

**Planning Board
Lakeville, Massachusetts
Minutes of Meeting
July 9, 2020
Remote meeting**

On July 9, 2020, the Planning Board held a remote meeting. It was called to order by Chairman Knox at 7:16. Ms. Murray, recording secretary, was audio recording. LakeCam was recording, and it was streaming on Facebook Live.

Members present:

Mark Knox, Chair; Barbara Mancovsky, Vice-Chair; Peter Conroy, Michele MacEachern

Also present:

Jamie Bissonnette, engineer for Zenith Consulting Engineers, Michael O'Shaughnessy, attorney for the applicant, Robert Poillucci,

Richard Rakoski, 30 Cross Street, Mallory Reis, 35 Cross Street, Tracy Smith, Shamrock Lane, Sharon Anderson 29 Cross Street, Kevin Fredette, Dave Morrissey, 37 Cross Street

Agenda item #1

Mr. Knox read this item into the record. It was an explanation of the Governor's Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law relating to the 2020 novel Coronavirus outbreak emergency which was why the Board was meeting remotely.

PUBLIC HEARING: Bella Way-39 Cross Street and part of 5 Harding Street

Mr. Knox explained the process for the Public hearing and when public comment would be allowed. He then opened the floor to Mr. Jaimie Bissonnette, engineer for the project. Mr. Bissonnette advised he was presenting the Form C subdivision for Bella Way off of Cross Street. Bella Way is a Form A lot with two lots being subdivided in the rear. He then shared the plan on his screen. It showed the design with an aerial overlay and also the area showing the Conservation restriction property designated in green.

Mr. Bissonnette advised they were proposing a private right of way, 40 feet wide, to come back approximately 700 feet to service two houses in the rear, and one house in the front which also has frontage on Cross Street. The houses are shown in a conceptual manner as typically when they do the drainage design, they try to show something that is practical that would be built so they can model the stormwater appropriately. He noted he knew there had been some concerns so he would like to address those in the beginning.

Mr. Knox said there had been a concern regarding the amount of visibility to the commercial property and Route 44. Mr. Bissonnette responded they had also done the permitting for 5 Harding Street which is the property on Route 44. They want to make clear that although this property is completely zoned business, except for a small portion in the rear, they are trying to be cognizant that there are a lot of residential neighbors along Cross Street, Paradise Lane, and Shamrock Lane. As part of the approval for 5 Harding Street, they have mounds of dirt in two areas. He noted the areas in green will be conservation restricted in perpetuity and will not be touched. They have been working with a biologist that specializes in the eastern box turtle as well as some other turtles and also the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife to make sure they have adequately addressed this. This protects the area that has been found to be most valuable for the habitat of the eastern box turtle. Ms. Mancovsky asked if that would be going to Natural Heritage Trust. Mr. Bissonnette replied they had been working with an organization called Wildlands Trust who would actually go out and monitor and ensure that nothing happens to the parcel. Natural Heritage is who requires the restriction to be put in place.

Mr. Bissonnette clarified that from the edge of the pavement of the commercial development to Bella Way there is approximately 300 feet that cannot be cut and will be monitored. He said another question that has been asked is about the access off of Cross Street to get to 5 Harding Street. He stated that right now there is an existing gravel road. That will be conservation restricted meaning no work and no access. They also wanted to make clear that although this property is zoned business, they are proposing the residential lots in the back because they feel it is more in harmony with the neighborhood. They have, by right, the ability to go in and permit another business type structure but being a good neighbor, that is something they are not looking to do.

Mr. Bissonnette advised there is already a Form A lot there that Mr. Poillucci had acquired to be able to access the lots in a more environmentally friendly way. Mr. Bissonnette then shared a grading screen. They are proposing a waived roadway meaning they are looking to construct a road to the simplest of design criteria, with waivers, understanding that it will never be accepted by the Town as a Town public road. They are looking to have a portion of it paved and then to meet the State Fire Code increase the width with a gravel apron to a width of 20 feet. At the end, they have a hammer head style which ties in to the two driveways to access each lot.

In regards to drainage, Mr. Bissonnette advised there is a segment of a trench drain at the entrance so that no water from Cross Street enters onto the road. That will be discharged through a flared end on the side to a non-jurisdictional wetland which is due to its size and lack of connection. There is another catch basin in which they have a pipe running under the road with a flared end into a forebay for treatment. That goes into a small detention basin which helps detain the water and release it at the same or similar rate so they will have no increase in runoff rate in storm events from what is in predevelopment. This also gives them good treatment even though storm water management is not applicable here because there are only two lots.

Mr. Bissonnette said they are in front of Conservation where Nick Lanney is presently reviewing the design. He has issued some comments that the Board should also have. This plan depicts the changes in reference to Mr. Lanney's comments. One of the comments was he felt that some of

the area from Lot 1 was going to pitch down towards the road, and they were not accounting for that area. They picked up and checked to make sure they were capturing all of that water and that it was graded to get into their storm system or be handled appropriately. Mr. Bissonnette said another comment was in regards to the four-inch pipe out of their outlet structure of their detention basin which is what the calculations showed they needed. Mr. Lanney's concern was that a four-inch pipe might clog with debris if not maintained over time. In response, they have created an outlet structure that is going to be a concrete box. It will hold a hole that is four inches drilled on the side at the same elevation. On the top of the box, which is still within the basin, it will have a catch basin lid or grate on it. If that four-inch hole ever does plug up, the water can rise and spill over into the top of that outlet structure and go down the pipe. The pipe has been increased to 12-inches which should alleviate that concern.

Mr. Bissonnette said another concern was if there had been a culvert analysis done on the pipe crossings for the two driveways. He replied there is now. They found they had to put three 15-inch pipes for a hundred-year storm. He advised to get water through a culvert you have to be able to build a head to push the water through, but as it is a relatively flat area, they don't have that ability to build up that head. That necessitates the use of more and larger pipes so that water can get through without backing up and becoming a problem. In the other area, they were able to build up a better head so they were able to use two 12-inch pipes. This information has been forwarded to Mr. Lanney for his approval.

Mr. Bissonnette said the last change was an item that had been brought up by the Building Inspector. There was a concern about the possibility of the front section on Lot 1 not meeting the 50 foot deep by 50 foot wide regulation. He displayed the area which showed the line that exists now is 39.76 feet. The wording of the regulation says 30 feet in length or width so that area would not be counted toward the land area or the frontage. They are going to create a triangular piece of 230 feet that will be called Parcel B and will have to be deeded to 5 Harding Street. It comes to a point at Cross Street so there is no actual frontage. In order to make up for the loss of 230 feet, they changed the angle of the lot line on Lot 1 from 74 feet to 54 feet ending up with over 70,000 square feet as required. He noted that this subdivision had been discussed when they were in front of the Board with the Site Plan. He believed the residents in attendance and the consensus had been residential in the back was preferable to business. He asked for questions.

Ms. Mancovsky asked Mr. Bissonnette if he could revisit the trench drain at the entrance. She noted when they talked about that area and Shamrock Lane the water problem down there is significant. She did think the culvert had improved that but what will happen with that trench drain? Mr. Bissonnette replied the purpose of the trench drain is right now on the proposed roadway, this would be the proposed high point in the roadway itself. He wanted them to keep in mind that on a waived roadway, like this, the pavement is actually more sized like a driveway. This is much friendlier when it comes to impervious surface and also for drainage and impacts. The trench drain is at their low point, and he then showed on the plan where it will be picking up water from so it will not increase the runoff from their site. They are using it here because to get the drainage to work appropriately in a situation like this, and with this small area, a catch basin didn't really make a lot of sense. The trench drain is more appropriate in this type of application. Therefore, they are catching it, picking it up, and running it via a pipe down into a manhole and

then out a flared end section to the existing low area. After it comes out of the low area, it is going to flow down towards 5 Harding Street so it will not end up on Cross Street. Mr. Bissonnette then shared his screen and displayed the trench details.

Mr. Conroy asked of the 14 feet across that is paved, how many of these segments are there? Are they four feet sections? Will they have to be pulled up to be cleaned? Mr. Bissonnette replied what winds up happening when you have a storm water system on a private way like this is there is one of two mechanisms that have to be put into place. Since this is a private way, they would either do a common roadway maintenance agreement or a condo association for the road. That is supposed to be structured in such a way so that plowing and maintenance is automatically contributed to by the residents that are able to utilize Bella Lane, and the Town does not have to do any maintenance or upkeep on it. Silts and sands can get in the trench drain but it is an extremely simple structure to get into in comparison to the catch basin. Mr. Bissonnette thought they could handle that with the common roadway maintenance agreement or the condo association. They could present those documents to the Planning Board if this was amenable. There could be devices in it that would allow the DPW to call and have it cleaned if that was an issue that needed to be addressed. Mr. Conroy asked how far it was from the trench drain to the flared end section where it exits. Mr. Bissonnette replied there were two segments. The first segment was approximately 200 feet and the second segment 20 feet for a total of 220 feet.

Mr. Knox said that he spoke to one of the abutters who had a concern about noise. If they were to approve this, they would condition the construction to begin after 7:00 a.m. and end by 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and probably 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Saturdays. There would be no construction on holidays or Sundays. Mr. Knox felt they were doing the right thing by making this business zoned portion of the property residential, but they would need a Special Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals. However, is there a guarantee if that happens now, will that always remain residential?

Mr. Bissonnette said their note #1 on the plan states "The purpose of this plan is to subdivide part of 39 Cross Street and part of 5 Harding Street into three buildable lots for residential use and Parcel A. He explained that Mr. Darling had asked the same question and what would happen if they did not get their Special Permit to build houses. This road is not adequate for business use. In good faith, they are putting this note on this plan to state their intentions clearly. If the Zoning Board denies a Special Permit for the three houses that they are looking to construct for any reason, then they will have to abandon the roadway and come back in with a different plan.

Atty. O'Shaughnessy said that he did not want to speak for Mr. Poillucci but you could restrict this property in perpetuity as a residential use. He did note that it would not be fair for the homeowner to not have the ability for a home office. Mr. Knox said that would not be the intent of what they are trying to stop. Mr. Knox said they should be afforded the rights of every other resident on the street but should not have a business advantage that they could do a lot more and it then becomes uncomfortable for the surrounding residents. Mr. Bissonnette asked if they wanted them to come up with some language along with the roadway maintenance agreement to present to the Board. Mr. Knox said yes even if it was something in perpetuity that said the homes will be compliant with residential zoning usage. Mr. Bissonnette thought that was fair.

Ms. Mancovsky asked if the developer would be amicable to having a covenant or HOA for road maintenance and also maintenance of the storms drains. Also, did they have any comment from Conservation? Mr. Knox then read the July 8, 2020, Conservation memo into the record. The applicant had submitted a Notice of Intent and the meeting had been continued until July 14, 2020. The applicant would be submitting revised plans. The Commission was also waiting for comments from Wildlands Trust on development alternatives and an engineering review by Nick Lanney. Mr. Knox asked Mr. Bissonnette if he could speak to any of those items. Mr. Bissonnette responded the second meeting was just a discussion about if the Wildlands Trust did not take the conservation restriction but it appears that is heading in a favorable direction. At the first meeting, they did a presentation as they had done tonight. The Commission wanted peer review by Mr. Lanney which they always welcome. He did speak with Mr. Lanney today who has not been able to review the revised plans yet. He was not sure if that would be ready for the next Conservation meeting. He believed they were taking care of all the issues that Conservation had asked of them. As far as Wildlands Trust, they requested some additional information which is a copy of the draft CR, that they had their biologist draft, and a copy of the Order of Conditions for 5 Harding Street which they supplied. They will be taking a vote to see if they will accept the project or not.

Ms. Mancovsky said it looks like the driveway coming in from the cul de sac is over a septic system. Mr. Bissonnette displayed the plan, and said that he has spoken with the property owner. His septic system was designed like that because of suitable soils. His understanding was there were some difficult soils in this area. He also showed where the well was and some wetlands in the rear. They were aware of where the septic was but it was not within their roadway. They have created a five foot strip along the side which will go with Lot 3 so that it is not even part of the roadway itself. There is well over ten feet to the edge of that septic system.

Ms. Mancovsky asked if the cul de sac was the circular area that was showing. Mr. Bissonnette replied the dark lines are the property lines or the right of way lines, in this case it is both. This roadway is what they are looking to have constructed, and it is called a hammer head. A fire truck can pull down, back up, and pull out. Mr. Bissonnette then went through the elevations to the catch basin. Mr. Knox stated that if Board members had no additional questions, he was going to open up the floor for public comment.

Mr. Rakoski said they had only seen the plans a few days ago. He would like to hold this meeting for a couple more weeks and have his attorney look it over and have an engineer also take a look at it. Mr. Rakoski spoke to the problems from the Shamrock project regarding the construction and water. He felt there would be a lot of water problems there which is why he was asking for a couple of weeks to have the plan reviewed.

The next abutter to speak was Mallory Reis of 35 Cross Street. Some of her questions about the wildlife had been answered and she thought it was great they were working on those wildlife issues. She asked how much would be cleared, and how close would it be to her property line. Should she have her property surveyed? Mr. Bissonnette then displayed the aerial plan. He showed the property line determined by their surveyor but noted that she was welcome to have a surveyor come out and check that. He advised the house corner to the property line was about

200 feet. They were not proposing anything in that area for grades but right now it doesn't appear there are a lot of trees. He was not sure about any type of site control but believed that the owner was willing to put up some kind of a visual buffer.

Ms. Reis asked what type of buffer it would be. Mr. Poillucci said to be clear it is that area on the bottom. He was going to transplant trees and fill in that area. They want as much as a buffer as possible on that property line. He thought there would be about 400 to 500 feet between the houses. She asked if he would be willing to write that in. If that could be done she would really appreciate it. He said that was fine. He has no problem setting up a Homeowners Association for that and also have that right in the people's deed when they buy the home. Mr. Poillucci said that he believed he could put deed restrictions on those two houses that limit their use to whatever rights that any other residential lot has in the Town of Lakeville. Atty. O'Shaughnessy said that if they were to go that way, that was probably the best way to do it.

Mr. Knox then called on Ms. Tracy Smith of Shamrock Lane. She stated that she didn't have anything to say. She didn't know much about this project so she just wanted to see what was happening. Ms. Sharon Anderson was also attending. She advised she was just watching, and she had no questions. Mr. Kevin Fredette was present. His questions had been answered in regards to the buffer zones. He thought all of the residents have concerns when once those pine trees and the existing grading is disturbed that they will be able to hear traffic from Route 44 more clearly. There is a noticeable difference between summer time and winter time when the foliage is on the trees. As much as the existing tree line could remain undisturbed would be in the best interest of the current residents.

Mr. Fredette also said bringing a fire truck down a 700 foot driveway seems like it could be an issue if either one of those homes ever had a public safety emergency. Has the Fire Chief signed off on this? Mr. Knox responded the Fire Chief has commented a couple of times on this project. He knew that the Building Commissioner has spoken to him regarding his latest comments. The Chief was a little concerned with the length and the hammerhead of being able to get a tanker truck in for staging areas, but he thought the radiuses on the hammerhead the engineer had provided are more than adequate to turn a truck around and get the vehicles in there. They would probably request a follow up comment from the Chief. Mr. Fredette asked if Fire and Conservation sign off are required before this Board votes on the approval of this subdivision. Mr. Knox said departments can comment or not but that it is really not a sign off from them. Conservation because of the wetlands, there is filing. They could approve 'pending' but he really did not like doing that because that could change the plan. The Planning Board likes to sign a final plan not an amended plan.

Mr. Fredette asked if they would wait for Conservation to return their findings before they vote on this approval. Mr. Knox replied that he might make that recommendation but he did not speak for the entire Board. He noted that if they did continue this it would most likely be on their July 23rd meeting. Mr. Fredette asked if that would be a Zoom meeting or a traditional meeting. Mr. Knox replied until the Board of Selectmen lift the no public meetings ruling, it would be in this remote format.

Mr. Dave Morrissey was asked next if he would like to speak. Mr. Morrissey said that he was next door to 39 Cross St. He had some concerns as well. The traffic from the trucks from Shamrock had been challenging. He wanted to make sure that there would be no access from Cross Street to 5 Harding as had been indicated previously. Mr. Poillucci said that back entrance is being totally abandoned and is now part of someone's lot. As Mr. Bissonnette had pointed out, the entire area that had been in the green is going to have a restriction on it so nobody could drive there. Along the back of 5 Harding there is going to be an earth berm with plantings for sound, and it will run along that back corner. It will be impossible for a car to drive from one to another. Mr. Morrissey said that he was more concerned with construction. He wants to make sure they would not be experiencing the level of traffic of two projects. Mr. Knox asked Mr. Poillucci for clarification that any construction at 5 Harding Street will always access from Route 44. Mr. Poillucci said exactly and it has to because before he can put a shovel in the ground, he needs that sign off from Natural Heritage. Once that restriction goes on, just like everyone else, he cannot go on that land. He noted once that is recorded no one will be able to access any of the land that had been designated in green on the plan. Mr. Poillucci stated they are keeping most of the grades, and he expected the construction time to be minimal. They would then begin the construction of the homes.

Mr. Bissonnette shared his screen again and said that he would like to explain something. He noted that if it is mandated that some areas have to be enhanced for turtle breeding they might have to access a part of that area. He was not aware of a plan for that at this time, but he did see one previously when this was planned to be a grocery store. He wanted to disclose that because he did not want anyone to think they were being dishonest.

Mr. Morrissey asked how this would be policed. The bridge over the brook has a certain capacity so trucks leaving will have to come out 39 Cross Street and head south towards Middleboro Avenue. There are a lot of children that live on this street now, and they need to know that will be policed. He noted that his septic system was also a concern. It is right up against the property line, and it was reduced by 10% because of space and suitable soils. His minimal Title V break out grading looks to be right at that five foot buffer zone that is going up. He was hoping he was considering either leaving some of that vegetation or doing something to give them some privacy as that driveway would run the length of his property. Mr. Poillucci said that he did not plan on cutting any tree that he did not have to. There are a lot of trees out there, that he thought were left over from the nursery. He planned on transplanting them all over and would try to do whatever he could.

Mr. Morrissey said the only other concern he had was there was an existing storm drain. He stated the water runs down Cross Street pretty quickly and tends to pool up specifically on that lot. He wants to make sure the drainage does not get any worse. Mr. Bissonnette said the drainage has been designed and is being reviewed by Mr. Lanney. They do not believe it is going to make anything worse. Mr. Morrissey said that in the event that it does like Shamrock, would they remediate it and how would it be handled. Mr. Bissonnette replied his understanding with Shamrock was there was a hump in the asphalt and they had to correct the asphalt itself. If there is a construction error, it is typically corrected by construction.

Mr. Rakoski said they had a storm a couple of weeks ago and it is not corrected, but the place had been flooded out. Mr. Bissonnette asked if the water was still bypassing the catch basin. Mr. Rakoski said absolutely. Mr. Rakoski said in front of 39 Cross Street there is a driveway there with a 12-inch pipe that runs under, and the Town has to dig that out and maintain it, sometimes twice a year. Mr. Bissonnette said there are a lot of wetlands in that area, but the majority of their stuff is in the back heading away from Cross Street. From the high point in the road and from that point down, all goes away from Cross Street. He advised the approximately 200 square feet of asphalt they are proposing should not make any difference especially as they plan on collecting it with the trench drain and disposing of it on site. Mr. Rakoski said he thought they were incorrect. He said they had a problem with Shamrock Lane. The jake brakes, horns, litter, speeding, etc. Mr. Knox said they do want to address this and limit some construction hours and make it as palatable as possible. Mr. Rakoski asked about a police detail. Mr. Knox said if it was warranted, and there was construction in the roadway. Mr. Rakoski said there will be speeding around that corner, and it is dangerous out there.

Ms. Mancovsky said she was familiar with this property. She asked Mr. Rakoski if the water was worse, the same, or better than what it was before Shamrock went in. Those retention basins that were installed were meant to mitigate what was already a problem. Mr. Rakoski said it is worse, and he explained the flooding problem. Ms. Mancovsky said that if they had a problem with the behavior of the developer's workers, they should call Mr. Poillucci who lives in Town. Mr. Rakoski said that he had tried to work with the developer of Shamrock but nothing ever got done. He felt the problem had gotten worse after that. Ms. Anderson said she called repeatedly on every speeding truck that went down there but nothing was ever done.

Mr. Knox said that although this was not a Shamrock Lane hearing could Mr. Bissonnette speak to the concerns about the water runoff and any issues if this roadway went in for Bella Way. Mr. Bissonnette replied he thought their design was simple, as far as the area that is going toward Cross Street. Mr. Rakoski said he understood the process but had Mr. Bissonnette been out there during a rain storm. Mr. Bissonnette replied he had gone out there when it was bypassing the basin in the beginning and the hump. He spoke with the previous DPW director, and he did agree there was a problem and it was bypassing the catch basin. He was told it was fixed and has not been out there in a rain storm since. However, if Mr. Rakoski was telling him it was an issue, he would probably have to go out and take a look at it again. Mr. Rakoski said there is a water issue with the whole thing. Mr. Bissonnette said that basin that is right off the road is purely for the runoff on Cross Street. That is not from the development, and that was done as a mitigation measure to help what is in the road. If that water is not getting in there and helping to reduce that then that is a problem, because it was put in solely for that purpose. Mr. Bissonnette said that he would make a note to go out there during the next rainstorm and see how it is functioning.

Mr. Rakoski said the draining is a big concern of his as well as the speeding. Mr. Bissonnette said maybe they could implement some type of warning signs and during construction they would be placed every day saying 'construction ahead'. Mr. Rakoski thought it should be a detail with one at each end of the road. Mr. Knox said they would take that under advisement but they did have some other business to conduct tonight. He then made a motion to continue

the Public hearing for Bella Way, 39 Cross Street, until July 23, 2020, at 7:00 p.m. It was seconded by Mr. Conroy.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Mancovsky-AYE, Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye

The hearing closed at 8:50.

ANR plan- Meet with Mr. David Maddigan from Maddigan Land Surveying regarding ANR submittal for 24 Montgomery Street

Mr. David Maddigan from Maddigan Land Surveying was present. He advised that tonight they had a Form A plan on Montgomery Street. Currently, it is a large parcel of approximately 12 acres with one home. They are just cutting off and creating two lots. One, Lot 1, for the existing house and the other, Lot 2, which will be a buildable lot. Both lots have the minimum required frontage, area, the front yard circle, and the distances at the setbacks, etc. Mr. Knox said he had reviewed it and it looked good. He asked if Board members had any questions.

Mr. Conroy wanted a clarification on the barn. There are two barns on the plan. Is the second barn staying with the original property? Mr. Maddigan replied the closest barn to the house will go with Lot 1. The rear barn is being cut out and will go with Lot 2 and the new owner. There were no additional questions.

Ms. Mancovsky made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to endorse the ANR plan for 24 Montgomery Street.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Mancovsky-AYE, Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye

Ms. Kim Jeswald was present. She said her property was supposed to close on July 13th. Should she extend that or would this be able to be signed in time. Mr. Maddigan replied that everything was approved but he was unsure if the plan would have to be recorded before the closing. He would speak to her tomorrow.

Discuss Planning Board Appointments – 43D Committee

Mr. Knox said at the last meeting both he and Mr. Conroy had expressed interest. Mr. Conroy said that he had a full plate right now so he was withdrawing for consideration. Mr. Knox said that he would like to stay in it for the duration at least of the Lakeville Hospital property. After further discussion, Ms. Mancovsky made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to appoint Mr. Knox to the 43D Committee as the Planning Board representative.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Mancovsky-AYE, Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye

Administrative Review and Updates-continued

Application requirements

Ms. Murray said it had been discussed to add the requirement of an electronic file with the submittal of an application to the rules and regulations. Mr. Knox said Ms. Mancovsky had also spoke to having SRPEDD align their regulations with their bylaws. Middleboro had also updated their rules and regulations recently but had hired a consultant. He asked if that could be an option. Ms. Murray was unsure and said they would have to get some type of a quote and see what that would entail. She asked if any of that would be involved in the zoning codification process that was being done by the Town Clerk. Mr. Knox said it would not.

Ms. Mancovsky said one thing she would like to see them do is hold up getting an item on the agenda until they had feedback from the other Boards although that could not apply to ANR plans. There is so much expertise that she doesn't have that other Boards do, should they be waiting for that information before they even look at a project? Mr. Knox said that was a good point. The Board then discussed a few different plans that had been submitted and how they had to be signed pending and then looked at again. Ms. Mancovsky asked was it a timing issue? Do they have to have it on their agenda, or can they wait for sign offs? Mr. Conroy said he thought the way they were doing it was giving the benefit of the doubt to the contractor. For example 57 Long Point, if they hadn't done anything with that plan until every other Board was satisfied, they would just be looking at it now. They want to help people the best they can when possible. He wanted to avoid a hard-fast rule of not seeing anything until every other Board had signed off. He did not think that was necessary but agreed that it sometimes gets complicated when there is a lot of back and forth. Mr. Knox said his concern would be that if they approve something pending or it hasn't been approved by another Board, they didn't sign the final draft. The Planning Board should be signing the plan of record.

Mr. Knox said that it appears that most applicants did submit an electronic file. Should they change the regulations to include that? Ms. Murray said, in her opinion, if they are going to update their Rules and Regulations they should probably do everything at once. For now, maybe they should just update their application forms. She suggested picking one and doing it through to completion.

ANR checklist

Mr. Knox said the three things needed for an ANR was the frontage, the access, and the area. Mr. Maddigan said that you do have to have legal street frontage, you have to be either on a public way or a way that was in existence prior to subdivision control law, and then you do have to have legal access onto the property. You don't actually have to have area but that will stop you further into the process if you don't.

Mr. Knox said he had gone through the rules and regulations and those were the items that were in them. Mr. Maddigan did like the checklist and thought it would be helpful to all involved.

His only concern was to have to identify the wetlands, brooks, etc. in a large lot where a small lot had been cut from.

Advertising

Ms. Murray said they had talked about this last time. She had been unable to advertise because of an outstanding bill with the newspaper and the engineer had been billed instead. She would like to set something up so that all engineers would pay for their own bill, and she would not have to bill them separately which seemed like duplicate work. She noted that this item had recently been on the Planners list serve and in most Towns the engineer is responsible for the bill. The Town prepares the ad but is not involved in the billing.

Certified mailing

There was a discussion regarding Certified mailings being confirmed as received right before a meeting. Mr. Conroy discussed if this would be adequate and if some were outstanding would it require the hearing to be postponed? Ms. Murray replied in Zoning some abutters had complained they had not been notified in a timely manner. At the time, the attorney had said the ad was in the paper and the intent to notify had been shown. It was something she could look into. She noted that now with Covid someone told her they hadn't signed for anything and the notice had just been placed in their mailbox. She saw some had been signed but several had the same initials or signature. Mr. Knox asked if they changed the procedure would that be something they would have to vote on. Ms. Murray replied because Town Hall was still closed to the public and she wasn't in the office every day, she would recommend keeping the procedure as is and then revisiting it in a couple of months.

New Business-Approve postage bill

Ms. Mancovsky made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy to approve the postage bill in the amount of \$208.50.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Mancovsky-AYE, Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye

Old Business-Update on Master Plan

Ms. Murray advised the books were in and ready to be picked up by Board members.

Next meeting

Mr. Knox advised the next meeting is scheduled for July 23, 2020.

Adjourn

Ms. Mancovsky made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy to adjourn the meeting.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Mancovsky-AYE, Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye

Meeting adjourned at 9:30.