

Town of Leicester Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jason Grimshaw, Chair; Debra Friedman, Sharon Nist, Andrew Kularski

ASSOCIATE MEMBER: Robyn Zwicker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Alaa AbuSalah

IN ATTENDANCE: Michelle Buck, Town Planner; Barbara Knox, Board Secretary

MEETING DATE: **May 15, 2018**

MEETING TIME: 7:00PM

AGENDA:

- 7:00PM Public Hearing, Special Permit Application (continued)
Amendment of Special Permit (SP2016-03) for Curtis Self-Storage at 1749 Main Street, Applicant: C&J Realty Trust
- 7:25PM ANR Plan
Pine Street; Applicant: Susan Shea
- 7:30PM Public Hearing, Special Permit Application:
Open Space Residential Development, Mayflower Circle/Holcomb Street (SP2018-01) Applicant: Central Land Development Corp
- 8:00PM Public Application:
Preliminary Subdivision plan, Parker Street (SUB2018-02); Applicant: Webster First Federal Credit Union
- 8:00PM Approval of Minutes:
 - April 3, 2018
 - April 10, 2018
- 8:45PM Town Planner Report/General Discussion:
 - A. Fire & EMS Headquarters
 - B. Miscellaneous Project Updates
 - C. Board Member Committee Updates

Mr. Grimshaw called the meeting to order at 7:00PM

Public Hearing, Special Permit Application (continued)

Amendment of Special Permit (SP2016-03) for Curtis Self-Storage at 1749 Main Street, Applicant: C&J Realty Trust

Ms. Buck gave an update from last meeting. The applicant is requesting a continuance on proposed change to the west side storage building, because the revised plans were submitted late last week and Quinn Engineering was unable to review them prior to tonight's meeting.

Marc Curtis agreed to be present tonight to discuss the fence issue between the storage facility and the Desaulnier property, but was not present at this time. There was a dispute, around a week ago, where the police and Town Administrator were involved, regarding the last section of fence between the properties. In discussions with the Town Administrator and police, they were under the impression that the Planning Board agreed at the April 17, 2018 meeting to change the fence to a post & rail, which was not accurate. The April 17th minutes were reviewed and there was discussion on the fence, but the Board took no vote or action on it. The minutes indicated the fence be installed in accordance with the approved plan. Because the record was still being reviewed, Mr. Curtis was asked to stop work on just that section of fence and that occupancy won't be held up because of this issue.

After reviewing the record and what was approved, the neighbors are disputing the fence being chain-link with slats. The Board's preference was white vinyl the entire length, but the neighbor's requested that it not be white vinyl because of the issue with wind. The section of fence remaining is 6ft and what was approved is chain-link with slats.

Ms. Buck noted there might be room for change, but the reason for vinyl fencing in that area was to meet the requirement for screening and a post & rail does not meet that requirement. At this point, Mr. Curtis will not agree to put the remainder of fence in as white vinyl, because that was not what was approved.

Discussion with the abutters.

Mr. Kevin Desaulnier was concerned the fence would go all the way to the road and block their sight pulling out their driveway onto Route 9. Where the fence ends now, was 15feet off the road and he didn't want the fence being solid beyond that point. Their properties were surveyed and Mass Highway owned from the property line to the last post. The vinyl fence goes to the last post, then a chain-link starts from the end of the vinyl to the road. He did not like the idea having a chain-link.

Mr. Grimshaw explained what was approved, is what was approved and it was difficult to go back on that. Ms. Friedman asked how many sections of chain-link were installed. Ms. Desaulnier said 5 or 6. Ms. Friedman noted that was approximately 30 feet.

Mr. Desaulnier said that area was 15-20 feet to the road, and like a wind tunnel. He wanted to see a split rail or anything other than a chain-link that allows wind to go through. He said this was discussed at previous meetings. Ms. Buck understood the request being that section of fence not to be solid white vinyl and everyone agreed on chain-link with slats. Mr. Desaulnier disagreed.

Mr. Grimshaw said the concern right now was how far the vinyl fence goes and what the remainder fence would be. Ms. Buck reviewed previous minutes, which stated where the vinyl fence ended and where the transition to chain-link would start.

Mr. Curtis arrived at this point. He explained the 22-point angle towards Route 9 was where the transition point started it's change over to chain-link. The chain-link fence company began to install the fence when The Desaulniers' interrupted the installation process. He understood where the Planning Board's was coming from and it is what it is. Until the Board says otherwise, he will stick with the original plan.

Mr. Desaulnier felt he made it clear what was agreed upon at the last meeting, it just never went to the Board for a vote. Ms. Friedman asked if a step down to from 6ft to 4ft, at the section would be acceptable. Mr. Curtis noted for the Board to keep in mind that the chain-link posts have already been cemented into the ground. When this all came about, the chain-link was already pre-cut and ready to go up.

Mr. Kularski felt it should be left the way it was originally approved and agreed by the Board. All agreed. Mr. Grimshaw said the Board was obligated to stick by the decision agreed and approved in the original decision. That it be a chain-link fence with slats, unless something could be worked out between property owners. Mr. Curtis agreed it was all workable.

Hearing no further concerns or questions, Mr. Grimshaw asked for a motion to continue.

MOTION: Ms. Friedman moved to continue the public hearing on 1749 Main Street Special Permit Amendment, to June 5, 2018 at 7PM

SECONDED: Ms. Nist – Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

ANR Plan

Pine Street. Applicant: Susan Shea

The property owner is creating a new parcel, labeled A, out of a larger parcel. Both lots meet all current zoning, 80,000 sf & 200ft frontage.

MOTION: Ms. Friedman moved to approve the ANR for Pine Street to Susan Shea

SECONDED: Ms. Nist – Discussion: None

Approval of Minutes

April 3, 2018

MOTION: Ms. Nist moved to approve the minutes of April 3, 2018, with minor typo correction noted.

SECONDED: Mr. Kularski – Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

April 10, 2018

MOTION: Mr. Kularski – moved to approve the minutes of April 10, 2018

SECONDED: Ms. Nist – Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

Town Planner Report/General Discussion:

Miscellaneous Project Updates

Complete Streets Grant Project, Public Forum, will be held on Wednesday, May 30, 2018 at 7PM in Room 3. The forum will provide an update on the project and allow opportunity for public input. The project is for transportation projects throughout Leicester and transportation projects that accommodate all users of the road, i.e., pedestrians, bicycles, horses, etc.

Public Hearing, Special Permit Application

Open Space Residential Development, Mayflower/Holcomb Street (SP2018-01) Applicant: Central Land Development Corp.

Mr. Grimshaw read the public notice into the record, gave instructions on hearing procedures and then opened discussion to the applicant.

Mr. Brian MacEwen of Graz Engineering, representing the applicant and Matt Schold, Schold Construction in attendance. They are proposing a 19 lot Open Space Residential Development off from Mayflower Circle and Holcomb Street. The site is approximately 56.7-acres, zoned Suburban Agriculture and Residential 1. The development will be provided with public sewer, water, underground electrical and communication services. A proposed Stormwater Management System will be designed for the development that will conform to current Mass DEP Stormwater standards and the Wetlands Protection Regulations. The proposal includes a new 2,300ft roadway from Mayflower Circle, bisecting all the land, with two wetland crossings, less than 5,000sf that will tie back into Holcomb Street. The lots vary in size and are developed based on current zoning for R1 and SA.

There are 19 lots proposed along the new roadways, having an extension to Holcomb Street and one lot to the north of Holcomb Street. There's an isolated chunk of land, separated by a wetland, having enough of upland area, off the end of Sterling Street, for this developer to also

be allowed to forward with a standard subdivision development by extending Sterling Street. Sterling Street ends 300ft in from Pleasant Street, and there can be an extension made off that roadway, to get additional lots and supported under a conventional subdivision development.

A general calculation of the gross lot area, wetland area and upland areas came up with 30 lots, under a reasonable conventional layout. With the open space design, there were less than what the calculations show. The lots are sized according to the reduced area of lot frontages, to provide the number of lots shown.

The argument was the goal to the Open Space Development plan, to minimize the footprint of the development area and allow a developer to get reasonably similar lot numbers from a conventional design, with an open space design. Under the open space design, the lot area and frontage were reduced.

One of the waivers proposed was to allow 11 lots on the dead-end cul-de-sac [the new roadway off Mayflower Circle]. The bylaw indicates no more than 10 lots under the open space development. Subsequent to the submittal, it was determined that was more of a zoning issue and not a regulation. Once they get into the full engineering design, they may need the 11th lot for Stormwater management. At the very least, there will be 10 lots, with one wetland crossing and the rest of the area will be dedicated open space.

A second cul-de-sac is proposed as an extension of Holcomb Street. They propose 8 lots, with only 1 lot being impacted by the wetlands. Municipal water and sewer will serve all the lots.

Second waiver was to allow reduced pavement width (24 feet instead of 24 feet)

Mr. Grimshaw asked for a review on the comments received from Town Departments. After comments from by the Board, discussion will open up to the public for questions and comments after review.

Mr. MacEwen reviewed the Waiver requests. The key waiver critical to the entire project, was the open space residential regulation for a 100ft buffer around the entire project. The land could be developed as a standard residential subdivision without any buffer, but the frontage along Mayflower Circle would preclude from doing an open space development, because there was less than 200 ft. The waiver is to help provide minimal disturbance to the open space and wetland areas. The open space development is consistent with the neighborhood and won't change the characteristics of the neighborhood.

Mr. Brian Green, Select Board member said the Police informed the Select Board that the residents on Holcomb Ave were concerned with an increase in traffic and public safety on that road. The resident at the top of the street, on the left [north], has a driveway in the front yard and very concerned with someone being hit, because they won't see oncoming traffic when pulling out.

Mr. MacEwen reviewed Quinn Engineering comments.

1) The applicant should address how the wetland perimeter was delineated.

The delineation done, was performed by a previous engineering company, and currently shown on the plan. If allowed to move forward, a full engineering design will be presented, that will work directly with the added information developed through an on-ground survey.

2) The applicant should document the right to restrict or otherwise affect development of unconstructed streets within the subdivision development.

The attorney representing the property owner, indicated, the owners have a right to do what they needed to do with their land. If a legal issue occurs, more information will be provided at that time.

Waiver requests:

1) To allow a dead-end street to provide access to 11 building lots

At this time, that waiver request is withdrawn, because it was a zoning issue versus a planning/regulation issue. If needed, it will be addressed at the definitive stage of development.

Ms. Christine Davis, 41 Mayflower Circle asked what a waiver request meant to allow a dead-end. Ms. Buck explained that in certain sections in the Bylaw the Planning Board has the authority to waive. The section related to the number of lots on a dead-end street is one the Planning Board does not have the authority to waive. She and the Building Inspector determined this waiver request was not something the Planning Board could waive through the special permit process. If the developer wants to pursue 11 lots, they will need to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance. The Planning Board does have the authority to grant the other waivers being requested.

2) To allow a buffer strip of less than 100ft at the perimeter of the project

As stated earlier, it doesn't suit the local characteristics of the neighborhood. The lots are less in area to provide for a dead-end cul-de-sac coming off Mayflower Circle. If needed, they will come up with some concrete numbers to see what will work relative to the development footprint at that location.

3) To allow a traveled way width of 24ft

They felt that was a comfortable width for the number of lots that would be served. Noted in Quinn Engineering review, "a roadway width of 24ft is within AASHTO recommendations".

4) To allow for the deletion of sidewalks

Given the neighborhood, this waiver would be consistent to what is currently exists.

Mr. Joe Ferrantino, 491 Whittemore Street, whose parents live at 37 Mayflower Circle, asked to explain the 100ft buffer requirement. Mr. MacEwen explained under the current regulation in place, any development area that proposes an Open Space Residential Development (OSRD) has to have a 100ft buffer from the edge of that development area, to individual lot lines. He said if this was a standard residential dimensional subdivision, there are no buffer requirements.

Mr. Ferrantino said lot 1 shows 200ft of frontage and asked if that was the reason there can't be a 100ft buffer. Mr. MacEwen said yes.

Ron Davis, 41 Mayflower Circle, mentioned two different things are being discussed, one will give land back to the Town and the second will connect through Mayflower and Holcomb. He asked when land gets deeded back to the Town, what happens to the property if someone wants to build on it, will they have to buy it back from the Town.

Ms. Buck explained Open Space Residential Development versus a conventional development. OSRD development is also known as a Cluster Development in some other Towns. The whole point for this type of development was to allow an alternative to a standard residential development that preserves more open space, by allowing smaller lot sizes. They can't develop more houses then allowed under a conventional development. The lots are concentrated more

closely together, so more land can be protected. It also reduces the Town's maintenance costs to the road, because they are shorter and narrower. In terms of the open space, whether it goes to the Town or Land Trust, the land is required to be permanently protected and cannot be developed in the future. She further explained, a standard development can skip the special permit process and just go through a normal subdivision approval process. An open space development requires a special permit where the Board evaluates the two alternatives and determines whether that was the best layout.

Mr. MacEwen indicated that whoever maintains the open space; a conservation restriction has to be in place for that property, which means it cannot be developed any further.

Mr. Matt Schold, developer of the project, explained his history in Town and understanding on the fear people have with development. He wanted to reassure the residents that an open space development preserves open space. It allows for a smaller footprint, with shorter and narrower roads and that development was part of community growth that helps support the tax base.

Ms. Pauline Anderson, 8 Holcomb Street, asked whether the plans were based on information shown on the engineering plans done in 2004. Mr. MacEwen said yes. Ms. Anderson questioned why the wetland flags at the bottom of her street were not shown on the plan being presented. Mr. MacEwen explained the wetlands were surveyed and put together by the previous owner and indicative to the wetlands on the ground within reason.

Ms. Anderson asked whether the current developer, would be selling off the lots for someone else to develop after permit approval. She was concerned a new developer won't follow the plan and do something else. Mr. Schold explained that regardless of who the developer was, they will be required to abide by the plan the Planning Board approved. Mr. Grimshaw agreed, otherwise it will have to come back before the Board for an amendment to the plan.

Ms. Anderson asked whether the developer knew about the previous special permit and variances needed, before they purchased these properties. Mr. Schold explained the previous developer's conceptual plan proposed 80 duplex units through the State's Chapter 40B housing program. They are not proposing that, only taking some of the survey information the previous owner had completed.

Ms. Anderson said the original development was started in the 50s and couldn't go any further then what's there now, because it's too wet. Another development was proposed in 2004 that never happened because of the amount of the wetlands there. She asked the impact to the area if Holcomb Street is extended and will an additional pump station be built to accommodate the new homes, if so, what will happen with the existing station.

Mr. Schold said the existing pump station will be moved slightly to the end of the cul-de-sac and will accommodate all the homes on the street. There won't be any interruption to service and not change to the sewer connection.

Mr. Robert Anderson, 8 Holcomb Street, asked why they were asking for waivers from sidewalks and width of the street, when the developers knew what the bylaws were before purchasing the property to build. Mr. Schold said the superintendent of Highway recommended no sidewalks. There aren't sidewalks there now and they were trying to stay with the current setting.

Ms. Buck explained it's written into the OSRD Bylaw with this type of development, for the developer to request certain waivers to allow more flexibility, in order to make this type of development happen.

Mr. Kularski asked the current road width of Holcomb Street. Mr. Schold said Holcomb Street is 19ft and Mayflower is 22ft.

Ms. Anderson noted that over the years the Town's people adopted Bylaws to protect the integrity of the Town and the future and safety of the community. Most of the streets in Town do not have sidewalks and a Bylaw was passed to make streets 28ft wide with sidewalks for a reason.

Sharleen McAdam, 7 Sterling Street, asked how this development will affect Sterling Street. Mr. MacEwen said under the conventional design, they were looking to create a lot in that area, because there was a piece of land that had access to a public way. The only issue was Zoning would require some type of Sterling Street extension and improvement. They were not proposing any development on Sterling Street under the open space development plan.

Mr. Walter Hayes, 32 Mayflower Circle, wanted to make the Board and applicant aware of a pond behind 37 Mayflower Circle. He explained a trench that's been there for years along the golf course. Mr. Schold said that's where there will be a wetland crossing.

Christine Davis, 41 Mayflower Circle, asked which plan was being proposed. Mr. MacEwen said the Open Space Residential Development was the proposed plan. They prepared a conventional plan in order to support the number of lots that can be develop under the Open Space Residential. Mr. Ron Davis felt the open space development will have the least amount of impact on both neighborhoods and made better sense.

Ms. Kathy Tritone, 28 Cricklewood Drive, had concern regarding the pond. From the pond is a brook and the brook comes down through the woods, crosses her backyard to Mayflower Circle. After the winter snow and spring rain, the brook becomes a river, flowing in several directions through the woods to the pond. She is concerned with the water table and the water level to the pond.

Ms. Christine Bates, 5 Holcomb Street, had concern with additional traffic being added to Holcomb Street and the current issues residents have pulling out of that street. She felt the open space plan would make it worse for Holcomb Street, because of the one-way in and out. The conventional development would be better because it creates a second means of egress for the residents of Holcomb Street.

Hearing no further comments, questions or concerns, Mr. Grimshaw asked for a motion to continue.

MOTION: Ms. Friedman moved to continue the public hearing on the special permit application for an Open Space Residential Development at Mayflower Circle/Holcomb Street to June 5, 2018 at 7:30PM or as soon thereafter can be heard.

SECONDED: Ms. Nist – Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

Public Application

Preliminary Subdivision Plan, Parker Street (SUB2018-02), Applicant: Webster First Federal Credit Union

Mr. Joseph Antonellis, Attorney on behalf of Webster First Federal Credit Union, Mr. Kevin Davis, General Counsel for the Credit Union & Mr. Robert Demetri, Surveyor/Engineer in attendance.

Mr. Antonellis thanked Ms. Buck for the enormous amount of time she spent with him and his clients to discuss proposed submissions on this preliminary plan. The preliminary plans were done with the possibility of submitting an ANR Plan and the Board to accept their position relative to Parker Street being a public way in the Town of Leicester. They are asking the Board for a sense on what type of waivers they might support.

Parker Street is difficult to travel on, however the Bank owns a significant amount of land they believe can be developed in a reasonable appropriate fashion by improving the roadway. That Parker Street is a public way in the Town of Leicester and eligible for Chapter 90 funding from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for improvements of the Town's roads and ways. This road has been left in disrepair and is very difficult to travel upon, but is a two way street and understood in order to get to the point of creating lots up there, they will need to improve the roadway.

Their initial plan was to file an ANR plan with a road improvement plan, showing basic improvements to Parker Street as laid out on the Preliminary Subdivision Plan. They plan to widen the travel way to 18ft and provide a significant gravel base to allow traffic to move along both sides freely. Other unpaved roads in the Town of Leicester that are public ways and still provide adequate access to the homes along them. Parker Street can be improved to that point where it can provide adequate access.

The plan submitted shows 15 lots, all of which conform to the Bylaw (the smallest at 1.84-acres and the largest at 23 acres, being the last lot on the street). Due to the size of the lots, the Planning Board might see the possible further development of those lots that will create additional traffic along that roadway.

Mr. Antonellis proposed, to the extent the Board can require, a development restriction on the lots, so they can never be subdivided. His client would be agreeable on limiting this project to 15 lots. They were willing to work with the Board to make this a very stringent restriction that will act similar to a Conservation Restriction on the property. He made note that the Police Department approved the plan. Ms. Buck questioned the Police Department realizing Parker Street being unpaved.

Ms. Friedman read comments from the other Town Departments.

- The Fire Department recommended approval with modifications: "Minimum of 2-fire cisterns provided; roadway must be 28' and paved; basecoat pavement in place prior to building permits issued; and that the Fire Department reserves right for additional comment upon receipt of definitive plans."
- The Conservation Commission recommended disapproval: "Insufficient information to complete review"
- The Historical Commission recommended disapproval: "Archaeologically sensitive area, graves, mill sites and old farms. Survey should be done."
- The Highway Department recommended disapproval: "Drainage (stormwater regs?) No open swales; paved surface and minimum of 24' width."

Mr. Antonellis introduced Robert Demetri to address the drainage concerns. Because the road is not paved, you're not required to capture the road runoff. The reason for the swale was to get infiltration along the full length of the roadway and won't have it concentrated at one spot. A gravel surface will absorb the water and won't create problems with the runoff.

Ms. Friedman asked how long gravel would hold up from traffic and plowing. Mr. Demetri said once it's compacted and graded, it holds up fairly well. Ms. Friedman asked how it will hold up with the amount of through traffic the road will get. Mr. Demetri said they were only proposing 15 lots. Ms. Friedman said this is an extension of Parker Street and will make this street a through street. People coming and going to Spencer, will use this road as a cutoff. Mr. Demetri considered placing signs stating not a through road. Ms. Friedman said although the road has not been proven public, it could not be posted not a through road.

Ms. Friedman asked which gravel roads in the Town of Leicester were dead ends or a cut-through that held up to traffic and plowing.

Mr. Demetri did not know any in Leicester, but could point out ones in East Brookfield and Ware. Ms. Friedman said Mr. Antonellis stated there were several unpaved roads in Leicester that are regularly traveled on and being in fair condition. She would like to know where, so she can check the road conditions.

Ms. Buck noted having numerous meetings with Attorney Antonellis and had never indicated the Town would accept gravel roadway and an 18' width. Mr. Antonellis agreed. They were here to explore what the Board's appetite was for developing Parker Street.

Mr. Kularski asked the current road width. Mr. Demetri guessed the current width at 18-20ft. Mr. Kularski was concerned Parker Street becoming a major cut through. He questioned if the location on the archaeology areas were known. Mr. Antonellis said there were no existing foundations.

Mr. Brian Green asked if Board of Health submitted comment. Public sewers were not available, so will there be septic or should there be tight tanks. Mr. Antonellis said the lots were big enough to support a septic system and application will be submitted to Board of Health at the definitive stage.

Ms. Buck asked whether the Bank was willing to discuss options on paving. Mr. Antonellis said the Bank's position was they will not pave the road.

Ms. Buck asked if the Bank was willing to modify their proposal, such as having a shorter dead-end. Mr. Antonellis felt the multiple lots on the street could be reduced and perhaps lessen the impact, but the issue seems to be with the cut through traffic. He wasn't sure about dead-ending the road because he didn't have the authority or ability to do that. The Bank's position is Parker Street being a public way and creating a dead-end could require a discontinuance of the other side of Parker Street. There are landowners on the other side and it could become very problematic in that regard.

Mr. Grimshaw would like to view what a compact gravel road looks like. Ms. Friedman agreed. An example of a road, very similar to Parker Street that was paved at one end and paved at the other end, with nothing developed in the middle was Hemlock Street. The people, who purchased the undeveloped land, had to improve the road and the Planning Board did not require a 40ft way or sidewalks, but did require pavement. That could be something to consider or having two dead-ends, if there were no additional lots.

Ms. Sandy Wilson said if proposing a dead-end with a cul-de-sac would require a width for the fire trucks and emergency vehicles to turn around. Ms. Buck said the last preliminary plan approved for Parker Street; the Board allowed a 2736ft extension of an existing paved portion of Parker Street at the Pine Street end.

Mr. Grimshaw asked what else needed to be considered to move this forward.

Ms. Friedman said the road width is a concern, not just because it will become a cut through, but for fire and safety vehicles to get by. In addition, a cistern would probably be required there for home insurance purposes.

Mr. Antonellis thanked the Board for their feedback and direction. They plan to continue moving forward towards a solution that works for the Town and Bank.

Hearing no further comments or questions, Mr. Grimshaw asked for a motion to continue.

MOTION: Ms. Friedman moved to continue discussion on the Parker Street Preliminary Subdivision to June 19th at 7:15PM and to extend the deadline for a Decision to June 30th.

SECONDED: Ms. Nist –Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

Ms. Friedman asked the applicant to provide a list of gravel streets that are public ways maintained by the Town before the June 19th meeting, for the Board to go and view. Mr. Antonellis made note on the Historical Commission comment that it might be an archeological sensitive area and they walked through the property and found no evidence of old foundations or gravesites.

Town Planner Report/General Discussion Cont:

A. Fire & EMS Headquarters

There have been a number of complaints within the last few months from the residents abutting the new fire station. One resident asked this be brought to the Planning Board's attention. The concerns are about the Stormwater basins not retaining water and should be draining better. The basins don't drain as they should because of the soils in the area. However, that is not necessarily causing the water issues with the neighbors. That was undetermined at this point. The complaints state the basin was overflowing.

Noted in Quinn Engineering's recent memo dated 4/26/18: "Engineer's records should be notified of the reported inconsistencies in the basin operations. The Town should require him/her to review this report, re-evaluate the performances of the Stormwater systems and identify means of remedying the inconsistencies."

The Town Administrator asked that Quinn Engineering take a look at the site. It's not Quinn Engineering's job to design and evaluate the solution. The people who built it have that responsibility. The Town Administrator spoke with the builder and set up 2 meetings with the abutters in June. Ms. Wilson noted the meeting was set for June 11, 2018.

B. Miscellaneous Project Updates cont.

Outdoor Storage

A request from Hank's Marine asked the Board to consider allowing outdoor storage with fencing and perhaps amending the Bylaw. Hank's Marine is an existing business in the Cherry Valley section of Town that is a grandfathered use. He has been using a property on Route 9 for boat storage, as the overflow area. There are no permits or approvals for the Route 9 site and no one ever sought enforcement on it. The owner of Hank Marine is looking to buy the property on

Route 9 and expand boat storage there. He's interested in the Board amending the Zoning Bylaw to allow outdoor storage.

Upon discussion, the Board noted these concerns: outdoor storage becoming a collection of old rusty vehicles; how to control or enforce outdoor storage; and environmental concerns.

Ms. Friedman suggested looking into what other Towns have for outdoor storage and how they regulate them. All agreed to review again after additional research.

Cell Tower

Mr. Grimshaw asked for an update regarding Huntoon Highway Cell Tower Appeal. Ms. Buck said after an extremely protracted discussion, the ZBA agreed to an advertised public hearing on May 29, 2018, to discuss a proposed settlement. The Town Moderator has been asked to moderate the meeting.

Mr. Grimshaw asked if the meeting was only to discuss a potential settlement and whether the ZBA can keep control of the meeting. Mr. Green noted the Town Moderator will keep the meeting on course. Mr. Grimshaw voiced a lot of concern on the amount of money the Town has spent so far on a case he felt should have never gotten to this point with the courts. Mr. Green motioned at the Select Board meeting, to drop this case and the motion failed 2 to 3.

Main Street Solar Farm

Ms. Nist noticed this solar project was preparing to connect to the grid. Ms. Buck said she will follow up with this project and get an update on some unfinished work.

Barber's Crossing parking

A parking plan not yet received to date.

Moratorium on solar farm

The Board agreed the Town should look at a cap on solar farms.

C. Board Member Committee Updates

The Poultry Committee held their first meeting on May 8th. It was a productive meeting, putting together a very ambitious schedule. They agreed to meet twice a month, on the 3rd and 4th Tuesdays. The next meeting scheduled for May 22, 2018. They will look at other Town Bylaws, define what backyard poultry is and then look at how much poultry someone can have, based on the amount of square footage.

Hearing no further comments, questions or concerns, Mr. Grimshaw asked for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: Ms. Nist moved to adjourn meeting

SECONDED: Mr. Kularski – Discussion: None –VOTE: All in Favor

Meeting adjourned at 9:35PM

Respectfully submitted:

Barbara Knox

Barbara Knox

Documents included in meeting packet:

- Agenda
- Memo from Michelle Buck, Town Planner to the Planning Board regarding the May 15, 2018 Planning Board Meeting
- Draft copy of the Special Permit, Site plan & Stormwater Permit Approval for Curtis Self-Storage at 1749 Main Street
- Copy of public hearing notice for Mayflower Circle & Holcomb Street Special Permit/Preliminary Open Space Residential Development proposal
- Copy of Special Permit Application for Mayflower Circle & Holcomb Street development plan
- Copy of narrative letter from Brian MacEwen of Graz Engineering regarding Mayflower circle & Holcomb Street development proposal
- Comments received from Hillcrest Water/Sewer District, Leicester Water/Sewer, Quinn Engineering, memo from Michelle Buck to Graz Engineering, Historical Commission, Fire Department, Conservation Commission, Board of Health, and Police Department regarding Mayflower Circle/Holcomb Street Development
- Copy of preliminary subdivision application for lots proposed on Parker Street
- Copy of cover letter from Attorney Joseph Antonellis for his client and property owner, Webster First Federal Credit Union regarding Parker Street Preliminary Subdivision plan
- Memo to Jose Cove, Town Counsel, from Michelle Buck, Town Planner regarding Parker Street Record
- Comments received from Quinn Engineering, Fire Department, Conservation Commission, Historical Commission, Police Department, Cherry Valley/Rochdale Water District regarding Parker Street Preliminary Subdivision Application
- Draft copy of Certificate of Decision-Disapproval Preliminary Subdivision plan for Parker Street Preliminary Subdivision
- Planning Board Minutes of April 3 and April 10
- Memo from Kevin Quinn to Planning Board regarding Leicester Fire and EMS Headquarters dated 4/26/2018
- Memo from Kevin Quinn to Planning Board regarding 24 Warren Ave Resident
- Memo from Kevin Quinn to Planning Board regarding Leicester Fire Headquarters - Construction Completion Assessment
- Email memo from Joel Hart to Michelle Buck regarding Fire Station plans/issues
- Copy of letter sent to Joel Hart from Kenneth Hodgson, Environmental Engineer regarding preliminary review of Stormwater plans for Leicester Fire Headquarters

Documents submitted at meeting:

- Letter from Leonard & Judith Ivel of 130 Pleasant Street regarding Mayflower Circle/Holcomb Street Preliminary Subdivision application
- Comment memo from Highway Department regarding Parker Street Preliminary Subdivision application