

**Planning Board
Lakeville, Massachusetts
Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, October 10, 2019**

On October 10, 2019, the Planning Board held a meeting at the Lakeville Police Station. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Hoeg at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Murray, recording secretary, was audio recording, and LakeCAM was making a video recording of the meeting.

Members present:

Brian Hoeg, Chair; Sylvester Zienkiewicz, Vice-Chair; Peter Conroy, Mark Knox, Barbara Mancovsky

Continued – Meet with Zenith Consulting Engineers regarding Site Plan Review for 5 Harding Street

Mr. Jamie Bissonnette was present. He advised at the last meeting they had discussed bringing in some schematics for the building which he then presented to the Board. He noted the garage doors will be on the back side of the building. The front will be the office with the windows. He stated that one of the questions had been in regards to the height of the building. He advised that the height would be within zoning.

Mr. Bissonnette said that another question that had been asked was regarding the culvert and the access road. He stated they would be replacing that completely so there would be a new pipe in that area. Mr. Conroy asked if the replacement would be wider. Mr. Bissonnette replied that it would be, and there would be retaining walls on both sides because of the grade change in that area. Mr. Hoeg asked if the road would be wider. Mr. Bissonnette said the road would be slightly wider in that area. The change is for slope to meet storm water management and treatment. He noted it does need to be pitched appropriately towards the catch basin so it can be treated prior to discharge. Mr. Poillucci advised that came up because of the comment from the Fire Department. He also let the Chief know that the buildings will be sprinkled but he will put a hydrant in if the Chief requires it.

Mr. Hoeg asked if they were still in front of Conservation. Mr. Bissonnette replied they had their first meeting and are in front of them and are actively working with them with a Notice of Intent. Ms. Mancovsky asked if, in his opinion, there was an impact to the wetland. Mr. Bissonnette replied there is some impact to the flood plain. However, this project is less impactful than the previous project. It has less impervious area and also less traffic. They are also closing off the ability to get to Cross Street. They are going to be putting a lot of land in a Conservation Trust and it will be monitored by a company to

ensure that it is not disturbed. There will be recorded plans with that restriction. They are in the process of putting that together with Natural Heritage and some other groups. Mr. Poillucci noted that one of the biggest concerns with the supermarket had been discharge from the roof would get too hot and discharge into the cold water stream and requiring a white roof had been a condition. They probably have a third of what had been previously proposed. Mr. Bissonnette advised they are infiltrating the roof, so it will go into underground infiltration.

Ms. Mancovsky recalled the development on Cross Street and how there had been a real water issue over there. Will it be affected by this project? Mr. Bissonnette replied that he believed this is an upgrading of that. He did not think there would be any impact but he noted there would be a turtle nesting area in between the woods and the single family houses. Understanding how the brook runs and the Taunton River runs, he believed they were closer to the culvert that gets to the Taunton River. However, he has not looked at the elevations but he knows the discharge and the way the streams flow and couldn't imagine it would go the other way.

Mr. Hoeg stated that he did like the design of the building. Mr. Poillucci then discussed the parapet on the building. Mr. Bissonnette explained it as siding for a second story. Mr. Poillucci noted there have been multiple versions of the plan but until they get it built out and see what the people want some of the doorways and windows could change. That is why the plan shows various different ways that it could get finished off.

It was asked how wide the curb cut was expected to be. Mr. Bissonnette replied the road entrance is 24' and the radius is 30'. Mass DOT gives you a hard time about going wider with a larger radius because of the speed at which you can take the turn. They will let you go up to 30' in some cases but only when there is hard justification for it. Ms. Mancovsky asked if the detention basins and ponds had been revised from the previous plan of the property. Mr. Bissonnette responded that the whole site has been designed differently and the drainage has been completely updated. He noted that they would be meeting with Conservation in two weeks. Mr. Hoeg asked if he would then be returning to the Board. Mr. Bissonnette said that was correct.

Mr. Hoeg then said he would entertain a motion to continue this review until they hear back from Conservation. Ms. Mancovsky made that motion. It was seconded by Mr. Conroy. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Mr. Hoeg asked if anyone present would like to speak to this. Mr. Timothy Jones of 36 Cross Street said he was not against it but this was the first he was hearing of this as he did not receive any notification. He noted that it had been said there would be no impact from 5 Harding to Cross Street. Mr. Bissonnette explained there would be no commercial access to Cross Street. Mr. Jones asked about a second means of access for the Fire Department. Mr. Poillucci said they have a Form A on which they are going to reconfigure it so the existing road will be part of that lot and nobody will have the right to go on it. Mr. Bissonnette said they will be seeking a Special Permit from the Zoning Board to build a house on Cross Street next to the existing homes.

Mr. Jones asked how many units would be in the commercial building. Mr. Poillucci said there are twenty. He added there will be no retail. They are called contractor bays. Mr. Jones said he was concerned about the aqueduct under them and the waste that could come out of the bays. Where would it be stored? Mr. Bissonnette said the plumbing code calls for floor drains inside of these bays to go to an industrial waste type tank. This is a tight tank with a 110% capacity beyond this. The drainage is being treated to exceed storm water management. It will have storm sceptor units that will filter materials, like oils, salts, sands, etc. out prior to getting to a drainage basin.

Mr. Jones asked how far the building is from 39 Cross Street. Mr. Bissonnette replied it is approximately over 300 feet to the property line. This is the closest point adjacent so 39 Cross would be even further. Another resident asked if there were going to be greenbelts there. They were not taking trees down. Mr. Bissonnette replied the plan they are working on is going to be a turtle nesting area for perpetuity. He displayed the area on the plan. There will be a conservation restriction, and it will not be able to be developed.

Mr. Jones asked what the hours of operation would be. Mr. Poillucci stated they haven't set any yet. He noted, unlike the previous supermarket proposal, there would be no tractor trailers, no retail, no manufacturing, or industrial. These units are strictly for contractors who have grown too large to work out of their homes. They park their commercial truck in there, come and get it in the morning, and leave. Some units have a small office in the front.

Mr. Jones also asked about the lighting. Mr. Bissonnette invited the residents to come and look at the lighting plan. They have a minimal amount of lighting for safety. He noted multiple lights that were coded with 0 which meant the light was casting nothing. These are lights that face down. Ms. Mancovsky added that because Lakeville is a dark sky community, the light has to face down. Mr. Bissonnette advised that if they have any complaints with anything, they can contact Mr. Poillucci as he did not want to have any angry neighbors. Mr. Bissonnette noted that Mr. Poillucci was also adding berms at the site to help block any type of potential sound and visually, to further lessen the impact on neighbors.

Mr. Knox then made a motion that the date for the continued Site Plan Review be October 24, 2019. Mr. Conroy seconded the motion. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Continued – Establish standard Site Plan Review fee for marijuana uses

Ms. Murray explained that presently the standard Site Plan Review fee is \$250 for a minor review and \$1,000 for a major review. When the marijuana Special Permit was Planning Board's responsibility, it was \$1,240 which included the \$240 for the Special Permit application. Did they want to keep that marijuana use at \$1,000 or did they want the consistency of the present fee structure for Site Plan Review.

Ms. Mancovsky felt they should keep the fee at \$1,000 and then made that motion. Mr. Conroy did not want to differentiate one business from another. Mr. Knox agreed. Mr. Zienkiewicz then seconded the motion. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Ms. Murray asked for clarification if that was a \$1,000 regardless if it was major or minor. Mr. Knox said his opinion was if they have a minor marijuana Site Review Plan it should be \$250 and if they have a major review it should be \$1,000. Ms. Mancovsky said that would be consistent with other businesses. Mr. Hoeg asked Mr. Knox if he was making a modification to the motion.

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to withdraw the previous motion. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Mr. Knox then made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy to keep their fee structure the same as it is for all other businesses which is \$250 for a minor review and \$1,000 for a major review and strike the Special Permit fee as it is no longer their purview. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Approve Meeting Minutes

Mr. Conroy made a motion, seconded by Mr. Zienkiewicz, to approve the Meeting Minutes from September 12, 2019.

VOTE: Mr. Conroy, Mr. Knox, Mr. Zienkiewicz, Mr. Hoeg – **AYE**
Ms. Mancovsky – **ABSTAIN**

Old Business-Schedule a meeting with engineers regarding 57 Long Point Road

Mr. Conroy asked if this appointment could be set up for their next scheduled meeting. Ms. Murray advised at their previous meeting the dates of October 28th and October 29th had been discussed as possible days to meet. The engineers were available both dates. She will reach out to them tomorrow to confirm a date. Members also requested the plans be sent to them electronically so they can review them before the meeting. Members then discussed they would prefer this meeting to be arranged on one of their scheduled meeting nights rather than having a separate meeting just for this topic.

Ms. Mancovsky then made the motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to have Ms. Murray contact the engineers and inquire the reason that this meeting could not be held on one of their scheduled meeting nights. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Old Business-Update on Shamrock Estates

Members discussed the peer review procedure that had previously been adopted. They also reviewed the Peer Review Information and Flow Chart. Ms. Murray then asked for

clarification regarding the Shamrock Checklist that had been included in the agendas. She advised it was a list that contained everything that had been discussed that needed to be done. She noted the first item was for Mr. Bissonnette to send a letter to Mr. Lanney. When she spoke to Mr. Bissonnette, he didn't say anything about a letter but it was his understanding that the Planning Board was going to take care of it. She said everything was very unclear and wanted to know if anybody had in fact contacted Mr. Lanney. Whose responsibility is this? Mr. Hoeg then asked Ms. Murray if she could contact Mr. Lanney. He will need to inspect and determine what needs to be done. He could then submit a bill. Ms. Mancovsky said they did not then need to let the developer know what the cost would be. Mr. Hoeg said no, they would bill him.

Mr. Knox recommended they update the flow chart to something they could all agree on. If there were items that were not liked, they could make changes and then vote on it. Mr. Hoeg said some of this would be done at the beginning of a project. Mr. Knox said he understood that but if this had been done at the beginning of the project they wouldn't be going back to his now. Ms. Murray agreed if that had been done the funds would be sitting there now. Ms. Mancovsky said she was in favor of the process that is listed out because it gives structure to an ambiguous situation. She had no objection to it. Mr. Zienkiewicz said there should be a process for closing out a job but it would not be peer review.

Ms. Mancovsky suggested they table this until their next meeting and if anybody has feedback or changes they could then possibly make a better checklist. After continued discussion, Ms. Mancovsky made a motion to table this item until their next meeting. Mr. Conroy seconded the motion. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

New business-Citizen Planner Training Collaborative (CPTC)

Members reviewed the CPTC 2019 fall workshops brochure.

Next meeting

Mr. Hoeg advised the next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 24, 2019, at the Lakeville Police Station.

Adjourn

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:00.