

**Sutton Planning Board  
Minutes  
September 24, 2018**

Approved \_\_\_\_\_



12/24/18

Present: J. Anderson, R. Largess Jr., W. Whittier, M. Sanderson, W. Baker  
Staff: Jen Hager, Planning Director

W. Baker acted as a full member in place of Scott Paul.

**General Business**

Minutes:

Motion: To approve the minutes of 9/10/18, M. Sanderson  
2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Whittier  
Vote: 4-0-0

(R. Largess Jr. arrives)

Filings: The Board acknowledged the legal filing of the following application:  
6 Burnap Road Retreat Lot – This lot had a previous approval that expired and they are re-applying.

Form A Plans:

Motion: To allow the Chairman to endorse a Form A plan dated showing a conveyance of .41 acres from 156 to 176 Mendon Road once the owners address and easement area are corrected/added, W. Whittier  
2<sup>nd</sup>: R. Largess Jr.  
Vote: 5-0-0

Correspondence/Other:

- Chapter 61 Release – 211 Boston Road: The Board reviewed a letter requesting release of the Town's first right of refusal for property located at 211 Boston Road. The offer on the land that the Town would have to match is \$280,000.  
Motion: To recommend the Town pass over its first right of refusal as there is no obvious municipal use for the parcel, R. Largess Jr.  
2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Baker  
Vote: 5-0-0
- Chapter 61A Release – 156 Mendon Road: The Board reviewed a letter requesting release of the Town's first right of refusal for a portion of property located at 156 Mendon Road. The offer on the land that the Town would have to match is \$5,800.  
Motion: To recommend the Town pass over its first right of refusal as there is no obvious municipal use for the parcel, W. Whittier  
2<sup>nd</sup>: R. Largess Jr.  
Vote: 5-0-0
- J. Anderson updated the Board that the shrubs that had impaired sight distance at Pleasant Valley Crossing have been trimmed, but he has suggested they be removed and moved to Phase III and replaced with something that will not grow to block sight distance in the future.

### **Waiver of Site Plan Review – Blackstone National**

Attorney Mark Donahue of Fletcher, Tilton & Whipple was present with his client Michael Gordon of Blackstone National Golf Course to request waiver of Site Plan Review for replacement of the function tent with a permanent structure.

The new structure will be located 80' northwest of the existing tent. It will be the same size as the tent with the exception of a 1,200 s.f. bump out that will take the place of 2-3 trailers and coolers that currently exist outside the clubhouse and tent, cleaning up the area. The 40' X 80' main structure will be post and beam. Mr. Gordon had provided pictures of similar structures as well as a conceptual rendering.

Attorney Donahue maintained Waiver of Site Plan Review was appropriate as the new structure will be the same size with a small addition for storage and non-public use. The occupancy, use and parking requirements will stay the same. They could obtain Site Plan approval with a myriad of waivers, but they would like to get going on the work and feel it is appropriate to grant the waiver.

There were no comments from the public.

**Motion:** To waive Site Plan Review to allow replacement of the event tent at Blackstone National Golf Course with a permanent post and beam structure not to exceed 3,200 s.f. with a 1,200 s.f. bump out having found 1. The proposed structure will be in approximately the same location as the existing tent (80' farther north from the existing clubhouse). 2. The proposed structure will add only 1200 square feet to the tent's existing footprint, and the sole purpose of the additional square footage is for storage and work space not for assembly. 3. The proposed structure will be used for the same purposes as the existing tent (gathering people to eat and commune together). 4. The proposed structure will maintain the same seating capacity as the tent. And 5. The proposed structure will not be visible from public ways or abutters, subject to the following conditions: R. Largess Jr.

1. Approval of all other applicable departments, boards, and committees.
2. Prior to applying for a building permit, the applicant will provide final architectural and landscaping plans for the new building to the Planning Board for approval.

2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Whittier

Vote: 5-0-0

### **Public Hearing – Scenic Roadway – 382 West Sutton Road**

As no one was immediately present for this hearing, it was tabled until after the next scheduled hearing.

### **Public Hearing – Site Plan – Sutton Solar LLC Phase 2 – 25 Oakhurst Road**

Steve O'Connell of Andrews Survey & Engineering returned with Alex Curlin of Nexamp to review the changes made in response to comments for Phase 2 of the Oakhurst Road solar project. He noted they have applied for and received negative determinations from both the Northbridge and Sutton Conservation Commissions. Graves Engineering has completed their review and recommended minor corrections have been made. Additionally, they have completed other recommended changes requested in the Planning Department and other departmental review correspondence.



With respect to the issue of inadequate screening for this phase and Phase 1. They have confirmed the plantings are the correct species but do not know why they are not growing as they should. They will add another row of plantings and investigate why the original plantings are not growing and take corrective actions to effect the intended screening.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. O’Connell stated these movable panels will track East to West only, they will not swivel 360°.

The Board reviewed the one requested waiver to allow extension of the site drive within the front setback.

Motion: To approve the waiver from Section IV.B.1. to allow the access driveway in the front setback as the intended screening will be accomplished despite the reduced setback,  
M. Sanderson

2<sup>nd</sup>: R. Largess Jr.

Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: To grant Site Plan Approval for a 1.3 MW solar photovoltaic installation straddling the Sutton/Northbridge town line subject to the following conditions: R. Largess Jr.

1. Approval of all other local, state and federal authorities and bodies.
2. Prior to endorsement of the Site Plan, reference to this Site Plan approval shall be entered upon the plans.
3. Prior to endorsement of the Site Plan, notes shall include a provision for replacement of dead or diseased plantings within a month of discovery and if not in a planting season they will be replaced at the start of the next planting season as well as removal of staking at the conclusion of one year.
4. Prior to endorsement of the Site Plan, notes shall include provisions to maintain the access driveway year round to provide safety vehicle access and all site amenities such as fencing, etc. in good and working condition.
5. Prior to any clearing, the limit of clearing shall be staked and a representative of the Planning board shall verify the limits with a representative of the applicant and the clearing contractor.
6. Prior to commencement of construction the applicant will be required to provide and up to date estimate for full decommissioning of the site as well as execute a surety agreement and provide decommissioning surety in a form acceptable to the Planning Board. The Board reserves the right to review the total amount of surety in years 5, 10, and 15 (approximately) and require additional funds should variables such as inflation, salvage value, etc. require an increase.
7. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Owner/Applicant (Operator) shall supply the Planning Board with copies of the following:
  - a. Site Control –documentation of control of the project site, sufficient to allow for construction and operation of the solar photovoltaic installations;
  - b. Utility Approval –evidence that the utility company that operates the electrical grid has approved the planned solar photovoltaic installation; copy of interconnected customer–owned generator agreement shall be provided.
8. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Applicant/Engineer shall submit three (3) complete prints of the endorsed site development plan, one (1) fifty-percent (50%) reduced prints and one (1) electronic copy to the Sutton Planning Office.
9. A Knox box shall be installed at the gate as approved by Sutton and Northbridge fire departments and shall contain a fully knowledgeable contact list for the site as well as appropriate system information for emergency response.

- 10. Any illumination, including security lighting shall be arranged so as to reflect away from abutting properties and be directed in a manner to limit light trespass.
- 11. Prior to start-up of the facility, the site engineer shall submit and As Built plan and written certification that the site has been constructed substantially in accordance with the plans approved by the Planning Board.
- 12. Prior to start-up of the facility, the Owner/Applicant (operator) shall provide the Fire Department with training and knowledge necessary for first responders to this location including a walk-through of the entire site, in consultation with the Fire Chief.
- 13. Prior to start-up of the facility, the Owner/Operator shall provide the Police Department with security information and keys, etc. for site access.
- 14. The Board reserves the right to review site landscaping and require additional plantings to achieve intended screening

2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Whittier

Mr. Curlin asked a question about surety. J/ Hager stated the applicant will have to follow the same process they did for Phase 1 where they produced an estimate for full removal of the system for the Board's review and approval and a performance agreement and schedule of deposits will be developed before construction can begin.

W. Whittier asked if a second knox box will be necessary or just more info in the first one? A second box will be necessary as this is a separately fenced installation with a different access point.

Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: To close the public hearing, R. Largess JR.

2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Baker

Vote: 5-0-0

**Public Hearing – Scenic Roadway – 382 West Sutton Road**

J. Anderson read the hearing notice as it appeared in The Chronicle.

J. Hager stated she was not certain why the applicant was not present.

No other parties were present for the hearing.

The Board noted they would like pictures of the existing stone wall as pictures submitted do not clearly show its construction type. The Board also asked if the Historic Commission had any comment.

Motion: To continue the public hearing to 10/22/18 at 7:20 PM, W. Whittier

2<sup>nd</sup>: M. Sanderson

Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: To Adjourn, W. Whittier

2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Baker

Vote: 5-0-0

Adjourned 7:45 PM