

The regular meeting of the Bridgewater Planning Board convened at 6:30 pm in the chamber room of the Academy Building.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Ajemian, Ms. Guarino, Mr. Geller and Mr. MacDonald

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Akins, Associate member and Mr. Romulus, Assistant Director ECD

PUBLIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL PERMIT AT 1050B ELM STREET- THEORY WELLNESS

Mr. Driscoll advised the audience that this hearing is being audio and video recorded. He explained the rules of procedure.

Ms. Guarino read the public hearing notice that appeared in the Enterprise on 2/5 and 2/12 into the record:

On Wednesday, February 19, 2020 at 6:30 pm., in the chamber room of the Academy Building, the Bridgewater Planning Board will be conducting a public hearing on application by Theory Wellness Inc. for a Special Permit under Section 23 of the Bridgewater Zoning Ordinance for the cultivation and Manufacturing-Adult Use Marijuana. The application is for the use only. The site plan for the building construction has already been approved. The location is 1050B Elm Street, Bridgewater. (Map 30, Lot 19) The application is on file in the offices of Town Clerk and ECD.

Notification receipts to abutters was received from the applicant.

Brandon Pollock, CEO of Theory Wellness ran thru the narrative of supporting documentation prepared for the Planning Board that was submitted with the application. He said they have been operating at 1050 Elm Street since January of 2017, both as a medical facility and adult use facility and have never received any nuisance complaints. This proposal is an expansion of their business, at the same location, new building.

- Applicant is not within 500 feet of any public or private, primary or secondary school, licensed daycare center, public library, public park or playground.
- The proposed Marijuana Establishment will be housed in a secure building. No aspects of it will take place anywhere other than inside the secure structure. It will have no windows, ensuring that no activities are visible from the exterior of the building.
- No storage of marijuana, marijuana products, or related supplies outside.
- Odor control has been taken very seriously. They have submitted a narrative, as well as an attachment, detailing their odor control plan which is similar to what is presently used. The purposed of the plan is to ensure that any odors, fumes or other forms of air pollution potentially generated by the applicant are properly confined, collected and disposed of. The plan is comprised of two main components: active odor control equipment and building design.
- He spoke about security and said that he has received an ok from the Police Chief with the security system. Both inside and outside security plans were submitted to him. There is a description in the narrative. The security is highly regulated by the State and they do come in and do a lot of inspections. He said they have had no incidences.
- Copies of their current licenses have been submitted. They are not required to seek a new license for this as it is an expansion of existing business.

- A list of all managers, officers, directors, persons or entities having direct or indirect authority over the management policies, security operations or cultivation operations of the establishment are listed in the narrative.
- Documentation of a bond held in escrow account- Mr. Pollock stated that they didn't feel this was required because as part of their State licensing requirements, they have already been required to hold funds in escrow, sufficient to adequately support the dismantling of the establishment. It would be the responsibility of the Commonwealth of Mass to handle the dismantling. He stated that the state would not allow the Town of Bridgewater to dismantle this facility.
- An odor control plan detailing the specific odor-emitting activities or processes to be conducted on-site was included in the narrative.

Mr. Ajemian questioned if their odor control plan was in effect when the facility first opened. He asked because when they were on a site walk about a year ago, there was odor and they were across the street. Mr. Pollock said yes, but they have added ionizers. Mr. Ajemian asked how different is this operation from the one you have in the original building? Mr. Pollock said as far as cultivation is concerned, it is the exact same size. The main difference is in the manufacturing as they have learned that there is a greater demand for infused marijuana products than they previously expected. So, they are dedicating more square footage to manufacturing products such as gummies and things of that nature. They also were lacking in office space, so they have added more offices. Mr. Ajemian asked who checks their odor control equipment that is put in and is it state regulated? Mr. Pollock said it is not State regulated, but their engineer has done multiple facilities working with architects and State Law. They have had no complaints. Mr. Akins commented that sometimes people don't comment, they just hold it in. He asked what we can do, even with your ionization, to ensure that we don't have an odor problem. He was told that it was upon them to insure that. He doesn't know what type of technology exists to quantify that. He said they are in somewhat of a difficult position, as there is another cannabis facility across and down the street and within 500 yards of them that he has no control over and they are larger, so that makes it a little bit more complicated. He stated that they are willing to work with the Town if there are any issues to solve any odor problem. He suggested that they could add additional carbon scrubbers in other areas of the building or work with an engineer for additional mitigation to solve it, if it was an issue. He commented that it was more of a technical design issue.

Mr. Geller questioned how often do you change the HEPA filters on your system? He was told that they are changed every six months; they have a pressure monitor on both sides of the filter, so they can monitor it via a computer; if there is a problem, it gets fixed immediately.

Mr. MacDonald asked about the security systems and it was discussed. He asked how much material do you expect to store? He was told a couple of hundred pounds could be stored at any one time. That is a couple weeks' worth of manufacturing, he said. Mr. MacDonald questioned the bond, and will it cover the new building? It was explained that the State requires a bond for each license (they have 6 different licenses with the State)

Notification received from the Police Chief on 2/17 that he has reviewed the plan and is ok with the security system that has been provided.

Pat Neary-245 Lakeside Drive- expressed concern about the odor in the area; neighbors and friends have told her of a strong odor of marijuana on the street. This is before an additional 20,000 warehouse is

added, she said. She spoke about an olfactometer that can determine the level of odor in an area. She said she had some literature on it that she would be happy to leave with the Board. She realizes that the Town does not have an odor ordinance, but they are going to have to come up with one. Mr. Akins said he did a quick google search and they do have devices that can detect marijuana smell.

No further questions from the public.

Mr. MacDonald made a motion to close the public hearing; seconded by Mr. Geller.

Discussion: Mr. Ajemian commented that his concern is going back to the odor; there is a process to prevent odor, but he is not sure the process is working. He would like more time to find out how this odor can be contained. He would like Mr. Romulus to do some research and come up with some sort of odor condition. Mr. MacDonald questioned the fact that there have been no formal complaints, so how can we believe it is an issue. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Romulus if he could come up with some sort of condition? Mr. Romulus said that the State does have some regulations provided by the cannabis control commission with regards to odor and he would defer to what the State has offered as guidance, but he will look into an additional condition. Mr. Driscoll questioned if the board wanted to close the hearing or wait until Mr. Romulus comes up with some language for odor control? The members were willing to close the hearing. **The vote was unanimous.** The board did not vote; they wanted to wait to see what Mr. Romulus had to offer for a condition. The vote was put on the March 4th agenda at 6:30 pm.

MOTION: Ms. Guarino

THAT: The regular meeting go into recess AT 7:00 PM for purposes of joint hearing with the ECDC

SECONDED: Mr. MacDonald

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Town of Bridgewater
Community and Economic Development Committee and Planning Board
Notice of Joint Public Hearing

Pursuant to section MGL Ch. 40A, Sec. 5, notice is hereby given that the Community and Economic Development Committee and Planning Board will hold a joint public hearing on February 5, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. in the Academy Building, Council Chambers, 66 Central Square, Bridgewater, MA 02324 to receive public input on proposed **Ordinance D-FY20-006: Zoning Ordinance – Amend Zoning Bylaws – Sections 8 and 9.60:** which seeks to amend Sections 8 and 9.60 by changing the zoning of Assessors Map 83, Lots 1-20, 39 and 82 from R A/B to “Planned Development District”, Additionally seeks to changes the minimum lot size to 2 acres in § 8.40 and § 9.632, adds language to § 9.632 – Requirements, (1) allowing the tract to be divided by a public/private way, deleting § 8.60 – Wetland Setback and adds a new § 9.632 – Requirements, (7) which addresses the depth buffer.

The detailed Ordinance is available on the following page and is on file with the Town Clerk and Council Clerk.

Michael Dutton, Town Manager advised the audience to sign in if they wished to speak. If later on you wish to speak and haven't signed in, he will recognize you after the others who have signed in.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, it was unanimously voted to open the joint hearing at 7:02 pm.

Ms. Guarino read the public hearing notice that appeared in the Enterprise.

Michael Dutton said he was the hearings officer but has no role in any vote or recommendation on the proposal in front of the Planning Board or the ECDC. He explained that the Town Council had a first reading on the proposal. After the first reading, the Council refers it to committee for further review and recommendation back to the Council. As such, they are required to hold this public hearing, hear the proposal, and take comments from the public. He said the committees will accept written comments after the close of the hearing and he will supply the proper place to submit those comments. He reminded that this meeting is being videotaped, and he encouraged the people to speak into the microphone. He asked people to limit their comments to 3 minutes due to the number of people present. He asked anyone who wishes to speak to give your name and address for the record. He explained that under Mass General 40A Chapter zoning changes can come from several different sources and in this case, the petitioner has requested the zoning changes.

Attorney Ed Brennan, on behalf of Claremont Companies, the property owner. He introduced Larry Silva, the civil engineer on the project, Ned Carney a principal with Claremont and Ken Fay, the architect for the proposed project. He felt it was important to keep in mind that this hearing tonight is for the changes that would allow this project to go forward. They have not designed the project as it is almost impossible to do until they know what the guidelines are going to be. They showed a concept plan which showed the footprint of a building and what it might look like. He then went over the zoning changes that they were requesting in order for a restaurant to go forward on this site. He explained that the reason they want it on the lake side rather than on the other side of the street is to distinguish it from other restaurants. He commented that it would be unique, a draw and very successful. There are six changes requested:

1. The underlying zoning of the property-they have just under 2 acres on the shorefront. They would need a change from the Residential to the PDD. That would allow this property to have a restaurant.
2. The minimum lot size in the PDD is 5 acres and they are requesting that the minimum lot size in the PDD be 2 acres.
3. They would need to amend Section 9.632 because their tracts of land are bisected by Pleasant Street (route 104) to read "The tract may be divided by a public or private way, provided the total acreage exclusive of the public or private way is not less than 10 acres". This would allow the lake parcel to be combined with the parcel across the street and considered as one PDD.
4. The 5-acre minimum is mentioned in two different places, so they are asking to amend 9.632, under requirements, (3) to read "minimum lot size 2 acres" to insure consistency within the bylaw.
5. There is a bylaw that states that no structure shall be located within 50 feet of a bordering vegetated wetland. They are asking that be deleted from the bylaw. He said the reason for that is that we have the Mass. Wetland Protection Act and the Town of Bridgewater has its own wetland bylaw under the zoning, so there are already two provisions in town that are addressing the wetlands issues and buildings; both under the jurisdiction of the Conservation commission.

Add a new § 9.632 – Requirements, (7) to read “The 5 acre minimum lot size, the 50’ minimum depth buffer adjacent to public ways and the building restriction within 200 feet of Route 104 shall not apply to Planned Development District project areas lying north of Route 104 and south of Lake Nippenicket. The front yard setback in this area shall be 35 feet. In lieu of the 50’ buffer adjacent to public ways, there shall be a landscaped area.” They are not asking for this across the street, just for this area north of Route 104.

Mr. Ajemian questioned why this wouldn’t be spot zoning? Attorney Brennan said he believes it isn’t spot zoning because they are extending a zone that is across the street and not going into a different area and asking that a small parcel be zoning inconsistently with everything around it.

Mr. Chase expressed concern about the proximity of the development to the shoreline. He would like to understand what the likely distance between both the northern lot line would be and the actual shoreline and the proximity of the furthest northern extent of the structure to the actual shoreline. Attorney Brennan commented that the lot line is the shoreline and everything that is there is owned by the Claremont company. Mr. Silva said that the conceptual drawing shows an area that has a solid building and then there is an outside dining area facing the lake. The building itself is showing to be 50’ from the closest corner to what would be the wetland area on that side. He explained that the lake is controlled by West Bridgewater and they basically take boards in and out of the dam next to the Canoe Club which changes the characteristics of the lake. He said he asked Mr. Iannitelli, the gentleman who is in control of it, how he manages it? He told him it was whomever screamed the loudest! Mr. Silva said there is a very good reason for their request to eliminate the provision that says the structure has to be 50’ away from wetland. He explained that when a bylaw is put in place it has to be reproducible so that somebody in the future who wants to measure something, they are able to measure it. Wetlands setback to a structure is not one that is like that. Wetland lines change and are subjective lines from one botanist to another and you will have a difference in opinion of where that wetland line is. There are a lot of structures in town that were legal when they were put in at 51’ from a wetland, but now that wetland changes for whatever reason and now it is 48 feet. He commented that the bylaw never should have gotten by the Attorney Generals office. It was something that should have been addressed at the Conservation level. They are showing this structure 50’ away, but in anticipating that something might change in the interpretation of it in the future didn’t want to be in a situation where that situation might put this building in non-compliance.

Attorney Brennan informed Mr. Chase that under the local wetland protection bylaw there is a 25’ absolute “no touch” zone and under the State Wetland Protection Act they have jurisdiction within 100’ of the wetland. Also, this area is in a ACEC so there are many levels of review.

The hearing was then opened to the general public at 7:30.

Mr. Gary Abrams-90 Goodwater Way-he felt that if Claremont didn’t get these changes, it wouldn’t be a hardship to them with their 150 acres across the street and suggested that the business would be just as successful there and still have a view of the lake. He expressed traffic concerns, danger of cars coming in and out of the site; zero improvements to the road; no lighting; people trying to cross the road to get to the restaurant will be a disaster; will cut down many trees without conferring with conservation. He expressed concern about the wildlife that live in there and the fact that they will be

displaced; concerned about light pollution. He wants to keep the area as it is for all to enjoy and asked that these changes not be recommended.

Janet Hanson- 665 Pleasant Street-felt that wetland setbacks were there for a reason. Commented that it should be on the other side of the street. She commented that private homeowners can't put decks close to the water, why should a business be able to so. She commented that they are asking for too many changes. She also commented that we do want a nice restaurant in our town, but not there.

Sharon Cumiskey- 15 Lakeview Park Lane-asked the board members and committee members requested that they seriously think about this; look at the laws and follow them.

Vernon Domingo-36 Saddle Drive-stated that the traffic in the area is very difficult; he is opposed to the changes; impacts on the lake will be significant and disastrous. He expressed concern about the impact on the Nip parking lot which is used as a staging ground for helicopters to rescue people from accidents. He asked that they don't go down this path and urged not to approve the changes. He felt this would change our environment enormously.

Michael Williams-48 Saddle Drive-spoke about not using union contractors and exploiting labor. He spoke a curve in the road as you drive into the community which is very dangerous; he suggested that needs to be fixed. He suggested that if a restaurant is built, that curve must go; it is a safety hazard. He stated that he opposes this Ordinance.

Frank Sousa-596 Main Street-informed the audience that he is the councilman who put this Ordinance forward. He explained that 84.6 % of our property tax dollars comes from residences and the average in a community of our size is 72% and that is why he stepped forward to support this. He spoke about all the increases in our taxes due to all the new projects coming forward...a new school, a new fire station, road, drainage and the water/sewer new plant.

Carlton Hunt- 80 Austin Street-commented that there needs to be provided a clearer definition of "structure". He expressed concern about parking and creating direct run off into the lake which might have some contaminants in it. He spoke about having pervious parking with paves with holes that is all filled with sand and grass. He also mentioned that State parking lot has a lot of open space and would benefit from this type of thing if they would allow it. They might consider asking the State if it can be done and used. He said that when he was part of the implementation committee, they worked with OCPC to look at where our priority development areas are in town. Elm Street and this whole area was part of that development. The Regional Planning Agency approved of that document. He said that is a factor that should go into this development area. He said that some of the parcels are listed as unknown owners with the Assessor's office, so he is not sure who really owns it. He did get notification today that it was transferred in 1998, but there are no records who says who owns them; he felt that should be clarified. He questioned the long-term plan of the remaining properties and how would that affect the change to 2 acres, rather than 5? He thought that was important to understand.

Pat Neary- 225 Lakeside Drive-stated that this is an unacceptable proposal, and most aggress is the elimination of wetland setback. She commented that a restaurant business has its own set of problems. There will be noise from the patio, added light pollution, lawn fertilizers, and snow melt. She said it is a known fact that sound is amplified over water. She expressed concern about the size of a parking lot needed for a restaurant and the runoff into the lake. She also mentioned that this area is designated as the Hockomock Swamp ACEC. The purpose of an ACEC designation is the long-term preservation of

conservation, management and stewardship of critical resources and eco systems. This is also the zone II aquifer for the Town of Raynham. The lake and the aquifer is what they use for a lot of their water, she said. She spoke about the lighting at the hotel and the promise that the lights would be turned off at a certain time; it didn't happen. The lights seem to be on all night; she lives over a mile away from the Marriott and she has to draw her drapes because of the lighting. Parking setbacks were changed from 200' to 50' with the promise of a buffer for the neighbors; only a few scrawny trees were planted and there is no buffer. She asked the membership to please protect the environment and the neighbors and deny this proposal.

Amanda Parks- 15 Bridle Road- reiterated everything that had been said. She commented that this just isn't the right spot for a restaurant.

Sam Baumgarten-60 Short Street-he ask, as a procedural matter, wouldn't it make sense to have diagrams like this up on the screen? He repeated twice " this is crazy". He spoke about the disappearance of Bridgewater's open space, farmlands, woodlands and all the housing and business development. He commented that this is beyond reasonableness. This project will forever harm what is Bridgewater's "jewel". He also spoke about it being in an ACEC designation. He read a section from the ACEC regulations. We must turn this project down to protect our natural resources, he said.

Monica Bentley-65 Ashtead Road- said she is representing the Taunton River Alliance who is against this project. She read a letter from Kitty Doherty, Taunton River Stewardship council, also opposing the project and questioned where the donation from Claremont was of conservation land along the lake that has been promised to the town for years. Is there any mitigation for the neighbors whose vista will be changed?

Kevin Burke-14 Heather Lane-Commented that wetland ECO systems are essential and asked that this be opposed for our ECO Systems.

Al Monkus-16 Saddle Drive had signed in to speak, however, when called he said all his issues had been discussed.

Larry Silva-asked to address certain issue that were raised: sidewalk-there is a sidewalk on the northerly side of Rt 104 and a proposed sidewalk on the south side is being designed right now; done in connection with the Viva project being built; it will connect from across the entrance of Lakeshore Center out to where the Axis entrance is located, including a crosswalk across from Lakeshore Center entrances with LED lights for safety. He said there was a comment made about the infrastructure part of it is that Claremont did pay out of pocket for a 3-mile extension of the sewer line which sparked a lot of the economic development in town, especially along Elm Street, Pleasant Street and down to North Street. He said when they first extended it, in conjunction with the Town to have all these residents be able to tie into sewer; but, when the Town Proposed it to them, they rejected it. This facility would be on sewer. He spoke about the mention of this being a residential area, but, historically there were several commercial establishments ..Jacks snacks, a place to buy food, and a dance hall; the area was known as Pilgrim Park and has a long history of having commercial uses.

Nancy Chiappini- 8 Birch Hill Road had signed in to speak, but she had left when the time came.

Eileen Hinney-316 South Street-agreed that it should be across the street; the fact that all these rules have to be broken so the restaurant can be “unique” is crazy. It is outrageous to change so many rules in this sensitive area.

Linda Schmuck-15 Sunset Lane-also agreed that it should go across the street...expressed concern about the environment. She said she agrees with all the assessments that have been made.

Thomas Schmuck-15 Sunset Lane-sees a lot of safety problems with this...huge amount of traffic going by off the highway; agreed with all the environmental impacts noted by others. Felt it was an assault on their neighborhood and an assault on common sense. He would love a good restaurant, but, put it across the street.

Julia Blanchard-27 Bridle Road-spoke about the great blue herons, ducks, birdwatchers and people from all over enjoying this area. She said the bylaws are there for a reason and respectfully asked that this not be allowed.

John Fitzgerald-369 Lakeside Drive-felt that Claremont has done enough, and this must be stopped.

Gary Abrams-90 Goodwater Way-refuted Mr. Silva about the sewer; he stated that it was put in for all Claremont properties and the residents were never informed that it would be available to them. He even went to the Axis hearings and suggested to them that they be a good neighbor and run the sewer line down their roads, Lakeview, Lakeside, Goodwater Way so they could hook into it; they refused to do that.

Chris Morrison-136 Mary Lane-commented that he believes that Route 104 is considered a State road, so they would have to go to the State for curb cuts and things of that nature. Stop it now.

Janet Hanson-questioned what would happen if changes were made and then the restaurant fails; what could they do with the property? She felt we had to look at the big picture. We could end up with something worse, she said. She commented that if you have to make so many changes, then it is not a good fit.

Tom Piquette-1358 Old Pleasant Street-commented that when Mr. Silva spoke about the businesses that were there, he didn't take into account where Route 104 was originally; it was at a safe distance from the Lake for runoff.

Francis Dion-141 Lakeside Drive-can see the boat launch from her window; enjoys watching the wildlife and boaters going by; this would completely change her view.

Monica Bentley-commented that if this property ownership is unknown as previously mentioned by someone, she felt a good use of this is to use CPC funds to get it and never let this happen again.

Robert Wood-60 Forest Drive-commented that part of this project has boat ramp, right of ways, easements, ways and pathways so what is going to happen to them? Mr. Dutton said the questions being asked are being written down and will be answered.

Mr. Dutton then deferred to the two boards at 8:35 pm.

Ms. Losche made a motion to close the public hearing. It was seconded by Peter Colombotos and unanimously voted.

Mr. Ajemian made a motion to close the public hearing. It was seconded by Mr. Macdonald and unanimously voted.

Ms. Losche made a motion to keep the written record open until March 15th. It was seconded by Ms. Guarino and unanimously voted.

It was noted that a letter was received from Melissa Ramondetta-317 Lakeside Drive.

TWIN MANSION ESTATES PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing convened at 9:03 pm.

Ms. Guarino read the public hearing notice that appeared in the Enterprise on 2/5 and 2/12 into the record:

On Wednesday, February 19, 2020, at 6:30 pm in the chamber room of the Academy Building, the Bridgewater Planning Board will be conducting a public hearing on application by Michael Meoli for a proposed two lot subdivision to be known as Twin Mansion Estates. The locus is off South Street on assessor's Map 125, lot 17. The plan was prepared by Michael J. Koska & Associates and is on file in the office of Town Clerk and CED.

Michael Koska presented the plan. It is two lots...lot 1 is 70,519 sf and lot 2 is 130,422 sf with a proposed 16' driveway with swales on either side. He stated that the applicant may want to change the size of the lots to make them more equal.

He said they filed with the Conservation Commission for the roadway construction. He understands that if any of the lots are within their jurisdiction, they will file individual notices of Intent. The water/sewer department said instead of an 8" water main they would like to see the hydrant "here" and have a 2" line into each dwelling. That is one of the changes they will make to the plans.

Mr. Koska stated that the comments from Mr. Etoniru can be addressed properly and to his satisfaction.

" I have reviewed the October 11, 2019 definitive subdivision plan for the above subject matter, along with the stormwater management system prepared by Michael J. Koska and Associates, Inc. (MJKA). The plan and the stormwater management system design are generally well presented. My review comments are as follows: 1. the dimensions of the proposed roadway at its intersection with South Street are incongruent with the dimensions shown on the October 10, 2003 Form A plan that forms the basis of the subject definitive subdivision plan, the engineer should clarify the conflicting geometric data; 2. the changes on the dimensions along South Street for the land at 1968 South Street constitute a modification of the land as part of the definitive subdivision plan, therefore, 1968 South Street lot should be included in the filing fee calculation; 3. the requisite building rectangle should be shown on the two new lots in order to verify their compliance with the Planning Board's rules and regulations (the Regs) governing the subdivision of land in the Town of Bridgewater; 4. the limit of clearing associated with the subdivision development should be outlined on the plan; 5, the locations and type of proposed street trees should be shown on the plan; 6. Meoli's Way is a proper name, the Regs do not allow the use of proper names as street name; 7. as a result of the undersigned's discussion with

the Water and Sewer Superintendent, the proposed looped water main may be eliminated and replaced with individual 2 inch water service pipes for the new lots if the applicant installs a fire hydrant and its appurtenant structures at the intersection of the subdivision roadway and South Street; 8. a waiver is required for the proposed use of rebars as lot markers in lieu of the required 5 inch square by 30 inch long concrete bounds.”

Mr. Koska said he will find another name if the board doesn't want to grant a waiver of a proper name. Mr. Driscoll felt that was put in for public safety and to be consistent, he wouldn't be in favor. Mr. Ajemian agreed.

Mr. Driscoll questioned Mike if he was seeking a waiver on the 15' radius. Mr. Koska said yes. He explained that his property was subdivided for the Meoli household # 1968 in 2003 and the plan is recorded in the Plymouth Registry of Deeds. Mr. Driscoll asked if it could be achieved by taking some land from the existing house? Mr. Koska said he could look into it; however, this is a 40' way and if you clear out the pavement on South Street there is no way you would have a conflict and he doesn't see the geometric need for anything that is 20' with the reduction of the road width. He would hope that the Board would consider that request. Mr. Driscoll said he would like to hear what Mr. Etoniru has to say about that; have never granted a waiver for that in the past.

Mr. Koska said they have 7 concrete bounds, but instead of concrete bounds at the lot corners, he would like to use rebar which was the regulation prior to the change. He asked if he should put in a formal waiver request?

Mr. Driscoll noted that the landscape plan and the subdivision plan are different; there are a lot more trees shown on the landscape plan. He asked Mr. Koska if there is a reason that they are all at the cul-de-sac and not any incorporated any into the roadway? Mr. Koska said yes; if you look at where the swales are for stormwater, it didn't make sense to him to try and put a tree in water. A planting strip was mentioned which Mike Koska will discuss with the sister.

Mr. Driscoll asked if the swales had infiltration, or just getting water to the infiltration area? Mr. Koska said no that all the infiltration will be roof drains on individual lots and also in the forebay in the detention basin.

Mr. Koska will put the waiver requests in letter form and revise the plan to address the comments.

A motion was made by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. MacDonald and unanimously voted to continue the hearing to April 1st at 6:30 pm.

The minutes of 2/5/20 were on the agenda for approval, however, no one had read them! They will be on the next agenda.

On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Geller, the meeting was adjourned at 9:28 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED: _____ 3/4/2020

