: 1) numbers on buildings and free standing signage; 2) curb cut approval pending MassDOT; 3) BOH approval; and 4) such other conditions as the Planning Board deems appropriate to ensure that the proposed development meets the required site plan design standards as set forth in the Town of Seekonk Zoning by-Laws. M. Bourque seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 7-0

Discussion: Modification of Covenant, Lot 1 Pine Hill Estates (Jacoby Way)

Attorney Michael Ferragamo from Brainsky Levinson, LLC was present representing Najas Realty to seek modification for existing covenant with regard to Pine Hill Estates. This is a 9 lot subdivision and 7 of the 9 are occupied. This covenant is to Lot #1 specifically. They are seeking a modification to permit the construction of a residential structure on the lot to allow marketing of the property and to finish existing site issues with the property (finish paving, installing the sidewalk).

M. Bourque said he is unfamiliar with allowing a developer to build on land that we have a covenant against.

Attorney Ferragamo said partly for the request is to finish the final grading to complete the final paving issues. There is only a current binder coat.

D. Sullivan said he has concerns with the size of the cul-de-sac and the width of the roadway. Vehicles are having difficulties maneuvering while backing out of their driveways and the concern of proper room for Fire trucks. He recommends those issues being taken care of before approving the request.

M. Bourque recommends not approving since this is not the process. Surety is suggested to construct a residence.

The PB members discussed surety, covenants, and the possibility of setting a precedence going forward.

D. Sullivan made a motion to deny authorizing the modification to the covenant, M. Bourque seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Not to approve 7-0

Discussion: Modification of Covenant, Lot 1 Orchard Estates

Attorney Michael Ferragamo from Brainsky Levinson, LLC was present representing Najas Realty to seek modification for existing covenant with regard to Orchard Estates. In lieu of the denial of modification of covenant of lot 1 of Pine Hill Estates, he withdrew his motion.

Discussion: Country Brook Estates

Costa Development, LLC
Change affordable Lot from Lot 18 to Lot 1

J. Aubin advised the PB that Mr. Costa not present.

The PB requested a continuance until the next meeting scheduled for May 10, 2016.

R. Bennett made a motion to continue this request until May 10, 2016, D. Sullivan seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 7-0

Discussion: Spring Town Meeting Streets Proposed for Acceptance

Jane Howland Estates - Todd Mello
Girard Estates (Betty's Way) - Attorney Marcelino
Tall Pines Drive - Steve Ippolitto

J. Aubin advised he has not been made aware of any concerns from DPW & Public Safety. BOS will have public hearing regarding the street acceptance.

D. Sullivan made a motion to forward the streets for proposed acceptance to be heard at the next BOS public hearing with our positive recommendation, L. Dunn seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 7-0

Discussion: SRPEDD Update

J. Aubin advised the board their request for the SRPEDD grant to help with the bikeway had been denied. He also advised the board that GIS has added new tools to the system and has allowed him to do some additional mapping. At that time, neighboring communities, agencies, public meetings can be contacted/conducted. Predominately existing streets and roadways and ideally in the future possibly off-road bike paths.

Monthly Department Update

J. Aubin advised the EDC, Assessor's Board and the Finance Committee have before them the TIFF agreement for the FedEx facility and will be forwarded to the Spring Town Meeting. He also provided an update on FedEx.

D. Sullivan requested a work session with Attorney Ilana Quirk to discuss options, requirements, and the capabilities for the PB.

Ch. Abelson said some things may fall under the Conservation Department.

M. Bourque advised if we request counsel present the PB will need TA approval.

J. Aubin will request TA approval to have work session with Legal Counsel

D. Sullivan requested a work session to discuss the sign By-law. He also would like to discuss the option having 2 meeting per month for a couple of months; 1) regular meetings/public hearings; 2) work sessions to discuss sign By-law, Subdivision Rules and Regulations, etc.

L. Dunn would like to have a ZBL that protects natural resources.

JA advised the office is currently reviewing the Subdivision Rules and Regulations and suggestions will be forwarded to the board for their review. Also, if in the meantime the PB members have any suggestions/recommendations to please forward them to the office.

S. Foulkes and L. Dunn discussed the recent conference they attended.

Approval of Minutes:

M. Bourque made a motion to approve the 2/24/2016 minutes, R. Bennett seconded and it was approved by Ch. Abelson, L. Dunn, J. Roach, D. Sullivan and S. Foulkes abstained due to absence.

S. Foulkes made a motion to approve the 3/8/2016 minutes with corrections, D. Sullivan seconded and it was unanimously approved.

Adjournment

A motion was made by R. Bennett to adjourn the meeting, M. Bourque seconded and it was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Kristen L'Heureux