

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF TISBURY
P.O. BOX 602
TOWN HALL ANNEX
VINEYARD HAVEN, MASSACHUSETTS 02568
(508) 696-4270
Fax (508) 696-7341
www.tisburyma.gov

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: September 21, 2016

TIME: 5:00 PM

PLACE: Town Hall Annex, 66 High Point Lane

ATTENDANCE: Bellante-Holand, Doble, Robinson, and Seidman

MINUTES: As referred in the August 17, 2016 Meeting Agenda

06 April 2016	m/s/c	4/0/0
20 April 2016	m/s/c	4/0/0
04 May 2016	m/s/c	4/0/0
01 June 2016	m/s/c	4/0/0
03 August 2016	Deferred	
17 August 2016	m/s/c	4/0/0
07 September 2016	m/s/c	4/0/0

APPOINTMENTS:

5:00 PM Board of Selectmen – Mass DOT’s 25% Beach Road Design Plan, project priorities
Attendance: J. Grande, B. Lampson, Danielle Ewart

D. Seidman welcomed the Board of Selectmen and noted that the joint discussion was being held for the purpose of discussing the Mass DOT 25% design and project priorities. M. Loberg, Board of Selectmen’s Chairperson requested a moment to call the Selectmen’s meeting to order at 5:03 PM. Selectmen present for the discussions were L. Gomez and T. Israel.

At the Planning Board Chairman’s request, J. Grande, the Town Administrator opened the discussions on the Board of Selectmen’s behalf. He disseminated copies of a handout the Board of Selectmen developed for the Annual Town Meeting outlining their concerns with the state’s proposal. He believed the information still pertained with some modifications. J. Grande submitted another list for tonight’s discussions with additional topics relating to the design details of the project. He explained that the list was generated from subsequent discussions about the design details with the Mass State Highway Department’s office (District 5).

J. Grande commented that C. Whittaker’s, H. Chapdelaine’s and H. Barrows’ comments at the hearing raised very good questions about storm water management. An in-depth study could surface low intensity development techniques that could be applied to other

properties as suggested by H. Stephenson. Additional merits in pursuing low impact development included low maintenance and the mitigation of pollutants.

J. Grande did not believe the 40 ft. wide layout from Five Corners to the Tisbury Marketplace that was offered by the state as an option took into consideration the future development and use of the one particular segment of the corridor. He felt they would be remiss in protecting the town's interest if they did not take advantage of the state's technical and financial assistance, because it was the most cost effective alternative. He believed it would benefit the town if they utilized the Mass DOT's easement to widen the road, if they preferred a wider layout, and to continue to inquire about the relocation of the utility poles and the placement of the conduits. He further noted that during the utility site visit, the state's representatives never mentioned the use of handholds (subsurface structure), and thought it prudent to add the subject to the list.

T. Israel requested a clarification regarding the expiration of the comment period. M. Loberg replied that the town had ten days to comment on the proposal in writing to have the correspondence entered into the record of the meeting. T. Israel thought it behooved them to focus on the issues they wanted to convey to the state. He wanted to ask the state if they were including a boardwalk (at their expense) along the section of the corridor past the Texaco Gas Station.

T. Israel also requested information about the location of all crosswalks. He wanted to know the about the state's plans for the existing crosswalk by the Net Result. B. Robinson asked T. Currier about the crosswalks, and understood that the one crosswalk was going to remain. Board members did not like the state's proposal and agreed to oppose the state's recommendation. B. Robinson recalled that they asked for a mid-block crosswalk near the Artcliff Diner because it was a long stretch from the Net Result to Five Corners. B. Robinson made sure to bring the two crosswalks by the MV Shipyard to their attention. L. Gomez noted that it had a calming effect on traffic. T. Israel felt the removal of the one crosswalk was a "non-starter. He couldn't entertain any proposal that eliminated the one crosswalk by the Net Result.

C. Doble commented on the need to address storm water management. Discussions ensued and M. Loberg thought they could re-route the sidewalk around the gas station so that it converged with the crosswalk at the Tisbury Marketplace and open up the front area for a storm water retention system i.e. bio-swale. Board members thought it merited further exploration. T. Israel inquired about the state's plan to address storm water. B. Robinson replied that they were proposing to use the existing 18 in. wide outfall pipes with the addition of deeper catch basins.

T. Israel noted that the state never clarified if they were going to address road erosion. M. Loberg recalled that the state offered to cantilever the sidewalk as a boardwalk. She strongly encouraged a more detailed discussion on the one segment of the road. J. Grande strongly recommended looking at various locations along Beach Road with an engineer to discuss potential "low intensity" proposals. B. Robinson cautioned against looking into one specific modality.

T. Israel inquired if the telephone poles were going to be relocated off the sidewalks. J. Grande understood that they were going to be placed in the back of the sidewalks, but did not know if they were all going to be located outside the right of way. T. Israel recommended negotiating with the state to get them off the sidewalk.

T. Israel inquired if the bikes lanes from Five Corners to the Tisbury Marketplace were going to be stenciled. B. Robinson replied in the affirmative. C. Doble requested that they ask the state to distinguish the curb cuts from the sidewalk with some type of treatment (material, contrast) so that they were easily recognized by cyclists and pedestrians. D. Seidman recalled that the state offered to paint a centerline on the SUP. The Board wanted to convey that they also wanted to have a Cape Cod Berm from the Tisbury Marketplace to the bridge and a granite/cement barrier from Five Corners to the Tisbury Marketplace.

M. Loberg wanted to utilize the opportunity to discuss the design speed with the state. She felt the posted limits had to be reduced, and consistent. C. Doble asked that they include a comment recommending that they reduce the height of the curb so that a bike pedal did not caught on top.

B. Robinson asked J. Grande for a clarification on a comment made earlier in the discussion regarding the width of the road. J. Grande advocated a wider road layout between Five Corners and Tisbury Marketplace because of its potential for development. The comments at the presentation regarding the recent increase in commercial development and activity indicated a higher pedestrian use that could not be ignored. It was his impression that the right of way should be expanded to accommodate a wider sidewalk. D. Seidman noted that the sidewalks in the current proposal were 5.5 ft. wide. T. Israel suggested that they ask for the maximum allowance. J. Grande indicated that he wanted to see 7.5 ft. to allow for planting beds (smaller shrubs), but nothing less than 6.5 ft. M. Loberg thought they should include the suggestion in the letter and ask for wider sidewalks, between 6.5 ft. and 7 ft., with the latter being the most desirable from Five Corners and the Tisbury Marketplace. B. Robinson noted that the wider sidewalk would allow the state the move the telephone poles a foot farther from the edge of the curb. D. Seidman recalled that it was the first item they recommended in their letter to the state back in January 2016.

It was clarified for the record that the 43 ft. wide layout pertained to the portion of the corridor starting at Five Corners to the Tisbury Marketplace. J. Grande requested a motion. D. Seidman moved to ask the Mass DOT to consider a 43 ft. wide layout for the portion of the corridor starting at Five Corners to the Tisbury Marketplace. B. Robinson seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 3/0/0

T. Israel moved to ask the Mass DOT to consider a 43 ft. wide layout to widen the sidewalk for the portion of the corridor starting at Five Corners to the Tisbury Marketplace. L. Gomez seconded the motion, which motion carried. 3/0/0.

M. Loberg inquired about lighting. J. Grande mentioned that the state was going to keep the cobra head utility poles. B. Robinson recommended staying with the particular light

fixtures. J. Grande inquired if they considered having low level pedestrian lighting by the crosswalks. M. Loberg questioned the need for lighted bollards in the locations of the crosswalks. L. Gomez inquired if they'd use reflective material in the road surface to illuminate it at night. B. Robinson explained that the state offered the white stripes with the ladder and nothing more. J. Grande preferred a high quality street print, and suggested submitting a set of specifications for the crosswalks to see if the state would absorb most of the cost.

B. Robinson asked the board members if they wanted to ask the state to delineate the process from the present moment to the presentation of the 75% design, in terms of their ability to meet with the state to discuss the details of the project, the number of meetings, etc. He thought they should also ask the state for a copy of their CAD files and tables and hoped they'd schedule a preview of the design sixty or ninety days before their presentation, so that they could submit their comments for revisions. J. Grande added a recommendation for information on the budget. C. Doble suggested that they be given the opportunity to comment on the design at 50% completion, otherwise it would be too late. Board members agreed.

M. Loberg thought they should request a meeting to discuss storm water management. J. Grande offered to arrange a meeting with a storm water consultant to discuss their ideas, and to have the same engineer join them at the meeting with MassDOT. All agreed.

T. Israel was interested in learning more about the state's proposal for a landscaping design, plantings, etc. B. Robinson recalled that the state recommended the most number of trees by Winds Up. He reminded everyone that the MV Commission agreed to conduct a speed study to submit to the state for further discussion. He thought they should contact the MV Commission for the study.

D. Seidman raised the subject of curb cut widths. The subcommittee was very specific about their recommendations. B. Robinson volunteered to email J. Grande the list the Beach Road subcommittee sent to the MassDOT.

2016/2017 Projects

T. Israel noted that they had asked the Planning Board for assistance in developing regulations for the harbor, and wanted to meet again on the subject, if his co-members agreed. C. Doble created a table itemizing the projects for 2016/2017 that she wanted to discuss with fellow board members this evening so that it corresponded with the Board of Selectmen's priorities. She thought it would be helpful to share the outline she had prepared for the Planning Board's discussions and recommended a joint meeting. Board members reviewed their calendars and noted that there were several conflicts. C. Doble offered to share the information with the Town Administrator, who was to pass the information forward to the Board of Selectmen for their comments.

K. MacLeane, the owner of a condominium at 31 Beach Road believed it was short sighted not to support 8 ft. wide sidewalks. The 5 ft. sidewalks did not protect pedestrians from being splashed on from moving traffic. He did not see any benefit in

reducing an amenity (sidewalk) that was currently 6 ft. wide. It was not the best solution for the merchants, pedestrians or town. He recommended a 43 ft. wide layout with an 8 ft. wide sidewalk on the south side of the road and a 5 ft. sidewalk on the harbor side. It would allow for bike lanes of equal width on both sides of the road. If the wider sidewalks were not feasible, they had to address the storm water in the area to make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

Complete Streets

J. Grande informed the Planning Board that he had submitted the letter of intent to complete the first tier, and was waiting for a Notice to Proceed. He asked the Planning Board if they had a Complete Streets policy available to download in the state's website.

C. Doble noted that she wanted to have the text reviewed by the consultant before submitting the language to the Board of Selectmen. D. Seidman offered to give the consultant a copy of the policy as soon as he received the final draft from C. Doble.

CPC Applications

R. Tattersall, DPW Director submitted an application for several improvement projects involving Owen Park, the old fire station property and the dog park. T. Israel met with H. Stephenson for the improvements they should pursue to improve the dog park.

C. Doble indicated that she was going to ask the Planning Board if they wanted to request assistance for a Land Use Plan or Open Space & Recreation Plan. She spoke with R. Tattersall about the latter, and mentioned that it would require the joint cooperation of the DPW, the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board. Planning Board members agreed that they would need the assistance of a consultant.

Old Fire Station, Beach Road

C. Doble informed the Board that they were meeting with the Parking Committee tomorrow to review drawings and to move forward on the first phase.

Planning Board Budget

D. Seidman advised the Board of Selectmen that the Planning Board's budget allowed for refreshments. The town accountant has refused to reimburse the board and staff for past purchases for public events. C. Doble indicated that they offered to provide refreshments for the Housing Production Plan's presentation tomorrow evening, but did not understand why they've been unable to recover the funds.

T. Israel understood that they had to have an administrative policy in place, and suggested that the policy could require the town administrator's approval. D. Seidman did not understand the need for the town administrator's approval when they've budgeted for the expense. They simply needed a town wide policy. L. Gomez agreed and did not think it had to be complicated. Additional discussions ensued with this regard, and the town administrator was directed to generate the policy.

6:00 PM Public Hearing – Special Permit Application for J. deBettencourt re
Automotive Repair Shop, AP 22A13.12 & 22A13.13
Attendance: D. Hodsdon, H. Lee, R. Tattersall

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:15 PM. Planning Board Chairman read the public hearing notice into the minutes and introduced the four board members present for the discussions. Copies of the revised site plan (rev. 05/31/16) and floor plans (Nos. A-1.1 and A-1.2) were laid out on the table for the board's review.

D. Seidman, Planning Board Chairman read the applicants' revised letter of application dated 19 September 2016 explaining their proposal to construct a 5100 sq. ft. structure to operate an automotive repair shop in the BII District and to re-configure the previously approved Form A division of land submitted by Thomas Pachico to eliminate the 10 ft. wide utility easement and shared property line. The letter in addition expressed intent to apply for a non-appurtenant sign off-site on State Road in addition to the signage that was allowed on site.

J. deBettencourt indicated that he had modified his plans since his discussions with the MV Commission. He had increased the number of drains from his initial proposal (i.e. four [4] drains) to five (5) drains for a total of seven (7) drains to absorb run-off at a 25 year storm level. The site plan included six additional notes pertaining to the drainage system, gutter drains & settling tanks and septic system.

D. Seidman inquired if the highlighted section in the northwest corner depicted a bio-swale. The applicant indicated that he had removed two parking spaces to increase the landscaping in the corner for additional vegetative screening. It was solely for aesthetics.

J. deBettencourt added that the references to the elevations for the retaining walls (i.e. T.O.W) were corrected from 131 ft. to 149 ft. He eliminated the reference to the stockade fencing and replaced the text with a reference to the black chain-link fence the town administrator requested. He mentioned that there was an 18 ft. drop from the retaining wall. The 4 ft. fence the MV Commission recommended was replaced with a 6 ft. high fence for added security.

Additional discussions ensued with regards to the hurdles in the construction of the retaining wall. J. deBettencourt explained that he had to reconstruct and reinforce J. Steeres's retaining wall so that the connection was stable and secure. He had to reduce the height of the abutter's retaining wall (22 ft.) to match the 18 ft. high wall he was constructing. He noted that C. Dias was interested in employing the same blocks for his retaining walls, and helped build part of C. Dias' wall which would improve the integrity of his retaining wall. The construction for the remainder of the retain wall was going to be tapered down so that the last course was flush with High Point Lane.

B. Robinson inquired if J. deBettencourt was replacing the buffer along High Point Lane. The applicant noted that he was adding plantings to the existing buffer, and replacing the scrub oak trees, as requested by the MV Commission. C. Doble wanted to know what the landscape design would be. B. Robinson recalled that they've requested a landscape plan from C. Dias prior to construction. In this instance, the construction was in progress. He thought they could ask for a landscaping plan once the walls and grading were completed.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired about the location of the sidewalks. B. Robinson thought it was a question they should discuss before the buffer was developed. He thought they could save some room for the amenity. D. Bellante-Holand did not understand why an important safety feature was not incorporated into the review process. B. Robinson commented that they could recommend adding the amenity within the road layout. C. Doble thought the sidewalk could be added across the street. R. Tattersall favored having the sidewalk at the entrances to all of the businesses and bus stop to prevent the need to cross the street. D. Seidman informed the Board that the buffer was town owned property, so that the sidewalk was the town's responsibility. C. Doble questioned whether they would have sufficient space for a sidewalk if the applicant was being asked to landscape the buffer. B. Robinson believed the review process offered the opportunity to explore the possibility.

J. deBettencourt advised the Board that he was also interested in removing the 10 ft. wide access/utility easement and property line that divided the two lots. They recommended revising the Form A plan of land.

J. deBettencourt revised the Floor Plans since his last meeting with the MV Commission, and referred the Board to Plan No. A-1.1. He explained that the room designations were incorrect. The storage room on the first floor was an equipment room and inspection bay. He added a side door to the inspection bay from the north, and changed the single door to the equipment room on the northwest of the building with a double door. He added two picture windows to the waiting area on the southeast corner of the building and added an additional door to the repair shop.

D. Bellante-Holand inquired about the use of the parking spaces on the south end of the building. J. deBettencourt replied that they were for customers. He added that the parking spaces on the westerly property line were for staging cars/trucks in need of repairs. She inquired if there was sufficient area for vehicles on the south end of the building to back out of their spaces with parallel parking across the travel lane to the inspection bay.

J. deBettencourt replied in the affirmative, noting that there was 80 ft. between the building and the retaining wall. D. Seidman inquired about the surface material for the parking lot. The applicant replied "RAP".

D. Bellante-Holand did not realize that the few remaining trees were on town property. The applicant noted that the vast majority of trees on High Point Lane were on his property. His property line was approximately 3 ft. to 4 ft. from the edge of the asphalt. The discussion led to a brief overview of the landscaping. D. Bellante-Holand commended the applicant on his efforts to replace the trees, but felt the Board were remiss if they did not discuss a plan to re-

establish the landscaping on the applicant's property in addition to what was being proposed on town land. It was short sighted. D. Seidman noted that it was a commercial district. He felt the applicant was limited by the industrial character of the area. C. Doble concurred with D. Bellante-Holand.

J. deBettencourt expressed an interest in placing signs both on and off site, and advised that he would need a special permit from the Planning Board for the off-site, non-appurtenant sign off-site. The applicant inquired if he needed a separate permit to offer coffee in the waiting room. D. Seidman referred the applicant to the Board of Health.

There being no further discussion from the applicant or board members D. Seidman referred to the applicable zoning regulation and read the section pertaining to "Findings". The board secretary advised the Board to consider the Board of Appeals conditions and restrictions, which required the applicant to provide nineteen parking spaces, motion censored lighting after hours, and a prohibition in the use of the property as a car sales dealership in their deliberations.

Board members were informed that the applicant was subject to the conditions of the MV Decision and Memo of Understanding with the Town of Tisbury. C. Doble reminded the board that they also had to address the issue with the landscaping and a pedestrian walk. D. Bellante-Holand concurred, and felt that they had an obligation to the town to address the absence of vegetation and sidewalk. She felt the Board was required to address these issues during the review process. There was a safety issue for the pedestrians going to the Park and Ride, bus stop and future businesses.

H. Lee, a member of the public inquired if there were any revisions to the application. D. Seidman replied in the affirmative, noting that they had been presented to the board at the beginning of the presentation. H. Lee inquired if the abutter, C. Dias was constructing the building to the shared retaining wall. D. Seidman replied that C. Dias withdrew his application for the variance and was now meeting the 15 ft. backyard setback. H. Lee inquired if the applicant was building the retaining wall to the property line. D. Seidman replied in the affirmative. H. Lee inquired if the Planning Board approved the application with the 10 ft. utility easement. D. Seidman replied that the applicant offered to submit a revised plan of land eliminating the 10 ft. utility easement.

H. Lee recommended a wider buffer for more landscaping. The current proposal was insufficient. J. deBettencourt noted that the wider buffer for plantings was not feasible throughout the perimeter of the property because of the retaining wall. The areas capable of sustaining vegetation were to the east and west of the property. The building and parking areas were going to be at a lower elevation. All that was visible from High Point Lane was the roofline. H. Lee inquired if the applicant was going to maintain the town owned land he was disturbing to construct the retaining wall at least until the vegetation was established. The applicant replied in the affirmative.

D. Seidman asked the Board if they were prepared to vote on the application. D. Bellante-Holand did not believe she could vote in favor of the application until the Board clarified that they could address the issues they've expressed with the landscaping and

pedestrian safety, namely the need for a sidewalk. She found it difficult to act favorably on the application because it did not appear to meet the findings listed in the regulation (visual and pedestrian access).

B. Robinson explained that the applicant is constructing a retaining wall right on his property line and expecting a green buffer along the road. The applicant was adding a 6 ft. high black chain link fence on top of the retaining wall with only four feet for vegetation. The applicant reminded the Board that the MV Commission limited him to planting natural species, which dropped their leaves in the winter. B. Robinson noted that they would not have enough space for both a sidewalk and landscaped area unless he moved the wall back 5 ft.

J. deBettencourt explained that he was not going to have a retaining wall along the property line that ran parallel to High Point Lane. He was just installing the fence. The High Point Lane side of the wall was to be finished 3 ft. back from his property line. B. Robinson calculated that the property line to the face of the parking area was 60 ft. minus the 3 ft. from the edge of the road and an additional 3 ft. for the thickness of the wall for a revised total of 54 ft. for the parking area. The additional 3 ft. would allow them to accommodate a sidewalk. J. deBettencourt was concerned about being able to back out and swing the larger commercial vehicles (45 ft. ladder truck) from the inspection bay.

D. Hodsdon inquired about the gutters. The applicant replied that they were in the back on the shed slope roof and connected to two drains. R. Tattersall inquired if he intended to install solar panels. The applicant indicated that it was a project he intended to pursue in the future.

B. Robinson did not find any language in the MV Commission's Decision pertaining to the 3 ft. buffer. The applicant recalled that it was part of the discussion during the course of the public hearing at the MV Commission. B. Robinson clarified for the record that the Planning Board was asking that the wall at the top finished 3 ft. back from the property line to give them enough room for a sidewalk. The applicant was concerned that it would interfere with his parking. D. Bellante-Holand noted that they were not asking any more of the applicant than what was requested of him at the MV Commission. The exception was that the verbal agreement was going to be in writing to meet their requirements.

H. Lee suggested that the curb cut should be 60 ft. wide. D. Seidman and B. Robinson disagreed. R. Tattersall reminded the applicant that he had to submit an application for the curb cut to the DPW along with a fee.

D. Seidman asked the Board if they had sufficient information to close the public hearing and enter into deliberations. Board members replied in the affirmative, and B. Robinson moved to close the public hearing so that they could enter into the deliberation portion of the review process. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried.

4/0/0

7:25 PM Deliberations: Special Permit Application for J. deBettencourt re
Automotive Repair Shop, AP 22A13.12 & 22A13.13

The Planning Board entered into deliberations at 7:25 PM to discuss the merits of J. deBettencourt's application to construct a 5100 sq. ft. structure in order to operate an automotive repair shop on an ½ acre lot within the BII District to operate an automotive repair shop.

B. Robinson recommended a condition requiring a 3 ft. planting buffer on the High Point Lane side measuring from the outside of the wall to the property line. He suggested adding a 2nd condition to require the submittal of a landscape plan after major grading and before the structure is constructed.

D. Seidman requested that they include a reference to the MV Commission's, the Zoning Board of Appeals' and the Site Plan Review Board's decision with a notation that the applicant is required to comply with their conditions and restrictions. The recommendation also applied to the Memorandum of Understanding the applicant signed for the Board of Selectmen.

B. Robinson asked the applicant for a copy of the revised site plan illustrating the 3 ft. buffer they had just requested. The applicant agreed. The board secretary reminded the board that the applicant offered to revise the Form A plan of land to eliminate the utility easement and shared property line that combined the two lots.

There being no further comment, B. Robinson recommended approving the application with the aforementioned conditions and restrictions. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, which motion carried. 4/0/0

D. Seidman recommended continuing the deliberations to review the draft decision on 09/28/16 at 6:15 PM. He advised the Board that he would not be available to attend meetings from October 5th to October 25th. The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 7:28 PM.

7:29 PM Ray Tattersall, DPW Dir. Re: Kristen Reiman, Own Little Way (R 25 District)

R. Tattersall advised the Board that he was soliciting their opinion on a request by the aforementioned property owner for a curb cut on Owen Little Way. He provided a map illustrating the location of the lot and its frontage.

R. Tattersall mentioned that the property owner had removed the hedging along the property line on Owen Little Way and was currently using a small section of the lawn for parking. He approached the Town Administrator for an opinion, and was advised that the access should be on the listed frontage i.e. Main Street. C. Doble thought the orientation of the house should have a bearing on the location of the access. The house faced Owen

Little Way. B. Robinson was concerned about the traffic on Owen Little Way. D. Hodsdon noted that the property owner parked on the street.

R. Tattersall asked the Board if they had an issue seeing a new curb cut on Owen Little Way, even though the property's frontage was on Main Street. B. Robinson replied in the negative. D. Bellante-Holand thought they should consider the curb cut's impact on parking to the town's one and only beach. It was possible that the additional curb cut could present a problem for the town. B. Robinson noted that there were additional curb cuts on Owen Little Way, and the parking area was further down the road closer to the beach.

D. Hodsdon was familiar with the property, and mentioned that there was a 6 ft. drop from the road into the back of the property. H. Lee was concerned about future improvements, which would require the removal of the hedge for better sight distances. The improvement would change the character of the property and neighborhood.

D. Bellante-Holland requested the opportunity to do a site inspection and asked that they postpone the discussion until next week. She rephrased the recommendation into a motion, which was then seconded by C. Doble. Board members voted 4/0/0

7:45 PM Daniel Vignolo, Form A Application - Cook Road, AP 08K01.1+

D. Vignolo informed the Board that he had improved at least 80 ft. of the road to meet the frontage requirement for the proposed lot as requested. He was prepared to submit a Form A plan of land creating the lot provided the Board believed the improvements were sufficient for Form A consideration. D. Vignolo asked the Board if they had the opportunity to inspect the road.

C. Doble noticed on her site inspection that the applicant had placed solid blocks on both sides of the improved section of the road. A section of road had a slope that essentially directed the runoff to the block wall. The applicant inadvertently channeled the runoff on the road towards the lower end to accelerate road erosion. D. Vignolo indicated that he and an abutter had plans to construct a small collection system to absorb the runoff.

B. Robinson inquired about the use of the solid blocks. The applicant indicated that it was suggested to him as a method of containing the runoff on the road. B. Robinson explained that the proper construction of a road was to do the exact opposite. Most plans called for storm water management systems that diverted the runoff into a containment area to protect the integrity of the road. D. Vignolo was open to any of the Board's recommendations, if the improvements fell short of their expectations. He was disappointed in that he had met with the Board in the past for recommendations because they did not have a set of minimum requirements to follow. It was difficult to know what they expected or wanted. The Board acknowledged.

D. Seidman asked the board to do the site inspection to continue the discussions on 09/28/16 at 6PM. Board members concurred.

6:00 PM Public Hearing (Cont.): Special Permit Application for Carl Kenney re:
Non- Appurtenant sign (24"X20") in the B-2 District, AP 22A01
Attendance: D. Hodsdon and H. Lee

The continuation of the public hearing commenced in due form at 7:50 PM. Planning Board Chairman read the public hearing notice into the minutes and explained that the applicant was asking the Board permission to add a business sign on the MV Savings Bank's property on State Road. The applicant submitted a letter of consent for the 24"X20" non-appurtenant sign from the bank with his application.

D. Seidman recalled from past discussions on a site visit that the photograph the applicant submitted did not reflect the sign's distance from the corner of the intersection. He noted that the existing directory style post on which the sign was to be installed was at least six feet in from the corner, so that it did not impact the site distance or create a safety hazard.

It was noted for the record that the site inspection was scheduled for the first review process, which was aborted due to an administrative oversight. D. Bellante-Holand inquired if the proposed sign was slotted for the space in the middle. D. Seidman replied in the affirmative.

B. Robinson noted that the Site Plan Review Board did not have an issue with the design or colors for the sign. There being no further discussion, he moved to close the public hearing and immediately enter into deliberations. C. Doble seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 4/0/0

7:52 PM Deliberations: Special Permit Application for Carl Kenney re:
Non- Appurtenant sign (24"X20") in the B-2 District, AP 22A01

D. Seidman entered a motion to approve the sign as proposed. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion. The motion carried. 4/0/0

The Board Chairman asked the Board to review the draft document with a request for recommendations. He was soliciting suggestions for "conditions and restrictions" to incorporate into the decision.

There being no comment, B. Robinson moved to approve the decision as written. D. Bellante-Holand seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 4/0/0

7:00 PM Public Hearing (Cont.) – Special Permit Application for Chris Dias, SBS
Properties, AP 22A13.11 & 22A13.14
Attendance: D. Hodsdon, H. Lee

D. Seidman opened the continuation of the public hearing for the above named applicant at 7:55 PM. He noted the applicant's absence for the record and affirmed that the

applicant had secured a decision from the MV Commission and the Zoning Board of Appeals. He was under the impression that the applicant had signed an agreement for the purchase of the 30 ft. wide strip that would allow the abandonment of the existing access easement to State Road. B. Robinson inquired if that was confirmed. D. Seidman replied in the negative, but recalled asking for a copy of the agreement. H. Lee thought it was important to verify that the agreement was signed.

Board members were advised that they had a draft outline of the decision. D. Seidman referred to s. 05.23.05, and read the requirements for the Board's consideration and comment.

B. Robinson inquired if there was a condition requiring the submittal of a landscape plan prior to the construction of the building. D. Hodsdon noted that the Site Plan Review Board made a similar request for the purpose of providing the Planning Board the information along with their suggestions. C. Doble asked that the language be revised to specify the Planning Board. D. Bellante-Holand thought they should be consistent and recommended that they request the landscape plan after the completion of the grading and the construction of the retaining wall.

B. Robinson noted that the applicant was providing a greater amount of screening on High Point Lane from the edge of the road to the property line. He explained that they would not be able to design the landscape until after they've finished the grading.

H. Lee inquired if the Planning Board was postponing their decision until they obtained verification from the applicant confirming that the existing 20 ft. wide access easement was being extinguished and that he was eliminating the 10 ft. wide utility easement. B. Robinson replied that the two could be addressed as conditions to the approval.

D. Seidman thought it important to know where the applicant stood on the agreement, because it was a significant issue for him. He recommended continuing the hearing to give the applicant the opportunity to address their concern. B. Robinson recommended 09/28/16 at 7:00 PM. The Board voted in favor of B. Robinson's recommendation for a continuation. The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled meeting at 8:12 PM

D. Bellante-Holand was concerned that the Planning Board was not addressing sufficiently the topic of view lines and vistas as required in the regulation. She felt the piecemeal address would have a detrimental impact on the characteristics of the area. D. Seidman thought that it was also pertinent to the area. It was a subject she thought they should discuss in depth, because of the potential ramification. D. Seidman thought they could bring it up during a work session.

BOARD DISCUSSIONS:

1. Planning Board in-town planning priorities
 - A. Beach Road – Public record response to DOT
 - B. Selectmen and Planning Board's project priorities (open space, area plans etc.)
 - C. Policy- Use of funds specifically budgeted for the purchase of refreshments

2. Daniel Vignolo
RE: Form A Application, AP 08K1.1 (Adequacy of Cook Road)
3. Benjamin Hall, Jr.
RE: Kingsbury-Millet Subdivision, State Road Association (approval)

Board members had the opportunity to review the subdivisions's road maintenance agreement, and believed it met their requirements.

Board members were advised that the road maintenance agreement was for a subdivision the Planning Board approved in the early 1990s. The applicants failed to comply with the conditions of the decision, and are pursuing all the necessary approvals in order to convey the lots to family members. After the Board approves the road maintenance agreement, the applicant can request the release of a Form O, which will conclude the review process.

B. Robinson moved to approve the road association document for the Kingsbury-Millet Subdivision off State Road. C. Doble seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
4/0/0

4. C. Doble noted that there were CPC funds they could apply for to help them develop a Land Use Plan, and Circulation Plan. The instructor at the MV Commission's workshop this past Saturday told her that they could develop area plans from the two aforementioned studies and incorporate the material in the future for the Master Plan.

She did not think the Planning Board had the time or resources to take on studies (Land Use) and suggested that they apply for the funds to hire consultants. The Board agreed. B. Robinson inquired about the cost for the Master Plan. C. Doble replied that it could cost anywhere from \$135,000.00 - \$300,000.00. They had several possible options. C. Doble offered to generate them for the Board. B. Robinson thought she could develop a placeholder for the funds.

D. Bellante-Holand moved to recommend that C. Doble submit a request for CPC funds to develop an Open Space Plan. B. Robinson seconded the motion. The motion carried.
4/0/0

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. MV Commission
 - A. 16 September 2016 Extended Schedule
 - B. 22 September 2016 Meeting Notice
2. Dept. of Environmental Protection
RE: Notice - Mink Meadows Association (sediment removal from tidelands)

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

PRO FORM Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 8:45 P.M.
(m/s/c 4/0/0)
Respectfully submitted;

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

APPROVAL:

Approved and accepted as official minutes;

Date

Daniel Seidman
Chairman