

**NORTH ATTLEBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING  
Thursday, August 18, 2011  
6:30 p.m.**

The North Attleboro Planning Board held its Regular Monthly Meeting on Thursday, August 18, 2011 at 6:30 P.M. in the Planning Board Office located at 43 South Washington Street, North Attleborough, Massachusetts. Board members present were Chairman Richard McCarthy, Vice Chairman Richard Peterson, Richard Houle, Mary Signoriello and Thomas Welch. Also in attendance was Town Planner Mary Burgess. Chairman McCarthy called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

**Vouchers were reviewed and signed.**

**Minutes**

There were no minutes for approval.

**New Business**

**Form A: David & Patricia Nicholson, Elm Street**

John Risser of Risser Engineering presented on behalf of the applicants. Mr. Risser reported that an A & R was approved by the Planning Board in 1981, and paper copies of the plan were signed by the Board, but the mylar was never recorded. The applicant was requesting a Form A in order to have the proper documents filed. Discussion ensued regarding the rights of ownership. The Board suggested the applicants withdraw their request, meet with an attorney and produce documentation of proof of ownership, and reapply to the Board. Mr. Peterson made a motion to accept the applicants' withdrawal of the A & R request for 186 Elm Street without prejudice. Seconded by Mr. Houle. The motion was approved 5 to 0.

**NORTH ATTLEBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD  
PUBLIC HEARING  
THURSDAY, August 18, 2011  
6:45 P.M.  
(Christina Estates)**

Vice Chairman Peterson opened the continuation of the public hearing from June 16, 2011 at 6:57 p.m. Board members present were Vice Chairman Richard Peterson, Richard Houle, Mary Signoriello and Thomas Welch. Chairman Richard McCarthy recused himself from the Public Hearing at 6:57 p.m. Also in attendance was Town Planner Mary Burgess.

Mary Burgess: Just for a quick update, we did receive three response comments that Earthworks provided a couple of months ago, unfortunately we didn't receive them soon enough, and unfortunately we didn't receive the money to review it soon enough, so we do not have those responses as of yet. I did not authorize them without the money. We got the money two days ago, so we're going to have to obviously continue it.

Houle: He can state what he wants to do, we'll listen and we'll go from there.

Kelly Killeen: Kelly Killeen, Coler & Colantonio, Inc. I'm here with Mr. Michael Intoccia. What we've done since we've last visited you is we've been to the ConCom, the Conservation Commission as you've asked, we were able to close out that hearing this past Monday night, Tuesday night, they should be issuing their decision within 21 days. It seems as if we've made (inaudible) the Conservation Commission based on their peer consultant's review, and a workshop that we had with the DPW, is we've added access to a outlet swale that we're creating for the detention basin, we've added a 4' wide walkway so the DPW can get down there, which is shown right here behind the Visconte property.

Houle: So that's not on here?

Killeen: None of that is shown on there.

Peterson: Isn't this the swale right here?

Killeen: That's the swale right there.

(multiple conversations)

Burgess: You have their response comments, we do not have, so EEI

Peterson: Yes, you're right.

Killeen: In the, I think we provided you with the responses to the Conservation Commission as well, right?

Burgess: I think they're in the packet.

Killeen: As I stated, the DPW in the workshop had mentioned that he would like to have a walkway so he can get down there with a weed-whacker and maintain the swale that we're proposing. We also got into the evaluation of this culvert in Cumberland Ave., a series of back and forth with the Conservation Commission and applicability of stream crossing standards versus the culvert that we're proposing. We made minor changes to the design, effectively what that means is the stream crossing standards they're trying to get as much openness as we can get so that any critters or habitat associated with the resources are allowed to pass back and forth. We did the best that we could as allowed by the stream crossing standards, we justified that before the Board, or before the Commission, they were happy with that. We also introduced the wetland replication area, the reason we have a wetland replication area is because we're proposing this outlet swale and detention basin. The last time we were here we proposed it this way, we had previously proposed tying into Cumberland, we were denied with the access to the Cumberland drainage because of capacity issues, so what we've done is we've routed this around the Visconte property into the existing wetland area, and alternately gone to its natural channel. The plan may look a little different in that when we previously proposed this plan we showed houses on these two lots, they've been removed. The reason they've been removed is because when we show the houses on this, these two lots implying development of

those two lots, and Conservation wanted it clear that their approval or denial would not be based on the development of any of these lots. At a later date the applicant will have to come back before the Conservation Commission to permit each of the lots that fall within their jurisdiction, so anything within the 100' buffer would have to be permitted with its own individual Notice of Intent. The Notice of Intent that we're expecting an order on would be for the road and the road infrastructure improvements only, no development on the lots themselves.

Houle: Through the Chair, what are you proposing, how long are you proposing that long is going to be?

Killeen: Right here? This is 635' total. What we did is, this is the old cul de sac, so effectively what we're doing is picking up from here down is going to be new, this will be altered in here.

Houle: And the other part will be Phase II?

Killeen: This is all Phase I, the modifications we have is for the entire subdivision, however this is only the Phase I portion. In doing that we lost 2 lots, one of them is now a detention basin, and one is lost over here from configuration.

Peterson: Now I got a little confused in all my reading on this. Where do we stand on the 15" culvert that you went back and forth with the DPW about?

Killeen: This up in here, we were denied connection from the detention basin.

Peterson: It wasn't a deny of connection, you were denied at one point changing it from a 15 to a 24".

Killeen: Right, so we were denied the connection that we wanted.

Peterson: So that wasn't an existing culvert, that was a new culvert that you wanted to add?

Killeen: We wanted to tie into the existing 15" and then upgrade it with a larger pipe. That created more issue so we were asked to research alternatives and

Peterson: So that's why you're going back

Killeen: With the DPW we were able to come up with this solution, the calculations were submitted for the reroute of the drainage, Mr. Kane has the calculations, most for the Conservation Commission and Planning Board as well.

Michael Intoccia: What we are fixing underneath when we go under the road there, the culvert, you can tell them we're replacing it with larger pipe.

Burgess: That was on the original plan.

Intoccia: Right, we're still doing that.

Killeen: This was previously proposed, it's a 21" pipe now, it was previously proposed as a 24". We're still maintaining that, however as I indicated we had two of these stream crossings standards evaluations that we did, we had to tweak it a little bit so we could satisfy both Conservation Commission and DPW. We've added, right now this manhole has no sump on it, has no ability to collect sediment, so what we're doing is introducing a new catch basin out here as well to pick up the drainage. There should be some water quality gain there, so the sediment will go into to the catch basin and then ultimately into a series of manholes and then on to the same discharge that was previously approved.

Welch: How are you getting all that water over to the other side?

Killeen: This water will come down off the hill, be picked up in the roadway itself through a series of conveyances, two conveyance pipes into the detention basin. This house, existing house

Welch: What about on the other side, you said you had to reroute it behind that house?

Killeen: Yes, so this house gets razed, the detention basin goes in, we have an outlet structure here, the outlet structure process in the culvert crosses the road 24" pipe. We've created a swale behind this property, a swale through the wetland area and ultimately discharging to the channel that's beside the

Welch: There's a stream going through there?

Intoccia: DPW wanted us to go, we always wanted to tie, DPW always didn't want us to tie in, they always wanted us to bring the water around there, so they came up with us this idea and it was a good idea that we didn't close our Planning Board meeting, we went in front of Conservation first to get all their ideas, because if they denied and didn't approve it, it would have been foolish what we did in front of you guys.

Houle: I think we kind of asked you to do that

Intoccia: So after their consultant reviewing it and coming back, so everybody agreed. What I told Conservation, they're worried about maintenance, I said I would set up a bond for the next 4 or 5 years, that ConCom would have a cash bond so in case DPW or we don't maintain it, they got someone that will maintain this swale.

Houle: Just out of curiosity Mary, were there any outstanding issues with DPW or ConCom?

Burgess: I have not heard from either of them.

Houle: On this new plan.

Burgess: Correct. Obviously they closed with Conservation, I know that the Conservation Agent was waiting to hear back from DPW, I believe she got that letter at I think 6:00 on

Tuesday. I haven't had a chance to review that letter as of yet. I will also be in touch with Bill McDowell and Shannon just to make sure we're all on the same page with their orders

Intoccia: But Bill did send a letter stating that this is what he wanted and DPW wanted and everybody was

Houle: I did see that.

Intoccia: So we finally got to there and closed the meeting.

Houle: Just out of curiosity, since it's on there anyway, what about the other cul de sac there, Delphist Monast?

Killeen: The connection was never made obviously, so the temporary detention basin that's in there now is going to be removed, a new one will be constructed and this cul de sac will be constructed.

Houle: And is that all going to happen at the same time? When is this all happening?

Intoccia: Hopefully the end of September. We're all set to go, we've got financing all set to go, we've got everything. We're ready to go. Our goal is to, we already have all this already in up to here, drainage, water, everything, hydrants, everything. That's all we've got to do, which is already a dirt road, just reconstruct this, knock this house down and build this base. Bill wants us to make sure we get this all in and get everything in for this year so we don't run into a problem, so that's our game plan to go forward.

Peterson: So do you have any utility connections to be made at Cumberland from that point?

Intoccia: Yeah, we tied in already at this point. Originally we tied in here and we were going to run everything through, remember there was a problem with the crossing, so now we will be tying in here.

(multiple conversations)

Peterson: And the drainage is already in Monast, already and it's all connected to Cumberland?

Killeen: That's already in, yes, we cut that and the high point down here. We connected from the high point down, it was going to go to the detention basin right here, so now in lieu of that we're replacing it with a basin here.

Peterson: So the drainage and water are already in Monast, and

Intoccia: And I have water already, not connected, but all my hydrants, everything, and drainage are already in.

Peterson: Ready to connect

Burgess: If I may, Mr. Chair. But you don't have them connecting from this so you don't have them up to the cul de sac, right?

Intoccia: The first 200 feet. So we'll take down that house right away, fill that basin.

Houle: Are your plans to keep it to the first 200 feet only for a while? You said to the first 200 feet, what do you mean by that?

Intoccia: No, that's the only I have to build now, everything else is built out there.

Peterson: He only needs 200' more.

Houle: I see what you're saying now.

Intoccia: We built this, and I build this hoping to get our permit here. We never could have got our permit here because (inaudible) took two years, so we came and bought this house, go this way, which we should have done the first time.

Houle: I think somebody told you that. Mary do you have any questions as the Town Planner?

Burgess: No, actually, as far as it stands, we've got DPW was the biggest issue besides Conservation and the wetlands as well because of that culvert, and they were saying no, no, no. So now if you work it out with them

Intoccia: We cut down 4,000 something square feet of (inaudible) wetland?

Killeen: You're at 4450 up here and now we're at 18,

Intoccia: So we went way down.

Burgess: Have the walls changed at all?

Killeen: We removed what was previously shown on the previously approved plan with the wall extending along here, that's been removed. It's been removed only because we're not showing the development of the individual lots

Houle: You mean yet

(multiple conversations)

Intoccia: What I said was I'd file each one separately in front of ConCom, separate fee, separate each one.

(multiple conversations)

Intoccia: (inaudible) we get in here and get this all stabilized, connect our drainage, water and get going.

Burgess: So with the new numbering, you currently have, we released the covenant for 7 lots

Intoccia: It's only 6 now.

Burgess: Okay so we need to update at well so that we just have those six lots.

Intoccia: Okay.

Welch: These are all going to be onsite septic systems as far as we know?

Intoccia: As of right now, but no, but the DPW made us put in a dry pipe so when they do get sewer there the pipe's already in the road.

Houle: Mike, when I was first on the Board, going back 5-1/2 years ago, what did I ask you to do?

Intoccia: Put the dry pipe in.

(multiple conversation)

Intoccia: By the way, on that other road too, when I said the water and drainage, your sewer pipes in too. All the green pipe is still there. We just don't know where we're connected though.

Houle: BOH give any type of a letter either?

Burgess: Actually because they had, the public health agent had asked me if it was within their jurisdiction to re-review this and

Houle: Aren't septic systems in their jurisdiction?

Burgess: Well they asked with the modification of the plan if it was in their jurisdiction, but that's not my job, so

Intoccia: When we do our septic systems we do an on-site with each individual person, that's when we would file, we're not doing it now, this is just a road layout.

Burgess: I believe they were looking for a second bite of the apple because they missed the 45 days mandatory compliance, so where you're not drastically changing the lot lines, it was my opinion that they (inaudible)

Intoccia: Thank you

(multiple conversation)

Intoccia: Let me ask you, what do you need me for the next meeting so we can then start the roadways?

Houle: I'd like to see the response from our engineering, number one. Mary, just out of curiosity, before we go onto the end there, is there still an issue with Diana?

Intoccia: Is that the tax lady? I'm supposed to have a meeting this week with her, she is out this week, we set the meeting up for the beginning of next week, me and my lender. We're going to see her and make sure our taxes are straightened out. I will have a letter before you vote to close the meeting.

Houle: I'm sure she'll give us a letter.

Intoccia: But I'm just saying you asked me to do that last time I was here, and I said I would. We turned around, she's away this week, next week we're going to meet, me, my lender and her.

Burgess: Also I had spoken with Town Counsel and it is not in our purview to hold this permit.

Houle: I wouldn't hold the permit, I was just (multiple conversations)

Intoccia: I just wanted to let you know I followed up on it. When's the next meeting?

Burgess: September 15<sup>th</sup>. They have had the response for about a week and a half, so I should expect them within the next week.

Intoccia: It's the same consultant as ConCom?

Burgess: It is, so it'll probably be rather

Houle: What do we have that night, Mary?

Burgess: Right now on September 15<sup>th</sup> we have Hickory Woods final punch list, and then possibly Greenwich Street, but I'm waiting for an updated plan, and that's for a site plan review.

Peterson: So we need a motion to continue the hearing to September 15<sup>th</sup>?

Houle: I make a motion that we continue public hearing for Christina Estates modification to September 15<sup>th</sup>.

Welch: Second.

Peterson: All in favor? Motion passes 4 – 0.

Burgess: Also a motion to extend final action to the end of September?

Peterson: May we have a motion to extend the date for final action for Christina Estates to September 30, 2011?

Houle: As stated.

Welch: Second.

Peterson: All in favor? Motion passes 4 – 0.

Burgess: I'm sorry, did we give you a time? We can do 7 p.m. on the 15<sup>th</sup>.

Houle: That's fine with me.

Burgess: Tom, if you don't mind modifying your second on that original motion.

Welch: Alright, modified to 7 p.m. September 15<sup>th</sup>.

**NORTH ATTLEBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING (Continued at 7:19)  
THURSDAY, August 18, 2011**

Richard McCarthy returned to the Open Session at 7:20 p.m.

**NORTH ATTLEBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD  
PUBLIC HEARING  
THURSDAY, August 18, 2011  
7:21 P.M.  
(Christina Estates)**

Chairman McCarthy opened the continuation of the public hearing from June 16, 2011 at 7:21 p.m. Board members present were Chairman Richard McCarthy, Vice Chairman Richard Peterson, Richard Houle, Mary Signoriello and Thomas Welch. Also in attendance was Town Planner Mary Burgess.

Burgess: Since the last time, I did receive a letter from Joshua Rosen from Commonwealth Engineering, describing some of the other items that the Board had asked for. This took place before I was here at the first hearing and then it's been continued ever since, and everybody's able to vote so we can move forward now.

Stephen Clapp: Mr. Chairman, my name is Stephen Clapp, an attorney with offices in North Attleboro. I represent the applicant, Cushman Development. Ray Bourque, principle of Cushman is here, and Josh Rosen, our engineer from Commonwealth Engineers will present the preliminary plan.

Joshua Rosen: For the record, Josh Rosen, Project Engineer, Professional Engineer with Commonwealth Engineers, a consultant's office at 400 Smith Street in Providence. I just really

wanted to reflect on a couple items with this preliminary plan. In my letter that I addressed to the Planning Board, sent through Mary, basically I highlighted the fact that back in July 2010, we submitted a preliminary plan for this development. In nature the submittal back in March is very similar, so the points I wanted to bring up were basically that from the plan in July this plan that was submitted back in March, we're still proposing this development would serve 8 new lots in accordance with the zoning, 7 of which would actually be buildable lots. The 8<sup>th</sup> remains for a storm water lot. The roadway configuration and the majority of the lot configuration is the exact same as was presented back in July. The only difference is on the front lot not owned by Cushman Development, this lot 315, there was a Form A recorded that took some of the land previously identified as part of the larger parcel back here, and actually merged it in with 315 so this lot got bigger, and in design of the complete storm water system as well as the individual septic, the lot line between lot 7 and lot 8 was just altered to make the lot 8 compatible for the storm water basin. So we basically did in working toward definitive, we did more detailed storm water analysis, we submitted individual septic to the Board of Health, those have all been approved. So what you see on this plan is basically more grading, a more final detail for each of the individual lots in terms of the site plan, but generally speaking the lot sizes are the same, the configuration of the roadway as it was originally proposed and the total number of house lots are exactly the same.

Houle: Mary do you have the old plans?

Rosen: I have the old plan with me, it's on the back of this.

Burgess: Which old plan?

Rosen: The previous preliminary plan.

Burgess: From?

Rosen: Back in July.

Burgess: Okay. Not Cushman Village? Cushman Estates?

Rosen: This is the one that was approved or voted favorably on by the Board here, and you can see that the storm water lot has basically been utilized just as we intended. Some of the grades here, the contour lines here are a lot more general than they are on the individual lots here, this is much more detailed. And these rectangles for our septic areas we're showing as boxes here. Now obviously we've designed all these systems so these are the actual field sizes, this is all the grading, it's just a more detailed plan. Do you want me to leave this set up?

Houle: That's okay, I just wanted to see the difference of what was going on?

Peterson: So what kind of grading is required in terms of raising the existing topography in order to get the septic systems and everything in, is it pretty close to what's there or, I guess, are there any major topographical changes?

Rosen: The side that actually came up I think in our previous discussions along the abutters' lots to the south, that area is the least amount of fill on site, so the top of the foundations of those houses will nearly match the houses on Norborough Drive. The ones on the top, in order to keep the roadway elevation above the water table, etc. and have our drainage work, there's a little bit more fill on the lots to the north of the new proposed roadway. But the elevations are all above the roadway, which is what we typically like to design so that all the storm water runoff is directed into the street, so it's not like we have any lots down in a bowl or anything like that.

Peterson: So you're going to be higher than the existing elevation on those upper lots, so when you get to the boundary line along the back side of those lots, how are you swaling the land or whatever to catch any water and get rid of any water that you catch.

Rosen: On the back side of the north lots there's actually the general watershed directs overland runoff basically straight across the property and then down to the south of this wetland area here naturally. We actually with our draining just continuing that flow, it's just more directed along the back of the property line now that we've accounted for grading on the backyards of these houses so the storm water concentration path is essentially the same, we're just bringing more directed along the back and it's still going to end up through a route, we've got this roadway culvert here that would allow the water to continue to the resource area like it does now. And the same thing on the south side, the back side of these lots, the water is going to be directed directly to this wetland through some grading via swale in the rear of these lots so there will be no water directed off the property to the abutters here.

Houle: It seems like a much better plan from a drainage, I have to wait to hear what our engineers say, but

Welch: Does it pond up there at all when that drainage, it's huge that area you're pointing out, what's the low point in that?

Rosen: In this area?

Welch: Where all your drainage is going?

Rosen: It's actually right at the back end of it, behind this house lot. The wetland resource area right here, we're draining at the lowest point which is right out the back. And then everything goes in through underneath Cushman Road.

Welch: And heads in that direction?

Rosen: Yes, to the golf course.

Burgess: If I may, through the Chair, the easements, the slope easements, were you able to get those to (inaudible) on those A & Rs and get them recorded?

Rosen: Yes.

Burgess: Okay. Because they were the A & Rs, the new regulations 15' slope easement, construction easement basically so that they can go in there and actually build the road and be able to maintain everything.

Rosen: The north lot actually had the easements, the south lot as I mentioned we did another Form A to grab some land for that particular lot, so at that point we added the easements on for them.

Burgess: And the site easements.

Rosen: Yes.

Burgess: Also in the originally approved, now rescinded plan, there was a (inaudible) activity to the property to the north, as required by our subdivision rules and regs. Is there still going to be a temporary easement if you recall, through that lot at the end of the cul de sac? Are you supposed to bring the road all the way around just in case that person next door wanted to develop their property at some point, to have some type of horse shoe effect? And on the original approved plan that was put in, in easement format, so that if that person ever, it could be a right of way through there. I know that it may be a little bit tight, but I think it was on 2 lots, the way that it went.

Rosen: When we submit the definitive. We will into that, sure.

McCarthy: Line of sight, each way on Cushman, adequate sight distance?

Rosen: Yes.

Houle: Mary, have you shown this to ConCom or anybody else yet?

Rosen: Yes, no, I'm sorry we have not.

Houle: BOH?

Rosen: Board of Health, yes. Approved septics. ConCom signed off on the ANRAD for the edge verification for the flags that we show in this plan.

Houle: Okay, and that's it?

Rosen: That's it so far.

McCarthy: Our engineers look at this?

Burgess: Generally I would not have, just because the level of detail, and they have not submitted a hydro or anything like that, because this is just really a concept I would not send to the engineers.

Welch: That low point where all your drains are coming through, how far is that to the property lines on those homes on Norborough?

Rosen: Where we are dumping into the wetland or where we are discharging to the wetland, that point is 100' from that property line. Where that wetland is at the widest there, southwest corner

Welch: Can you just point it out for me?

Rosen: This point right here is about 100' from this property line. Now the water, the storm water that's generated or the runoff to that wetland resource area right now, albeit that it's over land through wooded areas, lawn areas, the rate of runoff and the volume as per the regulations, hasn't changed based on this design.

Welch: But you have a lot more impervious surface now, right, you're going to be discharging everything through that area.

Rosen: Yes and no. Two things are happening. Number one is we've provided on some of these lots roof infiltration systems, separate or disconnected from that storm water area, so that the infiltration of the roof runoffs, that will take care of the roof impervious area, and the water that is generated to the storm water area, lot 8, that water is actually held back through detention before it's released to the wetland. So it's not like we're just pouring all the impervious surface

Welch: Yeah, I just was concerned for those property owners over there along that, it's only 100', it's significant I guess but not significant. It depends on

Houle: Well he's accounting for the roof drains too.

Peterson: Do you have it flagged where the wetland is on the other people's property, along that lower boundary line where Tom was just talking about, the wetland doesn't stop at that boundary line, those people's property.

Rosen: No there's an edge that would delineate on the opposite side.

Peterson: So some of the wetland is on their property already.

Rosen: Yes.

Welch: We had a resident come in that owns that property

(Multiple conversations)

Houle: You can see, that can fill, especially in a 100-year storm or something like that, you can definitely see where that can be a problem.

Burgess: If I may though the Chair. Just one more question, as you have done with Woodridge Estates, is there a chance to get that conservation buffered, just for those people on Norborough? I know that they were very concerned about having it that close and the drainage and everything like that. I don't know if that's something that's feasible. They had I believe 25', they had a really nice conservation where they were plantings some stuff.

Rosen: This one could be the same idea. The fact that this is R-20 zone, we went by pretty much the rear setback in an R-40 for Woodridge, which was 25. This is 15 in the back where we've got that swale, so we could do something for 15' on our lot 6 and 7 which provide the same kind of landscaping conservation buffer.

Burgess: If I recall those houses were a little bit higher and they were draining down, and I think if you were able to stabilize that swale a little bit better it wouldn't come off down to Norborough. So it wouldn't come down as much on those property owners as previously

Welch: I would like to see something like that.

Rosen: I can't speak directly to the, necessarily right now to the sight distance that we've done in preparation for definitive, but at the preliminary stage the first time through you asked us to investigate relocation of Cushman Chemawa's Golf driveway, and when we analyzed the sight distance of our new road, we also analyzed the potential of aligning the streets. There are certain impediments within the right of way, up and down, on Cushman right now that actually make the sight distance best where the location is right now, even with the new roadway. So we'll be presenting that, our findings there at the definitive stage.

Burgess: If I recall that's also when the water was going up and you were going to take it all apart anyway, at that point I don't believe that aligning the driveway was going to be as practical as it could have been back then.

McCarthy: Any other questions? I don't believe there's anybody from the public here relative to this. What do we usually do with a preliminary?

Burgess: Usually we make a motion to approve the concept with certain items to look at in the definitive stage, such as sight distance, easements along the rear properties, inspection of whether or not a road could be continued to the north per our regulations.

Houle: Would we get letters from all the Boards?

Burgess: That will come more at the definitive stage.

McCarthy: Alright. Someone want to make such a motion?

Houle: I'll make a motion that we accept the preliminary concept for Cushman Estates, and I don't know the name on that print, I can't read it from here, Mary, so I don't know the name of that

Welch: Just preliminary plan

Houle: Cushman Estates preliminary plan dated 3/22/11 with review of sight distance, conservation easement and roadway extension.

Welch: Second.

McCarthy: All those in favor? Motion passes 5 to 0.

Welch: I make a motion to close the public hearing for the Cushman Estates preliminary plan.

Houle: Second.

McCarthy: All those in favor? Motion passes 5 to 0.

**NORTH ATTLEBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING (Continued at 7:38)  
THURSDAY, August 18, 2011**

**New Business**

**Woodridge Estates – Project Update**

Applicant Ray Bourque updated the Board on the work completed to date. He requested 3 building permits and the establishment of bond amounts. Chairman McCarthy reminded that there would be no discussion regarding the issue currently in litigation. Mary Burgess prepared a draft of the remaining items to be addressed. In anticipation of the court ruling, Attorney Stephen Clapp, representing the applicant, requested 2 bond amounts for work to be completed (depending on the court ruling). Following discussion, Mr. Houle made a motion to accept the request to for Bond A and Bond B (as presented in Attorney Clapp's letter to the Board). Seconded by Mr. Welch. Motion passed 5 to 0.

**Site Plan: MetroPCS – 135 East Washington Street**

Bob Watson presented on behalf of the applicant, to install an LTE cabinet on the existing pad, which would require no tower work. Following brief discussion, Mr. Houle made a motion to accept the site plan dated July 28, 2011 for MetroPCS at 135 East Washington Street. Seconded by Mr. Peterson. Motion passed 5 to 0.

**Site Plan: MetroPCS – 192 Plain Street**

Bob Watson presented on behalf of the applicant, to remove an existing cabinet and install an LTE cabinet on the existing pad, which would require no tower work. Following brief discussion, Mr. Houle made a motion to accept the site plan dated July 21, 2011 for MetroPCS at 192 Plain Street. Seconded by Mr. Peterson. Motion passed 5 to 0.

**Old Business**

**Santoro Drive Site Plan**

Mary Burgess received a request of continuance and extension of final action for this property and read into the record a letter from Level Design LLC dated August 11, 2011. Mr. Houle made a motion to continue the site plan to October 6, 2011 and Final Action to October 30, 2011. Seconded by Mrs. Signoriello. Motion passed 5 to 0.

**Arns Park/Boch Toyota Site Plan Change**

Attorney Stephen Clapp presented on behalf of applicant Michael Clemmey, also in attendance. A section of the Arns Park motel which should have remained had recently been deemed structurally unsound and razed after a demolition permit was applied for and granted by the Building Inspector. Chairman McCarthy was concerned that the Planning Board had not been informed of this and wanted to be assured of no future communication lapses. Mr. Clapp and Mr. Clemmey stated that the demolition was urgent in nature, and will present the Board with a modified site plan.

**Completion of Waterson Estates Subdivision**

Mary Burgess stated that Shawn Jorde was unable to attend; the matter will be heard at the September 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Work Session**

**Proposed Updates to Application Fees**

The Board reviewed the fee analysis prepared by Mary Burgess, as requested. Brief discussion ensued. The Board will discuss further at a future meeting. Additional information (estimated administrative time spent on applications, which towns have consulting engineers) will be researched by the Town Planner.

**Warrant Article**

Mary Burgess stated that a letter was received from Attorney Elliot Bray, representing the owners of the old police station, requesting zoning be all C-75 instead of R-10S. The Board was favorable to the request.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the wording of the Warrant Articles for the October 17<sup>th</sup> Town Meeting.

**Board Policies and Goals**

The Board reviewed goals and policies from the previous year and upcoming year.

**Adjournment**

Mr. Houle made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Welch. Motion carried 5 to 0. The meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Signoriello  
Secretary