

Town of Franklin



Planning Board

**October 5, 2020
Meeting Minutes**

Chair Anthony Padula called the above-captioned **Remote Access Virtual Zoom Meeting** to order this date at 7:00 PM. Members in attendance: Joseph Halligan, William David, Gregory Rondeau (existed meeting prior to conclusion), Rick Power, Associate member Jennifer Williams. Members absent: None. Also present: Michael Maglio, Town Engineer; Matthew Crowley, BETA Group, Inc.; Bryan Taberner, Director of Planning and Community Development; Maxine Kinhart, Administrative Staff.

*As stated on the agenda, due to the growing concerns regarding the COVID-19 virus, the Planning Board will conduct a **Remote Access Virtual Zoom Meeting**. The Massachusetts State of Emergency and the associated state legislation allows towns to hold remote access virtual meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. In an effort to ensure citizen engagement and comply with open meeting law regulations, citizens will be able to dial into the meeting using the provided phone number, or citizens can participate by using the Zoom link also provided on the agenda.*

7:00 PM **Commencement/General Business**

Chair Padula read aloud the Zoom platform call-in phone number and the Zoom link which were also provided on the meeting agenda.

A. Street Acceptance Procedures: Update from Town Attorney Cerel

Chair Padula stated he believes Ms. Love put this item on the agenda in regard to the bond release for Sandy Knoll Estates.

B. Bond Release: Sandy Knoll Estates

Mr. Mark Cerel, Town Attorney, stated this was one of the more complex street acceptances he has dealt with. He stated that at this time the Registry of Deeds is closed to the public. If it is a small project, the documents can be mailed; anything more complicated needs to be conducted face-to-face with the Registry. He does not know when the Registry will reopen. He noted street acceptances are very labor intensive and provided an overview of the procedure. He noted that he has not had access to his office in Town Hall since March. Chair Padula asked what the Town can possibly get by holding \$10,000 for the next two years as everything seems to be in place, and he asked about a land taking. Mr. Cerel stated he has not had an opportunity to review the mylars for Sandy Knolls. He noted that Land Court land is also part of the Sandy Knolls review. He stated that \$10,000 is much less than the amount that was previously held. He noted that there are not insignificant charges by the Registry even if everything is in fine shape and no corrections are needed. If it is necessary to tweak the plans, there is also the cost of notifying the abutters and legal notification in the newspaper. Chair Padula asked if the Town always takes those monies for acceptance from the contractor. Mr. Cerel stated there was a backlog of 50 or 60 roads going back to the 1990s or earlier that have not been accepted as the Town does not have the funds to do the work. A better job of getting the documents on record has been done for the more recent subdivisions in the last several years. Chair Padula confirmed there is nothing the Planning Board can do at this point regarding Sandy Knoll. Mr. Cerel stated the plan is to hopefully return to Town Hall by the end of the month; then, he can return to the street acceptances that were in process.

C. Decision: 340 East Central Street***Mr. Halligan recused himself.***

Mr. Taberner referenced the September 29, 2020, memorandum from the Department of Planning and Community Development. He stated the Planning Board closed the public hearing on September 28, 2020. The Planning Board shall vote on the following Waiver Requests: 1. Chapter 185-21 (B) – To Allow 268 parking spaces whereas 301 is required; 2. Chapter 300 Section 11(B)(2)(a) – Minimum cover is 42 in. above the top of the pipe; and 3. Chapter 300 Section 11(B)(2)(a) – To allow HDPE be allowed for oil/water separator. He reviewed the Suggested Special Conditions: 1. Details for the reinforced concrete curb should be added to the plans prior to endorsement; 2. All units will be maximum two bedrooms each; 3. Color renderings and landscape plan shall be included in the endorsed set; 4. Applicant will provide the specifications for the AC units, any mechanicals located on the roof shall be screened; and 5. Any signage for the property will need to be submitted to Design Review Commission.

Chair Padula stated that the wording of Suggested Special Condition 4 should state: Applicant will provide the specifications for the AC Units **and all AC units will be unit contained**. Any mechanicals located on the roof **or ground** shall be screened.

Waiver Requests:

Motion to Allow 268 parking spaces where as 301 is required for 340 East Central Street. Power. Second: David. Vote: 4-0-0 (4-Yes; 0-No).

Motion that minimum cover is 42 inches above the top of the pipe for 340 East Central Street. Power. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 4-0-0 (4-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to allow HDPE be allowed for oil/water separator for 340 East Central Street. David. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 4-0-0 (4-Yes; 0-No).

Special Conditions:

Motion to Accept the following Suggested Special Conditions, and that the Suggested Special Conditions be included on the front page of the plans before they are endorsed by the Planning Board:

- 1. Details for the Reinforced Concrete Curb should be added to the plans prior to Endorsement;***
- 2. All units will be maximum two bedrooms each;***
- 3. Color renderings and landscape plan shall be included in the endorsed set;***
- 4. Applicant will provide the specifications for the AC Units and all AC units will be unit contained. Any mechanicals located on the roof or ground shall be screened; and***
- 5. Any signage for the property will need to be submitted to Design Review Commission.***

Padula. No Second or Vote taken.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

This determination shall be in addition to the following specific findings:

Special Permit VOTE for USE: §185 Attachment 9, Maximum Height of Building and §185 Attachment 3 Part II 2.16, to allow the use of a Vehicle Service Establishment.

Chairman Padula read aloud the following.

- a) Proposed project addresses or is consistent with neighbor or Town need.
Padula-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)
- b) Vehicular traffic flow, access and parking and pedestrian safety are properly addressed.

Padula-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)

- c) Public roadways, drainage, utilities and other infrastructure are adequate or will be upgraded to accommodate development.

Padula-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)

- d) Neighborhood character and social structure will not be negatively impacted.

Padula-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)

- e) Project will not destroy or cause substantial damage to any environmentally significant natural resource, habitat, or feature or, if it will, proposed mitigation, remediation, replication or compensatory measures are adequate.

Padula-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)

- f) Number, height, bulk, location and siting of building(s) and structures(s) will not result in abutting properties being deprived of light or fresh air circulation or being exposed to flooding or subjected to excessive noise, odor, light, vibrations, or airborne particulates.

Padula-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)

- g) Water consumption and sewer use taking into consideration current and projected future local water supply and demand and wastewater treatment capacity, will not be excessive.

Padula-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)

The proposed use will not have adverse effects which overbalance its beneficial effects on either the neighborhood or the Town, in view of the particular characteristics of the site and of the proposal in relation to that site.

Padula-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES; David-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)

Chair Padula stated there were also the standard conditions of approval #1-13.

Motion to Approve 340 East Central Street, Site Plan. David. Second: Power. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)

Mr. Halligan re-entered the meeting.

D. Discussion: 160 Grove Street – Phasing Plan

Mr. Jim Stukel of the Stukel Group stated that in their first submission they had a Phase One and Phase Two description. Ms. Love had stated a plan should be developed and brought before the Planning Board for discussion.

Chair Padula stated that this project was not phased on the Special Permit. Mr. Stukel stated that in the submission before the Planning Board it was phased; it was part of the project description. Mr. Taberner stated it was not really discussed when it was approved; he wants to make sure the Planning Board is happy with this plan. Chair Padula asked Mr. Taberner to confirm that on the Order of Conditions it is a phased project. Mr. Taberner noted that the Planning Department was provided with an additional set of documents that was not part of the Planning Board's meeting packet.

Mr. Stukel shared the plans on the screen. He said the intent is to put in the entire infrastructure for the project in Phase One. He reviewed the Phase One Sitework Plan. Mr. Taberner reiterated what was going to be constructed in Phase One including the temporary basin. He noted that only part of the building will be constructed in Phase One. The temporary basin will go away when Phase Two of the project is done; he reviewed the Phase Two Sitework Plan. Mr. Stukel stated the concept was to not disturb anything to the east

of the wetland. Mr. Taberner stated that in September there was a two-phase plan submitted; it is similar to what was provided to the Planning Board tonight.

Chair Padula stated that he remembers the applicant talking about phasing for the grow facility; he does not recall that they were only going to put in some of the infrastructure. He said that the bylaws state all of the infrastructure including drainage and parking must be completed and working before building occupancy is granted. Mr. Halligan agreed with Chair Padula that the infrastructure must be in. He stated he does not remember anything about phasing. Mr. Stukel stated all infrastructure components will be in place for the part of the building that will be installed in Phase One. Ms. Williams questioned if there was any temporary fire lane access along the east side of the building. Mr. Stukel said that in previous discussions prior to COVID, the fire department wanted to access the entire perimeter of the property. He stated the entire building will be sprinkled. Mr. Halligan stated that phasing works in certain projects. He asked if the applicant were to gain support for phasing, what is the time schedule for the second phase, and would they be willing to forfeit occupancy of Phase One if Phase Two is not started. Mr. Stukel explained why he would not agree to that. Mr. Halligan stated he looks at these projects for the three percent of sales revenue and benefits to the Town.

Chair Padula noted this item was on for discussion tonight. He stated that research needs to be done. He believes that all the drainage infrastructure has to be in before occupancy. He does not believe that building half of the building was discussed; he believes that using half of the building was discussed. Mr. Taberner stated he has a diagram submitted in September 2019 and a letter submitted in October 2019 which shows a phased plan that is very similar to what is presented tonight; it shows that all the drainage and infrastructure was going to be installed. He stated the applicant is now asking for a temporary drainage basin in the middle. He noted a letter was submitted from Hennep Cultivation, LLC on September 25, 2019, regarding the Phase One and Phase Two descriptions. The phased part was discussed in detail; long before COVID. He suggested the Planning Board review whether the applicant must have the infrastructure in place in the back half as the applicant had said they would.

Chair Padula asked if the project encroached on wetlands. Mr. Taberner stated there was a great deal of Conservation jurisdiction. Putting the temporary basin in the middle would not impact the wetlands. However, the applicant would need to get extensions from Conservation. Mr. Halligan asked if the temporary basin would be within 100 ft. of wetlands. Mr. Taberner stated it would be between the 50 ft. to 100 ft buffer; it would have to go back before the Conservation Commission. Discussion commenced that the temporary basin could be moved outside the 100 ft. buffer. Chair Padula stated that this is a Site Plan Modification; therefore, BETA would look at it. Chair Padula reiterated that the Planning Board would never approve anything with a partial drainage system; by their rules and regulations it has to be working before an occupancy permit can be issued. Therefore, the applicant must determine if they want to return for a Site Plan Modification which would need to be reviewed by Conservation and BETA. Mr. Stukel asked questions. Chair Padula stated this is not a decision that would be made under General Business. He requested the departments look at the approved plans and special permit, meeting minutes, etc., so it is known exactly what was approved and how it was approved.

E. Meeting Minutes: September 14, 2020 & September 21, 2020

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for September 14, 2020. Halligan. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for September 21, 2020. David. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:05 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – Continued
Maple Hill

Definitive Subdivision

Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Mr. Jeffrey Dirk, Vanasse & Associates, Inc., stated that since the last public hearing in which he appeared before the Planning Board, they have made significant progress with closing out some of the open items with the town engineer and BETA from a traffic perspective. He stated that he submitted a letter dated September 21, 2020, which outlines the refinements to the transportation improvement program which deals with three areas: sight line deficiency along Maple Street, traffic calming measures along both Bridle Path and Kimberlee Avenue, and traffic calming measures within the subdivision. He stated they have agreed to reconstruct about 225 linear ft. of Maple Street dropping the profile about 2 ft. to reduce the crest hill. This will involve some reconstruction of Franklin Springs Road as well to make sure the grades match with the existing pavement. They will also reconstruct the wheel chair ramps for ADA compliance and reinstall the sidewalks that are there. They will reconstruct utilities, water lines, and gas lines if needed for proper clearance to the pavement surface. He discussed that the general consensus was to remove raised islands and raised features such as speed bumps from the list of traffic calming measures. They agreed to construct three compact urban roundabouts at the intersections in the center.

Mr. Taberner noted a letter submitted by the homeowner at 59 Bridle Path which is provided in the meeting packet. He referenced the letter from the Department of Planning and Community Development dated September 30, 2020, which references a letter provided by the applicant and a list of requested waivers. He stated the biggest item to be discussed and considered is that the applicant is requesting a phased plan for construction. He noted the applicant is offering to pave Bridle Path. He stated the applicant requested an extension to October 30, 2020.

Chair Padula confirmed all Planning Board members read the letter from the homeowner. He read aloud a letter from Mr. Maglio dated August 30, 2020, indicating agreement with the applicant's proposed improvements. Mr. Crowley stated he reviewed the applicant's traffic calming measures and stated BETA is in agreement. Ms. Williams stated she thinks the traffic calming measures are a great idea and noted that having sidewalks on both sides of the road would be important. Chair Padula noted the Planning Board has usually waived two sidewalks in lieu of getting upright granite. Mr. Halligan noted this is the first time he has seen that the applicant has committed to repaving Bridle Path. Chair Padula noted the mini roundabouts are not in the Town's regulations at this time.

Mr. Chris Peterson, 66 Bridle Path, discussed concerns about the proposed roundabouts. He said this will negatively change the character of the neighbor and the 65 existing homes. He asked how the Town will plow the roundabouts and stated there is no benefit of the roundabouts for the Town or the neighborhood. He discussed that a second sidewalk should be considered. Mr. Taberner read aloud comments submitted via chat from residents: Ms. Kerry Campbell asked about road striping, Rebecca asked about slant granite; and Maegan Schlitzer asked about maintenance of the roundabouts. Mr. Maglio stated DPW reviewed the submittal, and they are in favor of the proposed roundabouts. He stated the DPW Director was also in favor of them and said it would not affect the plows. Mr. Maglio stated they were also in favor of the improvements proposed to Maple Street.

Mr. John Cetrano, 64 Bridle Path, reviewed the traffic calming measures and asked about the center islands, flush splitter island, and proposed roundabouts. Mr. Dirk provided responses. Chair Padula noted a suggestion from DPW of flower urns in the islands in the summer.

Mr. Steve Dunbar stated that mentioned two sharp curves on Kimberlee Avenue in his previous letters which were discussed at previous Planning Board meetings; however, there is no mention of the curves in BETA's letter, the applicant's letter, or listed on the waiver list. Mr. Maglio stated the issue of the existing curves on Kimberlee Avenue has come up in the past. Under the conditions of a collector street, it would not meet the guidelines. He is not sure if those curves could be reconstructed to conform; there may not be enough right of

way. He confirmed Kimberlee Avenue is an accepted street by the Town. Mr. Dunbar reiterated that as a collector street, the zoning rules would apply for the minimum requirement; this is a concern for the folks who live on the street.

Mr. Christopher Brady, 36 Kimberlee Avenue, expressed concern about the proposed Kimberlee Avenue roundabout. He stated this will have a direct impact on his property. Everything in his front yard would be disrupted. Mr. Maglio stated that the proposal shows the existing cul de sac would be reduced to a smaller roundabout; he reviewed the reduced pavement area. Mr. Halligan suggested the cul de sac/roundabout be moved down to the bend. He confirmed the work to be done would be on Town land, not on a private citizen's property. Mr. Dirk stated that all the work taking place would be in the Town right of way; all we are doing is giving the property owner more green space and extending their driveway. Mr. Brady asked about the Maple Street conversion being in Phase II. Mr. Dirk stated the traffic calming measures would be installed in the final paving.

Mr. Josh Lechter, 35 Kimberlee Avenue, indicated concern about the extension of their property and that having a piece of driveway installed rather than the entire driveway would not look good. He expressed concern about safety issues. Mr. Lincoln Purdy, 54 Bridle Path, referenced BETA's letter of August 4, 2020, and questioned the approximately 2,000 truckloads of road building material to be imported to the site, as well as the other contractor vehicles for this project. He noted the proposed traffic islands have not been installed in Town before and asked how they will be seen by the plows in the winter. Chair Padula stated the islands are made to be plowable. He asked if the applicant must go to ZBA when taking road material into a site. Mr. Taberner stated he thought a special permit to export material is needed; he would check regarding imported material. Mr. Halligan noted that if it was a water resource area, each load brought in would have to be sampled. Mr. Stephen Higgins, 4 Phaeton Lane, questioned the traffic calming measures. He would like the developer to provide locations where these have been installed so residents can talk to the neighbors in those areas to see what they are like. Mr. Dirk stated he will see if he can find some locations. Chair Padula stated these traffic calming measures are not in the regulations, but the Planning Board has asked the developer to put them in. Mr. Higgins expressed concern about the developer paving Bridle Path, but not all the side streets; it will look foolish and idiotic. Mr. Taberner mentioned the Norfolk roundabout has a raised island in the middle, so it is not an exact example. Mr. William Buckley of Bay Colony Group, Inc., representing the applicant, Carroll Construction Corp., stated they did not offer to repave Bridle Path. He stated his recollection is that when they were phasing the roundabouts and they were done in the third phase, they would be in sync with the Town's repaving plan for Bridle Path which was going to be 8 to 10 years; repaving of Bridle Path would be an undertaking by the Town.

Ms. Laura Dombroski, 20 Kimberlee Avenue, questioned traffic volume and safety. She stated there is a perfect storm with the curves on Kimberlee Avenue, and the number of trips will make this a high-volume road. She has reached out to MassDot; they noted this is up to the Planning Board. She discussed safety concerns regarding snow, road width, curves, and traffic volume. She asked if the Planning Board would have MassDot look at this. Chair Padula stated the Town's subdivision regulations supersede MassDot as the Town is more stringent. Mr. Michael Itani, 20 Bridle Path, stated there are other options that are more reasonable. He stated that children play in the street because it has not been a high-volume traffic road. This high-volume road is not what people moved to this neighborhood for. He hopes the Planning Board puts the best interest of the citizens first and talks to the residents before making a decision. Mr. Higgins asked for clarification of whether or not Bridle Path is going to be paved. Mr. Buckley stated the developer is not going to pave it. He reiterated that with the phasing of the development, the third phase would coincide with the Town's repaving schedule for Bridle Path in 8 to 10 years. He stated that with almost 60 lots, it might be a 10- or 12-year project; it depends on the economy. Chair Padula asked about the wear and tear on Bridle Path and Maple Street over 10 to 12 years from truck traffic. He stated that if a developer is responsible for putting all the truck traffic on a street which ruins the street, the developer should be responsible for repaving the street. Mr. Maglio stated he is pretty sure there was no commitment from the DPW to pave the road when the project is done; he will check. Mr. Ken Dagesse, 16 Kimberlee Avenue, discussed the impact of the many

construction vehicles on the two roads in the current neighborhoods. Mr. Halligan confirmed the through way from Bridle Path to Kimberlee Avenue would not be available for vehicles until the Phase III roads were finished, probably around year seven. Mr. Dunbar expressed concern about Kimberlee Avenue becoming a collector road; he requested the Planning Board have Vanasse & Associates, Inc. address the concern as to whether they must apply for a waiver. He would like to document that this concern is being pushed aside and not addressed. Chair Padula asked Mr. Taberner to put this down as a waiver. Mr. Dunbar stated it is probably difficult to find roundabouts in residential areas because usually traffic is not put through a residential area; they are located in downtown areas. He expressed concern that the 700 ft. of frontage that Mr. Labastie owns was not used to solve this problem. Mr. Taberner stated tonight's comments from the chat will be available in the next public hearing meeting packet. Chair Padula noted that most people do not like the traffic calming measures; he will take ideas from residents on other measures.

Motion to Continue the public hearing for Maple Hill, Definitive Subdivision, to November 2, 2020. Halligan. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Recess for five minutes. Power. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:10 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
70, 72 & 94 East Central St – Multi-Family
Special Permit & Site Plan Modification
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Chair Padula recused himself.

Mr. Richard Cornetta, attorney representing the applicant; Mr. Brad Chaffee, owner/applicant; Mr. Rob Marcalow of Kuth Ranieri Architects; and Mr. Rick Goodreau of United Consultants, Inc. addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Cornetta summarized that they were last before the Planning Board in August 2020. Since then, the applicant has made plan revisions and the Planning Board has received a plan with alterations to the original plan based on comments received from the Planning Board and Town staff. The applicant has shifted the building location, made the building longer, added an additional unit bringing the count to 14, modified the access drive around the building, and added seven parking spaces. The applicant plans to keep the integrity of the two lots; both lots will be in compliance with zoning frontage and setbacks. At 88 East Central Street they are proposing to renovate the existing structure and place an additional structure on it with a courtyard, add an additional 15 parking spaces, and have an access easement allowing circular vehicle travel to the adjacent site. They have received initial comments from BETA. They are seeking Site Plan approval and two Special Permits to allow multi-family in the C-1 zone and allow building height up to 50 ft.

Vice Chair Halligan stated that a Special Permit requires four votes; however, only three Planning Board members are present at this time. He expects Mr. Rondeau will review the meeting tape and be prepared for the next meeting. He noted that each Planning Board member is allowed to miss one meeting and make it up by reviewing the video tape; Mr. Rondeau will have to do that before the Planning Board can make a decision. Mr. Cornetta stated they understand.

Mr. Goodreau expanded on Mr. Cornetta's summary and provided additional details regarding the most recent filings. He provided an overview of the site layout and the changes made. He discussed the stormwater management plan and stated they have provided a stormwater report. He addressed comments from BETA regarding the proposed pipe type for the stormwater system; he requested input from the Planning Board on the preferred pipe type. He discussed the underground drainage system pipe size. He stated they plan to provide a resubmission addressing BETA's comments.

Mr. Taberner confirmed there are two waivers requested by the applicant. Mr. Goodreau reviewed the two waivers: to allow for less than 42 in. of cover over the RCP pipe and allow the use of HDPE pipe in one area.

He stated that possibly they will add another waiver or modify the waive to allow for the proposed roof recharge system piping. Mr. Taberner suggested the applicant clarify the waiver requests as two or three waivers in the next meeting. He stated the color renderings need to be included in the endorsed plans. Mr. Maglio reviewed the revised plans and stated he does not have any further comments at this time. Mr. Crowley reviewed comments he provided in his October 1, 2020 Site Plan Peer Review letter. He noted lighting spillage, request for clarification on how the applicant will combine the lots, confirmation that a passenger vehicle can enter the garage and waste collection vehicles can get to the dumpster, and existing conditions are being mimicked for the stormwater discharge.

Planning Board members asked questions. Ms. Williams noted the revised entrance/exit on the east side of the plan and asked if there has been any study done on the sight lines for exiting. Mr. Goodreau said the retaining wall that is currently there will remain; however, they provided sight distance calculation on sheet four of the plan set. Vice Chair Halligan agreed with Ms. Williams that with the retaining wall it will be difficult to see the traffic. He stated he is reversing his previous thoughts on having open access to the original development. He suggested having the fire breakaway gate to eliminate some of the traffic to reduce the safety issue. Mr. David stated agreement with Vice Chair Halligan on the safety breakaway gate being put back. He discussed the parking areas on the left side of the driveway and asked if a walkway was needed. Mr. Chaffee discussed the location of the centrally located sidewalk. Mr. David asked if there was enough space for a truck to pull into the dumpster area. Mr. Goodreau noted they will look at that as BETA also pointed it out. Additional concerns regarding noise screening for AC units, dumpster screening, turning radiuses, labelling on the plans, curbing as all vertical granite, and converting plastic pipe under parking to RCP pipe were discussed. Vice Chair Halligan asked if prior to endorsement all three parcels would be owned by the same entity. Mr. Cornetta stated they will be three separate parcels. Vice Chair Halligan confirmed this is not how the current plan before the Planning Board is presented. Mr. Cornetta explained how they plan to conform to the frontage setbacks; they will be showing a plan with the proposed lot lines for the three separate properties. Vice Chair Halligan reviewed the plans for the home at 88 East Central Street. He noted that as they will be separate lots, all lots need to comply including the dumpster area, dumpsters, dumpster pads, dumpster screening, and AC units screening. Ms. Williams asked about accessible parking spaces. Mr. Goodreau stated it has been complied with. Discussion commenced on the parking space requirements and signage for visitor parking spaces. Mr. Taberner noted a public comment from Liz, an abutter who has spoken in previous meetings, who expressed concern about the porches on the back ends of the property with it being four stories; there will be some vegetation in the summer, but not during the rest of the year. Mr. Chaffee said he met with Liz prior to this meeting about the porches. There will be four decks on the corner where her property is located. Vice Chair Halligan asked that the neighbor's concern be addressed; he would like to explore this further. Mr. David and Vice Chair Halligan requested a rendering of the back of the building to show the balconies and any existing tress that may provide screening.

Motion to Continue the public hearing for 70, 72 & 94 East Central St – Multi-Family, Special Permit & Site Plan Modification, to October 19, 2020, at 7:20 PM. David. Second: Power. Vote: 3-0-0 (3-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Adjourn the Remote Access Virtual Zoom Planning Board Meeting. Power. Second: David. Vote: 3-0-0 (3-Yes; 0-No). Meeting adjourned at 10:38 PM.

Judith Lizardi, Recording Secretary

******Accepted at the December 7, 2020 Planning Board meeting***