

SEEKONK PLANNING BOARD
Public Hearing and Regular Meeting
March 8, 2016

Present: Ch. Abelson, R. Bennett, S. Foulkes, J. Roach, D. Sullivan
Absent: L. Dunn and M. Bourque (with cause)

Ch. Abelson opened the meeting at 7:01 p.m. and introduced the Planning Board Members.

Continued Public Hearing for Definitive Subdivision Curt Street Extension

(Public hearing continued from the February 9, 2016)

J. Aubin advised the PB that Woodard and Curran provided supplemental correspondence and copies were provided to the board members.

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 summarized four outstanding issues:

- 1) Request made for shorter granite bounds (6x6x4)
- 2) Location of the fire box
- 3) Total suspended soils
- 4) He disagrees with comments made by the engineer regarding the percolation tests. Mr. Gorodetsky referenced Stormwater Management Regulations. It is his understanding that according to page 2 of the Mass Regulations a 4 lot subdivisions shall not apply. He stated as far as infiltration is concerned, it is the depth of the groundwater table. He said he could comply with this requirement, however, this would require waiting for the private driveway and reconfiguring the design. His design goal is to minimize disturbance as much as possible.

Mark Pereira a civil engineer with Woodard and Curran, who is working on behalf of the Town, was also present. He asked Mr. Gorodetsky for the reason why he disagrees with the comments.

Alex Gorodetsky said that the standards state that it shall not apply to a 4 lot subdivision.

M. Pereira explained their concern is not with the size of the development but with the practicality of the infiltration basins. He further went on to explain their last review and based on where they saw groundwater (sides of the basins), he suggested they do a bounding analysis. Mr. Pereira explained that when you have an infiltration basin and you have groundwater, as water starts to infiltrate through the basin, the groundwater starts to rise and the distance between the new groundwater level and the bottom of the infiltration basin is essentially where you get your treatment. So as groundwater starts to take up that layer, that otherwise would have had groundwater beyond the infiltration basin, you are no longer getting the treatment you need. So essentially it is making sure it is getting treated and it's infiltrating at the rate you designed.

A. Gorodetsky said he understands, however, state regulations do not require complying with the standards. He stated that it has been a gray area. It says it shall not comply.

M. Pereira said that is something they will review. Regardless of what the stormwater regulations state, he is looking at the practicality and functionality of the systems. Typically there are regulations and/or requirements the PB can require if they feel they have just cause. He further went on to comment on the TSS removal and 44% is standard. We have seen it on other applications that when you have higher infiltration rate, the higher the infiltration rate, the less amount of time that stormwater can be treated. You want to make sure it is cleaner before it hits the infiltration basin.

S. Foulkes asked if the BOH made a determination on the percolation tests on the 4 lots.

J. Aubin said he is waiting for further review from the BOH but not necessarily regarding the percolation test.

D. Sullivan said the number and locations of the fire hydrants have not been addressed. He also asked if there have been comments regarding the size of the main going in, services, etc. from the Water District.

J. Aubin explained when the PB office receives each application/plans, they are sent to each department for comments. To date, the Water District has not responded in regard to this 4 lot subdivision. If a decision does occur tonight, conditions of approval can be; 1) Water District approval; 2) response regarding the fire hydrants/boxes; and 3) confirmation of the turnaround that was discussed at the last meeting.

D. Sullivan asked if the PB made a decision tonight in regard to items 12 and 14, would it be contingent on approval from the BOH and Conservation.

J. Aubin said the septic systems is in the purview of the BOH. In regard to the driveway and the construction done to date, that was facilitated by Conservation approval which was granted in January.

D. Sullivan referred to comments for item number 12 dated 3/3/2016. It mentioned the reason for the analysis is because the infiltration basin is less than 4 feet. The height of the water table and the affect it was going to have on construction was brought up at the last meeting. Mr. Sullivan asked what that would do to the placement of the structures in that area as far as the water table.

J. Aubin said that is one of the key issues considering the development that has occurred around this property over the years and the storm water situation that is out there now.

D. Sullivan asked if the application can be denied based on the response from our consultant engineer and concerns we have regarding the water table. He stated his main concern is the water issue because of what comes uphill will go downhill.

J. Aubin said the applicant's engineer provided testimony saying they can conduct a mounding analysis and could probably provide for a handling of the dissolved solids, so denial at this point may be questionable. The PB can consider making a provision for an "exemption" for the 4-lot subdivision that has been referenced in the Stormwater Management Handbook Volume 1 Page 2.

D. Sullivan expressed his concern with approving the subdivision and inquired as to whether the BOH and/or Conservation could request future approval if the houses get flooded 1-5 years down the road.

Ch. Abelson said either a continuance must be requested tonight or the application can be denied.

A continuance was discussed among the PB members, Mr. Gorodetsky and Mr. Vieira.

S. Foulkes requested answers from BOH and the Fire Chief...

J. Aubin said he would draft memos to the Fire Department, BOH, and Water District.

D. Sullivan is concerned with follow-up and follow-through with the engineer regarding the water.

S. Foulkes is concerned with the 10 year old perk tests. She would recommend new tests since the area has been disturbed by the removal of trees.

Mr. Gorodetsky said the perk test done last October passed and he does not think the BOH will require more tests. He said that the perk test has nothing to do with the amount of trees and groundcover. It is an easy site to perk and the groundwater table is good. However, they will await the decision from the BOH.

M. Pereira said there have been situations when there are concerns relative to the infiltration capacity of the basins that post construction tests can be required to insure they are working as they were engineered. There is an option of having an engineer oversee the construction and to make sure there is no activity going on to impact the infiltration capacity.

George Agostini lives at 145 Sykes Road. He presented photographs of the area and flooding that has occurred to Chelsea Drive, Sykes Road and Lauren Drive. He advised the board when he developed houses on Sykes Road (from the brook to the end where his home is located) not one grade was changed and all the lots stood the way they were. He stated Mr. Vieira is going to have his elevation 8 feet above virgin soil and he is bringing in a thousand yards of fill for his house as well as the other 4 lots. He does not think the PB should not approve this subdivision because the people who live in the neighborhood should be protected. He thinks the 6 ft. swale with 12" deep will not be adequate to handle the amount of water they get. He referred to page one of packet he provided to the PB members and summarized foundations, elevations, walls, trenches, swales, and the direction of water flow. Mr. Agostini is not against building but would like it done correctly so it does not affect the surrounding neighborhoods. He feels this is going to impact everyone and will ask his own engineers to review this subdivision if Mr. Gorodetsky approves it.

Mr. Gorodetsky said he was not sure about that.

Mr. Agostini continued to discuss abutting properties and referred to the plans. He stated the people on Lauren Drive's basements will be below or close to the water table because of the grades. Fill should be brought in to protect your neighbor not negatively impact them. The house foundations, grades, elevations were discussed.

J. Vieira explained the only thing that is being built up is the leach fields and that is the purpose of the walls. The wing walls going out is in the front of the house. He is doing all the swales so water doesn't go into anyone's yard. He believes it should take in water that has already impacted their yards and now will go into his property. He is doing more and more to try to protect the neighbors. He is trying to do everything in his power to keep water from going anywhere. If anyone has a problem resulting from him, he will fix it. He is not looking to dump water in anyone's property. He stated the reason he is not bringing in fill in the backyard and doing a walk-out basement is to keep the water running toward the front.

Mr. Agostini said he is correct about only building up the front and not the back. The wing walls will stop water from pushing Mr. Vieira's earth around and will only push the water out to the neighbors.

Peter Servidio has lived at 122 Chelsea Drive for almost 10 years. They were promised things by the developer, as well as the town, but most of it did not come to fruition. We were promised culverts, swales, irrigation. Instead we have ducks, geese, water, and an ice skating pond. He is asking for the subdivision to be done correctly and asks for a promise from the board and the town that it is going to be done correctly.

S. Foulkes recommends denying the application at this time until the grading and design standards can be confirmed by the engineer.

M. Pereira said he can only speak to what his firm looks at. They look at what is contributing to the site and where the site is contributing to. Based on the information that they were given, the applicant did define the watersheds correctly. Their concerns is if the water is going to be infiltrated from the site to the neighbors' properties. We do see that things are coming onto the site and that swale that they have proposed will collect water from adjacent sites and the site itself and discharge it off to the river. I cannot speak to the internal grades but I am not seeing any real concern based on the perimeter boundaries of the watershed. There are 10 standards that are required by the state that applicants must comply to. Aside from the watershed, we look at the quantity leaving the site and we always need to know what is leaving the site under the existing conditions and where it's going. What is discharging now is discharging to the tributary to the Runnins River. The applicant is not proposing discharging anything new to the adjacent properties. It's all going down to the tributary.

Ch. Abelson asked if Mr. Pereira would agree that it is taking some water away from abutting properties.

M. Pereira said yes because the watershed limits actually extend the property line so it is actually collecting water from the adjacent properties, managing it on their site and sending it to the tributary.

S. Foulkes asked if the water flow will be changed to some degree if trees are removed and impervious material is being added. Also, will the river be able to accept it all without overflowing its banks.

M. Pereira said that is the purpose of the infiltration basins. If you look at the site the way it is, there is no storm water management features. It's just running off site to the tributary. When you go in and develop you need to provide stormwater measurement that is going to hold back that excess flow so you are not going to be creating problems downstream of the site. The purpose of the infiltration basins and swales is to mitigate any new development that is on the site vs. what is currently....

S. Foulkes asked if the size being designed will be adequate for the potential water flow.

M. Pereira said yes. The applicant provided calculations to show what is happening under existing conditions vs. what is happening under proposed conditions. Those calculations are then used to size the basins by using a software program to run the analysis. Based on the information we were given, the basins are designed to honor the conditions.

Ch. Abelson asked if it will handle the 100 year storm.

M. Pereira said that it would not necessarily handle the 100 year storm but it is sized to manage 100 year storm without creating any adverse impacts.

D. Sullivan what is difference between manage and/or handle the 100 year storm.

M. Pereira said there are some storms that you would have to essentially detain or retain flow and that is so you don't make conditions downstream worse. Then there is above that. Anything that is above that just needs to be managed in a sense that it's not just going to wherever it needs to go, you are sending it where it needs to go. You don't necessarily need to treat it, you don't necessarily need to attend to it, but you need to retain it. Anything above that you are managing it so it does not overtop the banks. The velocity is tied to the flow. The more flow you have on a site, the higher the velocity. The calculations show the flow off the site is the same or below the existing conditions.

S. Foulkes said she is still concerned.

Ch. Abelson would like to continue this hearing to obtain the information that has been requested.

R. Bennett asked Mark if he felt comfortable with the design of the swale to move and direct the water in a certain direction.

M. Pereira asked Mr. Gorodetsky if he had a flow map.

A. Gorodetsky said he did not have it with him.

M. Pereira did take a drive to Chelsea Drive and Sykes Road today and said he would meet with the residents if they wished to discuss some issues.

A. Gorodetsky demonstrated on plans where the runoff will go. He said if it would make Mr. Agostini comfortable, we could make the swale wider. He also referenced the grades of the houses. The swale cannot be made deeper because of groundwater table. Another suggestion would be to address the roof runoff.

S. Foulkes asked about the one permit the applicant has is for a private drive.

J. Aubin explained it is an existing residential lot of record.

M. Pereira said the concerns raised by neighbors appear to be concerning what is leaving the site and causing problems to the adjacent properties. One suggestion I would make is to request the applicant to make some cross sections through the property. Essentially outline the property and then show what the grades do along that line. If that can be visually seen, the high points will be seen.

Greg Gauthier has lived at 100 Chelsea Drive for about 4 years. He asked if there is a process in place to insure that what happened at Chelsea Drive does not happen again, and if it does, what will be done about it. Even if everyone has great intentions, the same thing could happen again. Similarly to Mr. Agostini, he asks that the PB protect the people currently living there. Additional concerns he stated; 1) according the Subdivision Rules and Regulations and the plans, he did not see a topo at 1' intervals; 2) concerns for a performance bond; 3) concerns with the swale not helping his property and the possibility of making it worse because his property is at a lower grade and water will not travel upward.

Mr. Agostini said that since all 4 lots have had 5-6 ft. of fill brought in, a 6' swale, 12" deep is not going to handle the water. The board should protect the people and not the developer.

D. Sullivan asked if a continuance to the next meeting is appropriate at this time or if a denial is appropriate based on case history according the Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

J. Aubin said that is a question for legal counsel or the courts.

Ch. Abelson said an applicant has to adhere to the Rules and Regulations and the board has to find something that does not meet the standards or requirements.

D. Sullivan asked if a denial is appropriate based on what has been presented.

Ch. Abelson responded that if our engineer gave us something that said it wouldn't work, then we could legally deny it. However, if it is denied without a conflict to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations or drainage calculations, then it may end up in court.

D. Sullivan said we could find a similar situation that happened at Chelsea Drive if there is an engineering situation that is not caught during the construction phase.

R. Bennett said if the engineer spells it out... There have been mistakes made, such as on Chelsea Drive, but we don't have...

D. Sullivan expressed his concern with the possibility of building on wetlands in the future.

Ch. Abelson said Conservation Commission will examine the wetlands.

D. Sullivan said he is of the opinion that the board should understand the legal repercussions and legal opinion of what can and can't be denied.

J. Aubin said certain criteria must be met in order to approve a subdivision, or if it can't be met, why. A valid reason must be given if it is to be denied. In this situation, both the applicant's engineer and the planning board's engineer said the design meets the standards.

D. Sullivan said he is concerned that everything relies on everything being done exactly right, and if one thing isn't done exactly right, we are going to have problem.

Ch. Abelson said we have to take our engineer's expert testimony as far as infiltration areas and construction.

J. Aubin addressed an abutter's concern regarding surety. The process of surety is established after approval when the applicant comes forward with a construction cost estimate, the board makes a decision whether or not that is acceptable amount. Under today's regulations when a subdivision gets approved, an engineering oversees the process, the applicant comes back before the board to reduce surety or to discuss a change to the design. There is specific engineering oversight that goes into the installation of public improvements, and in this case, the storm water improvements as well. Approvals do not get signed off on and the applicant is off to do what they may.

D. Sullivan asked if this application falls under the appropriate cause to enter into executive session with legal counsel for advice.

J. Aubin said a request can be made to legal counsel but applications need to be addressed during public hearing.

D. Sullivan suggested making a request for legal advice due to the concerns raised. He is not against a continuance but does request more information before making a final decision.

J. Roach asked for the conditions of moving forward with a continuance.

Ch. Abelson said responses from the Fire Chief, BOH, Conservation, the engineer has requested information, and the possibility of making the swale a little wider.

M. Pereira suggested Mr. Gorodetsky provide cross sections to show how the grades change (existing vs. proposed). He reiterated that he will meet Mr. Gorodetsky at the site to discuss this matter.

J. Aubin said the TSS removal, the mounding analysis, fire suppression details, hammerhead details, BOH comment regarding the perk test, Water District regarding the water line, widening the swale, roof drainage mitigation, and response from Conservation Commission.

Ch. Abelson asked if Conservation gave them final approval.

A. Gorodetsky explained if this project is approved, then the project goes to the Conservation.

J. Aubin will contact TA to speak with Town Counsel.

R. Bennett made a motion to continue this hearing to conduct further fact finding, D. Sullivan seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 5-0

Ch. Abelson asked if anyone in the audience was here for the public meeting concerning the By-law amendments or against moving to the next agenda item. Hearing no objection, the next item was heard.

Site Plan Approval for 728 Fall River Avenue

Paul Carlson from InSite Engineering was present for the applicant, Tony Albuquerque and Dormans Auto, for the proposed Site Plan Application. The property is located at 728 Fall River Avenue, AP 9, Lots 159-164 and is located in a Highway Business Zoning District. The proposed plans for the used car lot was provided and shown to the board. The biorention area, lighting requirements, landscaping requirements were also provided. He explained there will be 35-40 parking spaces, a 1500 sq. ft. office building located to the rear of the property with 4 parking spaces to meet the requirement for the office space. An agreement with Charlie Tapalian has already been met and Woodard and Curran are in their final review stage.

J. Aubin advised the board that there is a paper street identified as Rachel Avenue and they should move forward to merge the lots.

S. Foulkes inquired about the wetlands.

P. Carlson said the wetlands are further northeast of this lot and about 200 ft. away.

S. Foulkes asked if there will be enough room to park the cars.

J. Aubin said this is a stand-alone use and there will not be any automobiles being repaired at this site.

D. Sullivan referred to the BOH memo stating a concern regarding the potential of standing water.

P. Carlson said it is designed for 100 year storm event within the stormwater regulations. It mandates the entire system to be able to be drained in 72 hours and it is consistent with the design and the material underneath it.

J. Roach asked if the report from W&C had been received yet.

J. Aubin said there were a couple minor issues with regard to the swale but that should be resolved shortly.

David Sullivan made a motion to approve the Site Plan with the following conditions; 1) approval by MADOT, curb cut approval; 2) approval of the proposed waste water treatment system by the BOH; 3) staff and peer review of the application and submission of a final plan; 4) applicant shall pursue the formal abandonment of the Rachel Avenue, if necessary right-of-way, and submit such plan or plans as may be required to merge the lots of record comprising the site and reconfigure the property line between the subject lot and AP 10A, lot 16 as shown on the submitted plan in conformance with the Subdivision Control Act.; 5) There shall be no more than forty (40) automobiles located on site being offered or held to be offered for sale; 6) There shall be no repair or servicing of automobiles on site. It was seconded by Ron Bennett and unanimously approved.

VOTE: 5-0

D. Sullivan asked if Abandonment of Rachel Avenue would have to go to town meeting, and if so, then it will not be heard until the fall.

J. Aubin said that it would be a condition without approval. The applicant can still move forward.

P. Carlson said as long as there is an agreement between both parties then construction still can take place. We have to do a title search to make sure this was not abandoned and it may be done by a deed depending on the original agreement.

S. Foulkes is concerned with the traffic in this area.

J. Aubin asked about the line of site.

P. Carlson said there is great site vision, but also agrees with the amount of vehicles that travel this road. Vehicles and trees will not block line of site.

S. Foulkes asked about the signage.

P. Carlson said there will be a free standing sign which will be located on the north side of the property. The specific plan will go to the Building Inspector for approval. It will probably be illuminated but will not flash.

VOTE: Approved 5-0

Discussion: Preliminary Plan for Brady Estates

11 Lot Subdivision located off Lake Street, AP 16, Lot 3 located in an R-2 Zoning District

Paul Carlson from InSite Engineering represents the applicant, Heritage Realty Enterprises, LLC for the preliminary subdivision of Brady Estates. The property is approximately 500 yards south and west of the intersection of Lake Street and Route 44. This particular parcel comprises of about 10.8 acres of land. The existing property in general is existing farmland with old collapsed structures located on the property. The terrain from east to west have wetlands that run along the outside perimeter. The proposed subdivision will have 11 lots that meet the R2 Zoning District. Each lot will have individual septic systems and all utilities are available off Lake Street (water, gas, electrical will be brought in). The drainage will utilize LID components, swales, bioretention areas to handle the 100 year storm event. There will be sidewalks on one side of the roadway per the regulations. One waiver is being requested for the roundings. We meet the criteria for the roundings of the roadway but we do not have the roundings for one right-of-way,

J. Aubin advised the board this lot is owned in common with lot 38 to the rear. They are both non-conforming lots.

S. Foulkes asked if it will be a HOA.

P. Carlson replied yes and advised that they did meet with the TRC. Feedback was provided by DPW and the Fire Chief in regard to the cul-de-sac and the discussion remains open.

J. Aubin advised Dave Cabral from DPW prefers an open cul-de-sac without a landscaped island.

Ch. Abelson asked about the plans for the unbuildable lot (lot 12).

P. Carlson explained it would be used for open space and/or possibly drainage.

S. Foulkes asked if lot 12 was wetland.

P. Carlson said no it is still part of farm, but due to the geometry of it, you can't put anything there.

D. Sullivan asked if there were wetlands in that area.

P. Carlson said no but it does surround the entire parcel of land. He further stated, to date, the wetlands have not been flagged. The information he provided to the board is based on GIS information, other maps, and us walking the site to visualize where the wetlands are. We will have that flagged and provide more information during the definitive phase. We feel comfortable where the wetlands are right now.

J. Aubin asked if they felt comfortable that the wetlands will not extend out into the cul-de-sac.

P. Carlson said absolutely not.

J. Aubin asked if T-loop was a consideration as opposed to the cul-de-sac.

P. Carlson said no due to the width of the lot.

R. Bennett made a motion to approve the preliminary subdivision plans for Brady Estates subject to inclusion of lot 38 and further discussion regarding the cul-de-sac/island, J. Roach seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 5-0

Site Plan Application for 120 Highland Avenue

AP 8, Lot 131 located in a Highway Business Zoning District

Michael Levinson attorney for the applicants D'Angelo's and Brian McLaughlin was present. He provided current and future photographs of the building.

David Bray an engineer with Caputo and Wick was also present on behalf of the applicants. He summarized how the building façade will modernize the plaza. About 6,000 sq. ft. will be demolished at one end of the building and a new space will be built adjacent up against the existing structure because Buffalo Wild Wings require higher ceiling heights. The existing building is 10 ft. off the northerly property line and will now be 15.2 ft. The subject parcel is comprised of 89,999 square feet of land and 97 parking spaces. We are proposing landscaped islands which will reduce the pavement of 2,000 sq. ft. The existing drainage system, as well as the improvements to the drainage system, was discussed and collection points will be added. The existing commercial space for seating was discussed for D'Angelo's, Town Fair Tire and Buffalo Wild Wings. Proposed parking will have 91 spots and will include striped handicap spots. He advised a waiver was requested for a peer review because it is an existing facility and drainage system. He advised the septic system is in review with the BOH.

R. Bennett asked if the curb cut at the southern corner of lot is new or existing.

D. Bray said it is an existing curb cut.

R. Bennett asked about the landscaping plans.

D. Bray explained the required 7 trees will be planted and the proposed lighting is 19' high.

J. Roach asked about where service deliveries will take place.

D. Bray showed the delivery plans to Town Fair Tire. Town Fair Tire just renewed their lease for 10 years.

J. Roach asked about where the cars drive in and out of the bays.

R. Bennett asked if 30% shading on the parking lot will be sufficient.

D. Bray explained due to existing utilities and location of the new light poles, planting trees is difficult.

J. Roach inquired about people parking in the Raymour and Flannigan parking lot.

D. Bray pointed out the property line and said it would be at their own risk and not promoted by the owner. However, there is plenty of excess parking due to a cross easement for parking next door.

D. Sullivan made a motion to approve the site plan with the following conditions: 1) approval of the proposed waste water treatment system by the BOH; 2) resolution of any outstanding comments generated by the staff review; and 3) waiver. R. Bennett seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 5-0

Discussion: Approval Not Required for land located at 246 Cross Street

AP 28, Lot 156 and 169

David Bray the engineer with Caputo and Wick was present on behalf of his client, Jeffrey Seyboth. The parcel is located on the southerly side of Woodland Avenue and the westerly side of Cross Street. Mr. Seyboth is building a house and would like to acquire this piece of land (referred to in the plans). It would open up the land by the garage. Essentially, it is a land swap of 3809 sq. ft. into lot 2 and 1700 sq. ft. into lot 1. Both lots meet the frontage and area requirements of the R-4 zone.

Discussion took place in regard to location of the driveway and reasons why the driveway will be placed in such a way.

R. Bennett made a motion to endorse the Form A, D. Sullivan seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 5-0

Public Hearing: Spring 2016 Zoning By-law Amendments

Opened the public hearing at 9:30 p.m. to discuss the spring 2016 Zoning By-law Amendments.

D. Sullivan made a motion to waive the reading of the advertisement, R. Bennett seconded and it was unanimously approved.

The Planning Board Members were introduced.

J. Aubin advised the PB that there has been one additional correction and an amendment to section 6.10-11 with regard to the Continuing Care Residency Overlay District to make it consistent with the other time frames. The BOS reviewed the proposed corrective and substantive Zoning By-law amendments and have requested four changes/corrections:

1. A typographical and citation correction to §2.1.3, paragraph four, has been added to the corrective amendments.
2. Footnote 7 to Table 4.2.4 Business and Commercial Uses has been made applicable to the proposed Gas and Fueling Station land use classification.
3. Proposed minimum front/corner side yard setback for the local business district has been increased to 10 feet.
4. Roadways have been excluded from the minimum density calculation for conservation subdivision developments in the WRPD.

Mr. Aubin asked the PB to review the proposed amendments, consolidate the corrections and substantive changes into the warrant document for town meeting. He will solicit public comment, discuss this matter with a full board, and forward a recommendation on the proposed amendments as deemed appropriate to Town Meeting.

A motion was made by D. Sullivan to close the public hearing, R. Bennett seconded and it was unanimously approved.

Public Hearing closed at 9:33 p.m.

A motion was made by D. Sullivan to present the ZBL amendments, substantive and new provisions, as well as with the noted amendments and corrections to the Spring Town Meeting, R. Bennett seconded and it was unanimously approved.

VOTE: Approved 5-0

Monthly Department Update

J. Aubin discussed the recent EDC event with approximately 55-60 attendees. He also advised the board the application to SRPEDD for technical assistance had been submitted.

Discussion of the casino in Taunton took place and how it could affect the Town of Seekonk. Possible opportunities may include secondary benefits such as the hospitality industry and restaurants.

Approval of Minutes: January 12, 2016 and February 9, 2016

R. Bennett made a motion to approve the minutes from January 12, 2016, D. Sullivan seconded and it was unanimously approved.

D. Sullivan made a motion to approve the minutes from February 9, 2016, J. Roach seconded and it was unanimously approved.

Adjournment

S. Foulkes made the motion to adjourn the meeting, R. Bennett seconded and it was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Kristen L'Heureux