

Minutes of Meeting
Grafton Planning Board
September 12, 2016

RECEIVED TOWN CLERK
GRAFTON, MA
2016 SEP 27 AM 10 10

A regular meeting of the Grafton Planning Board was held on September 12, 2016 in Conference Room A at the Grafton Municipal Center, 30 Providence Road, Grafton, MA. Present for the meeting were Chairman Michael Scully, Vice-Chair Robert Hassinger, Clerk David Robbins, Linda Hassinger, Tracy Lovvorn and Associate Member Sharon Carrol-Tidman. Staff present was Town Planner Joseph Laydon and Assistant Planner Ann Morgan.

Chairman Scully called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ITEM 1: PUBLIC INPUT

None.

ACTION ITEM 2B: DRAFT DECISION: MODIFICATION OF A SPECIAL PERMIT (SP 2015-6.1) & SITE PLAN APPROVAL – REQUEST FOR 1 YEAR EXTENSION TO CONSTRUCT – FREDRIC & MARGOT CHURCHILL (APPLICANT/OWNER) – 114 MERRIAM ROAD

The Board reviewed the draft decision and no changes were made. It was noted that the Decision reflected only an extension of time for the period to construct.

MOTION to make favorable Findings F1 through F7 and to approve the application for a Special Permit and Site Plan Approval with Conditions C1 through C4 made by Mr. Hassinger, **SECONDED** by Mrs. Hassinger. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

ACTION ITEM 2C: DRAFT DECISION: MODIFICATION OF A SPECIAL PERMIT (SP 2014-9.1) & SITE PLAN APPROVAL – BORREGO SOLAR (APPLICANT) / CHRISTY PEASE (OWNER) – 79 OLD UPTON ROAD

The Board reviewed the draft Decision and made some edits.

MOTION to make favorable Findings F1 through F21 as edited and to approve the application for Modification of a Special Permit and Site Plan Approval with Conditions C1 through C9 made by Mr. Robbins, **SECONDED** by Mr. Hassinger. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

ACTION ITEM 2D: DRAFT DECISION: SPECIAL PERMIT (SP 2016-11) & SITE PLAN APPROVAL – ACCESSORY APARTMENT – LAYTH ALKAHDADY (APPLICANT / OWNER) – 56 FITZPATRICK ROAD

Ms. Morgan noted and reviewed edits to the draft received from Mr. Hassinger. There was some question about the language in Condition C3 which states that in the event that a special permit granted for accessory apartment is no longer valid that the house shall revert back to single family status. She noted that this language was developed in conjunction with and at the request of the Building Inspector. This language enables him to work with the electric company in removing equipment that served the accessory apartment.

Mr. Robbins noted that the decision was missing language relating to the fact that an approved Decision does not run with the land but rather the Applicant / Owner. He requested that the language be added into the draft decision under Condition C1. Ms. Carroll-Tidman asked about this language wanting to know why it is not part of the Zoning By-law. Mr. Hassinger reviewed the history of the Board's position on the matter noting that it has been an ongoing practice and unofficial policy to ensure that there is not a de facto increase in two family houses in zones where that use is not allowed.

Mr. Laydon noted that the thresholds for determining "accessory" to the main use was that the unit was contained within the main structure at a floor area not to exceed 20% of the total square footage of the main house. He further noted that some towns are found a way to get accessory apartments included on the State's Subsidized Housing Inventory.

MOTION to make favorable Findings F1 through F247 as edited, to grant Waivers W1, and to approve the application for a Special Permit and Site Plan Approval with Conditions C1 through C7 made by Mr. Robbins, **SECONDED** by Mr. Hassinger. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

ACTION ITEM 2E: DRAFT DECISION: SPECIAL PERMIT (SP 2016-12) & SITE PLAN APPROVAL – ACCESSORY APARTMENT – RICHARD & LESLIE ST. JEAN (APPLICANTS / OWNERS) – 5 SIBLEY STREET

The Board reviewed the draft decision. Mr. Hassinger requested that language be added to Condition C3 as discussed in the previous decision (see Action Item 2D).

MOTION to make favorable Findings F1 through F23 as edited, to grant Waivers W1 through W5, and to approve the application for a Special Permit and Site Plan Approval with Conditions C1 through C7 made by Mr. Robbins, **SECONDED** by Mr. Hassinger. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

ACTION ITEM 2F: DRAFT DECISION: MODIFICATION OF A SPECIAL PERMIT (SP 2015-13.2) & SITE PLAN APPROVAL — CLEAN ENERGY COLLECTIVE, LLC. (APPLICANT) / KAREN & ROBERT KELL (OWNERS) – 207 PROVIDENCE ROAD

Mr. Laydon noted that a draft decision was unavailable for review by the Board at this time. Mr. Greg Carey, Applicant, asked to speak to the Board regarding the timing of reviewing a decision. Mr. Scully granted his request.

Mr. Carey reviewed the constraints the project faced noting that they were hoping to begin construction in October. A delayed Planning Board decision would push back this time table which could potentially impacting funding sources and contractor schedules. He noted that the Building Inspector would not issue any permits until the 20 day appeal period had expired and that his contractors have told him that they would not begin work until all the permitting was secured. It was noted that some Applicants opt to proceed at their own risk but Mr. Carey noted that his contractors would not. Mr. Laydon noted that the timing of construction was important to make the Applicant eligible for a particular funding program which is essential for the project to move forward. Mr. Carey confirmed that the project needed to be complete by January in order to receive the funds. Given that time frame they need to begin work in October. Mr. Laydon noted that the plans have been and continue to be vetted by staff and that the project could move forward quickly through the Building Department if the decision has been approved and the 20 day appeal period passes.

Mr. Carey asked if the Board would consider acting on a draft decision prior to the next regularly scheduled meeting of September 26, 2016 preferably sometime on for before September 16, 2016. The Board reviewed their schedules and determined that the best time for the majority of the members to meet would be at 8:00 a.m. on Friday, September 16th at the Municipal Center. Mr. Robbins noted that he would be not available on that date. Mr. Scully noted that he would be available to participate via remote access as did Ms. Carroll-Tidman.

Ms. Carroll-Tidman stated she had been absent from the August 29th hearing when this matter was presented before the Board but that she would be able to view the video and sign a Mullin Rule Certificate which would make her eligible to vote. Mr. Hassinger asked if she had been appointed as voting member prior to the close of the hearing. She had not but it was pointed out that the September 16th meeting was being scheduled due to unforeseen circumstances that could not have been anticipated on August 29th.

Staff were directed to schedule a meeting of the Planning Board for Friday, September 16, 2016 at 8:00 a.m. at the Grafton Municipal Center for the sole purpose reviewing and acting on a draft decision for Modification of Special Permit (SP 2015-13.2) and Site Plan.

ACTION ITEM 2A: REQUEST TO REVISE APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED (ANR 2016-7): 104 CREEPER HILL ROAD – TOWN OF GRAFTON (OWNER).

Mr. Laydon reviewed the plan noting that this is a modification to the previously endorsed ANR plan. The proposed easement area which includes the tower and the enclosed compound area has been moved 50 feet to the west of its original location which moves it outside of a flood plain buffer area which would eliminate the need for review by the Conservation Commission. No other changes are proposed and no changes to lot lines or frontage will result from the modification. Ms. Carroll-Tidman asked if the change would increase the impacts to the residential neighborhood to the east. Mr. Laydon noted that it would not as the compound would be moving further away from the residences.

MOTION to approve the modification of the previously endorsed ANR plan and to authorize the Town Planner to sign it made by Mr. Hassinger, **SECONDED** by Mrs. Hassinger. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

PUBLIC HEARING 6A: (7:30 P.M.) REQUEST FOR DEFINITIVE PLAN APPROVAL – “BULL MEADOW” SUBDIVISION – OFF APPALOOSA AND BRIDLE RIDGE DRIVE – BULL MEADOW, LLC (OWNER/ APPLICANT).

Mr. Laydon noted that he had received an email from the Applicant requesting a continuance to October 24, 2016. The request is based on the fact that the Applicant is still working with the Conservation Commission and that they would like to have that work complete prior to returning to the Planning Board.

MOTION to grant the Applicant’s written request to continue the public hearing to October 24, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. made by Mr. Hassinger, **SECONDED** by Mr. Robbins. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

PUBLIC HEARING 6D: (7:30 P.M.) MAJOR RESIDENTIAL SPECIAL PERMIT (MRSP 2016-4) – “THE RIDINGS” SUBDIVISION – STEVEN VENINCASA CASA BUILDERS & DEVELOPER’S CORP. (OWNER/APPLICANT) – 88 ADAMS ROAD.

Mr. Laydon noted that he had received an email from the Applicant requesting a continuance to October 3, 2016. Revised plan sets were received in the office today and there was not enough time for staff review and peer review. Mr. Laydon had contacted the Applicant regarding this matter and the Applicant agreed that a continuance would be in order.

MOTION to grant the Applicant's written request to continue the public hearing to October 3, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. made by Mr. Hassinger, **SECONDED** by Mr. Robbins. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

PUBLIC HEARING 6B: (7:30 P.M.) REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OF SCENIC ROAD PERMIT (SRP 2015-1.1) – 114 MERRIAM ROAD –FREDERIC CHURCHILL (OWNER/ APPLICANT).

Mr. Robbins read the legal notice for the public hearing.

Mr. Carl Hultgren of Quinn Engineering presented the request for the modification to the Board. He reviewed the history of the original permit. Since that time, someone has purchased the property and has sited the new house closer to the road and in a location that requires impacting the stone wall and trees in a location that was not approved by the Board. They are proposing moving the cut in the stone wall approximately 40 feet to the west of the original location. They intend to follow the conditions of the original permit in that they will use the stone from the new cut to repair and rebuilt the extant stone wall along the existing frontage of the lot and not haul it away. Additional request for modifications include abandoning the original plan for tree removal at the previous location and the removal of a small twin deciduous tree approximately 4" in diameter to allow for the new driveway cut in the stone wall. The driveway is proposed to be graded at 4% in the right of way.

The Board noted that the request is only for the change in location of the driveway access to the lot. Mr. Laydon noted that he had been out to the site to view the proposed changes of which he presented photos for review. The Board reviewed photos and the proposed trees to be cut noting that there was one significant tree shown in the photos. Mr. Hultgren noted that they would not be impacting or affecting that tree. Mr. Laydon noted after review he felt that the proposed changes were appropriate and that the trees proposed for cutting did not contribute significantly to the canopy of Merriam Road due to size and disease.

David Crouse, Tree Warden and Highway Superintendent, was present and was asked if he had any comment. Mr. Crouse stated that he was in agreement with Mr. Laydon's assessment. He added that that the cherry tree in question was wrapped with bittersweet and was in poor health. He had no additional comments.

MOTION to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft a decision taking into account all information received made by Mr. Hassinger, **SECONDED** by Mrs. Hassinger. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

PUBLIC HEARING 6C: (7:30 P.M.) REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OF A SPECIAL PERMIT (SP 2015-3.1) & SITE PLAN APPROVAL – HILLTOP SELF STORAGE FACILITY – 100 MILFORD ROAD – ROCCO ADDEO, JR. D/B/A HILLTOP SELF STORAGE OF GRAFTON, LLC (APPLICANT / OWNER).

Mr. Robbins read the legal notice for the public hearing.

Attorney Christopher Senie, representing the condominium association for Hilltop Farms, was present to discuss the request for modification. He reviewed the negotiations between Rocco Addeo and the association to reach an agreement on a revised landscaping plan beyond what was approved by the Planning Board. The two parties have negotiated a revised plan that, in the opinion of the association, will provide more visual screening and be visually consistent with the condominium landscaping along Milford Road. Travis Brown of Andrews Survey reviewed the proposed revisions which include planting a row of white pines along the top of the western berm of the detention pond which is currently under construction. The berm is approximately 8 feet in height. In addition, changes were made to the planting plan near the entrance of the building to include two red maples. The maples and the white pines are scheduled to be planted in Phase I of the site development. They plan to install a temporary fence around the area to be developed during Phase II. He noted that this plan was agreed to by both parties.

The Board, Mr. Senie, Mr. Brown and Rocco Addeo (property owner) discussed the following issues:

- Nature of the agreement – Mr. Senie reviewed the legal disposition of the agreement reached by the condominium association and Mr. Addeo which was negotiated after the Planning Board approved the original Special Permit and Site Plan Approval. Mr. John Precove (sp?) president of the condominium association, noted that they were seeking to increase the visual screening by relocating and adding several landscape elements and to provide more visual consistency along Milford Road by having the modified landscape plan be more reflective of the landscaping buffer along the condo complex frontage. He added that the plantings intended to screen the solar farm behind the site (also owned by Mr. Addeo and permitted by the Planning Board) were not thriving and not achieving the intent to visually screen that site. Mr. Laydon noted that he had conferred with Town Counsel who confirmed that the Planning Board was not bound by the agreement but that the Applicant / Owner could request a modification. Mr. Brown and Mr. Senie both stated that they understood that position and that was the reason for appearing before the Board at this time. It was further stated that both parties worked together collaboratively to reach the agreement and hoped that the Board would favorably consider this request. Mr. Laydon noted that while he disagreed that the proposed changes would be an improvement on the approved plan he recognized that the abutters were the people who had to live with whatever is installed.
- White Pine vs. Blue Spruce – species selection – The Board noted that the original plan calls for white pine which hasn't changed in the proposed revision. Mr. Senie stated that the association had originally agreed to that species but had since requested that blue spruce be installed instead. Mr. Matt Leidner of Civil Design representing Mr. Addeo noted that there was no interest in revising the agreed upon species selection. It was noted that white pine grows at a faster rate than blue spruce and which would insure that the screening was achieved more rapidly. The Board discussed the advantages and disadvantages of both species including rate of growth to height and width and the fact that white pine tend to lose their lower branches when fully mature. Mr. Senie stated that the association had presented their request to Mr. Addeo who did not wish to renegotiate for several reasons including cost. Mr. Senie stated that while the association would prefer blue spruce that they were in agreement that white pine would be acceptable. Mr. Laydon reviewed some photographs of the site noting that white pine was used as a screening element along the condominium frontage and illustrating the rate of growth through previous pictures. He added that there were additional species installed within the Hilltop tree buffer area which offset some of the white pine characteristics and provided more visual variety. Mrs. Hassinger noted that a mix of varieties in front and behind the white pine line would add more visual depth. It was noted

that Mr. Addeo had not planned to or agreed to adding additional varieties as part of the negotiated agreement. Mr. Laydon noted that Mr. Addeo could add additional plantings at a later date to offset the loss of branches when the white pine reach maturity. Mr. Laydon reviewed current photos showing the detention pond under construction and the berm where the white pine are proposed to be installed. He stated that the white pine are more visually consistent with the landscaping across the street at the Hilltop condominium frontage. Mr. Robbins noted that the change in location of the white pines didn't appear to be as problematic as the species selection. He added that the Board could consider conditions to the modified permit which would allow for flexibility in species changes in the event that the association and Mr. Addeo negotiated and agreed upon future changes.

- Visual impacts – changes affected by the proposed revisions – Mr. Hassinger asked if the planting of trees on the 8 foot high berm would be enough to screen the approved rooftop solar panels as that was a point of discussion during the original hearing. Mr. Brown noted that the solar panels would be mounted at such a low profile that the trees would block that view. Ms. Lovvorn asked about the proposed addition of trees near the building entrance. Mr. Brown noted that the association had requested three tree but agreed to two once it was explained that third proposed tree could not be planted in their preferred location due to underground utilities. Mr. Laydon noted that the proposed changes did not detrimentally change the original intent to screen the front of the building. He noted that Mr. Addeo had recently approved a change in façade materials which involves the installation of stone face on the bottom of the building. This new architectural articulation provides more visually variety. Mr. Hassinger noted that the views of the site when travelling north on Milford Road would not be significantly impacted and the views from the southbound side would only really change as result of the white pines being elevated on the 8 foot high berm. Mr. Laydon demonstrated that the white pines would be adequate screening but there were several other plantings along that frontage that bear watching to ensure the screening of the solar facility to the rear of the site which is also owned by Mr. Addeo and was permitted through the Planning Board. The proposed changes were not seen as problematic or a significant deviation from the originally approved plan.
- Drainage design and modifications that may require Conservation Commission review – The Board asked if the proposed changes impacted the originally approved drainage system which was a topic of concern at the original hearing. Mr. Laydon noted that system was currently being built according to plan and that the relocation of the white pine trees from the front of the basin to the top of the berm behind the basin would not impact that design. No further review / approval from the Conservation Commission is required. The Board asked why these modifications weren't discussed at the time of the original hearing. Mr. Laydon reviewed the site development history noting that at the time of the original decision the work on the detention basin was too far along and that the two parties had not entered into an agreement that could be included as part of the public record.
- Installation of landscaping to date: - Mr. Addeo noted that all plant material to be installed in Phase 1 was in the process of installation. He plans to place the order for the white pines the following week and hopes to have all the material installed within the next two weeks to ensure adequate growing time this fall. Mr. Laydon noted that he had conducted a site visit and found that the installation process was proceeding in an appropriate manner. It was further noted that Mr. Addeo intends to install an irrigation system which will support the long term maintenance of the plan material. Mr. Al Sanborn of 38 Cherry Lane asked if a certified professional or arborist would be overseeing the installation of landscape material and in particular the trees. The answer was no and that such a requirement was not a part of

the original decision but that there were conditions that required that the landscaping be maintained for the life of the permit.

- Bond & enforcement – Ms. Carroll-Tidman asked if the Board could require some form of surety such as a bond to ensure the health and longevity of the plant material. Mr. Laydon that any failed landscape material would have to be addressed as part of an enforcement action. He noted that the conditions of the original permit stated a number of benchmarks for ensuring that the screening was installed and maintained properly for the life of the permit. If Mr. Addeo fails to adhere to the conditions then someone could file a complaint with the Building Inspector / Zoning Enforcement Officer who would be responsible for enforcing the terms of the permit. It was noted that all the conditions of the original permit would remain in full force and effect and that the modifications would not change any of that. Ms. Carroll-Tidman noted that the intent of the permit to ensure appropriate and adequate screening. The conditions of the original permit must be adhered to and conditions of a modified permit can address the potential need to review and add additional screening if the modification fails to achieve its intended goal.

Mr. Scully asked if there was any additional public input. None received.

MOTION to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft a decision taking into account all information received made by Mr. Hassinger, **SECONDED** by Mr. Robbins. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

STAFF REPORT 4B:

Mr. Laydon provided an overview of the following:

- North Grafton Village Master Plan – he has met with the consultants and work is underway to schedule several public meetings.
- DHCD – Town Meeting approved the changes to the 40R district which require DHCD approval.
- Staff had met with some WPI students who are evaluating the MS4 stormwater requirements as they relate to emergency preparedness planning.
- Additional staff support is being organized to assist the department during Nicole Larson’s family leave time. Approval has been received to pay for part time help from the Conservation Agent assistant who is a currently a part time employee.
- Main Street / Route 122A project – work continues to advance the project towards 25% design. Mass DOT will conduct a public hearing. Additional Town comments are still being received. Ms. Morgan noted that the Historical Commission (of which she is Chairwoman) had reviewed the impacts to historical resources Sampson Square and Wenc Square and are working to provide a recommendation the Selectmen with particular attention paid to the war memorials, the canon and the tree canopy at both sites. Mr. Hassinger reviewed his concerns and comments he’s received from some people who object to the project. Mr. Laydon reviewed the public process to date noting that additional input was still being sought. Ms. Morgan noted that no one from the general public attended the recent meeting but that there was a public comment form on the Planning Department webpage under the current studies page.

- Worcester Street Corridor Study – comments received at the August public forum have been complied by VHB, the Town’s consultant. Those comments are currently under review by staff and V
-
-

DISCUSSION ITEM 3A: CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

Mr. Hassinger reviewed the status of the Committee’s review of the Planning Board requirements in the Charter. Presently the Board is elected. It has been proposed that the Town Charter be change to require that the Planning Board be appointed. Mr. Hassinger noted that all the Committee meetings are available for viewing at GCTV through their Video on Demand page. The August 8th meeting had been removed from the playlist but has since been reinstated. Several members of the Board have attended past meetings of the Committee and have submitted information to demonstrate the workload and complicated nature of the subject matter that comes from State law. Mr. Robbins noted that the Committee would be holding a Public Hearing on the matter on September 15th.

Ms. Lovvorn noted that the Grafton News had launched a survey to receive public feedback on the matter but she was unable to find the results. Mr. Hassinger noted that the Committee also has a short survey on their webpage but that no results had been posted.

The Board reviewed their individual opinions on the matter. Mrs. Hassinger noted that she was opposed to a change in the Town’s government that removed the voter from their direct voting rights. Mr. Hassinger noted that the Charter was changed once before to reduce the term from 5 years to 3 years for the sake of improving accountability which one of the reasons the matter has been brought forward at this time. He noted that there are some cases (large cities and very small towns) where appointed membership may be a benefit. This is one of the few boards or committees left in Town that the voters get to directly elect who they want (School Committee and Board of Library Trustees are two others). Ms. Carroll-Tidman noted that some people are intimidated by the process of running and prefer to wait for a vacancy that they could be appointed to. Mr. Hassinger stated that the issue appeared not how members are seated but rather lengthy, uncontested incumbencies. Maybe the issue of term limits should be visited. Mrs. Hassinger noted that members of boards or committees whether elected or appointed are beholden to the voters of the Town regardless if people vote or not. She added that, in her opinion, the Planning Board was not “broke” as some contend. Mr. Robbins noted that this issue would not be fully vetted or ready for Town Meeting vote this fall and that there was opportunity to continue the public discussion on the matter.

Ms. Lovvorn leaves the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Mr. Scully asked if the Board would like to formally respond in a collective manner by writing a letter from the Board to the Committee. The Board discussed various options for response noting the time frame to respond. The Committee will have its public hearing on the matter on September 15th. Mrs. Hassinger noted that she was uncomfortable with a collective response as she had her own specific concerns and opinions on the matter. Ms. Carroll-Tidman stated that she wanted to view the video of the past meetings and would not wish to submit her name to formal correspondence at this time. After reconsideration, Mrs. Hassinger noted that she would be agreeable to stating a general opposition to the concept. The Board noted that they would request that the record be kept open so that more information can be submitted by the Board collectively and / or individually.

MOTION to request staff to draft a letter to the Charter Review Committee to be signed by the Chairman stating their opposition to the current proposal to have the Planning Board members appointed by the Board of Selectmen instead of elected and to request that the record be kept open to allow for additional comment by the Board made by Mr. Hassinger, **SECONDED** by Mr. Robbins. **MOTION** carried by majority vote – 4-0-1 (four AYES – Mr. Hassinger, Mrs. Hassinger, Mr. Robbins, Mr. Scully; one abstention – Ms. Carroll-Tidman).

BILLS 4A:

The bills were circulated and signed.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING ON AUGUST 29, 2016 4C:

The Board reviewed the draft minutes and made edits. Ms. Morgan noted that the minutes could not be approved until such time as the transcript from the 104 Creeper Hill Road cell tower application had been received and reviewed by the Board. Once that is done, the transcript becomes part of the official meeting minutes. Concern was raised about holding back the meeting minutes. Ms. Morgan noted that she would discuss the matter with the Town Clerk and that a solution would be achieved so that the draft minutes could be made available to the public.

CORRESPONDENCE 4D:

It was noted that the Police Chief had submitted correspondence requesting that space be reserved on the proposed cell tower at 104 Creeper Hill Road for emergency services notification equipment. Mr. Laydon noted that he had contacted both the Fire Chief and Police Chief asking if they were interested in reserving space on the tower. The Fire Department has also requested space at 60' height on the tower to allow for the installation of an air horn. The primary reason is to alert residents in the North Grafton in the event of an emergency situation associated with the LPG facility.

Mr. Laydon stated that correspondence from Attorney Joseph Antonellis regarding a request for bus routes in the Brookmeadow Village subdivision is under review by staff.

ITEM 5: REPORTS FROM PLANNING BOARD REPRESENTATIVES ON TOWN COMMITTEES AND CMRPC

None.

ITEM 7: ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH MAY LAWFULLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD

None.

ITEM 9: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Robbins, **SECONDED** by Mr. Hassinger to adjourn the meeting. **MOTION** carried unanimously 5 to 0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

EXHIBITS

- Memo from the Town Planner, Joseph Laydon; Re: Comments for 9-12-16 Meeting; 8 ½” X 11”; color; dated September 12, 2016; 4 pages.
- Draft Decision; Modification of Special Permit (SP 2015-6.1) – Common Driveway – 114 Merriam Road – Frederic & Margot Churchill (Applicant/Owner) – dated July 21, 2016; 4 pages.
- Draft Decision; Modification of Special Permit (SP 2014-9.1) & Site Plan Approval (SP 2014-9.21) – Construct a 650kW Solar Energy Generating Facility – 79 Old Upton Road – Borrego Solar Systems, Inc. (Applicant) / Christy Pease (Owner) – dated August 18, 2016; 7 pages.
- Draft Decision; Special Permit (SP 2016-11) & Site Plan Approval – Accessory Apartment – 56 Fitzpatrick Road – Layth Alkhadady (Applicant/Owner) – dated September 9, 2016; 7 pages.
- Draft Decision; Special Permit (SP 2016-12) & Site Plan Approval – Accessory Apartment – 5 Sibley Street – Leslie & Richard St. Jean (Applicant/Owner) – dated September 9, 2016; 7 pages.
- Draft Minutes of Meeting, Grafton Planning Board, August 26, 2016; dated September 7, 2016; 10 pages.
- Correspondence; Re: Brookmeadow Village, request for School Bus Service on Private Roadways; submitted by Joseph M. Antonellis; dated August 31, 2016; 2 pages.
- Request For Definitive Plan Approval – “Bull Meadow” Subdivision – Off Appaloosa And Bridle Ridge Drive – Bull Meadow, LLC (Owner/ Applicant); includes the following:
 - Email Correspondence, request for continuance to September 26, 2016; Fw: Appaloosa Drive, Grafton; from Brian Marchettie, P.E.; dated August 30, 2016; no received date; 1 page.
 - Email Correspondence, request for continuance to October 24, 2016; Fw: Appaloosa Drive, Grafton; from Brian Marchettie, P.E.; dated and received September 12, 2016; 1 page.
- Request For Modification Of Scenic Road Permit (SRP 2015-1.1) – 114 Merriam Road – Frederic Churchill (Owner/ Applicant); includes the following:
 - Application Form for Hearing Under the Scenic Road Bylaw; dated August 17, 2016; received by Clerks Office on August 17, 2016; 1 page.
 - Certified Abutter’s List; Signed by Assessor’s Office Manager on June 10, 2016; received August 17, 2016; 1 page.
 - Project Narrative and Site Images; Re: SRP 2015-1 Modification, 114 Merriam Road – Lot D; submitted by Carl Haltgren, P.E.; 8 ½” X 11”; color; dated August 17, 2016; received August 17, 2016; 2 pages.
 - Certificate of Good Standing; dated June 9, 2016; received by the Treasurer/Collector Office on June 9, 2016; received August 17, 2016; 1 page.
 - Decision of Planning Board, Scenic Road Permit (SRP 2015-1); received by the Town Clerk on July, 21, 2015; received August 17, 2016; 6 pages.
 - Subsurface Sewage Disposal System Plan; Prepared by Quinn Engineering, Inc.; 24” X 36”; black and white; dated August 17, 2016; 1 page.

- Email Correspondence; Subject: 114 Merriam Road; sent from Katrina Koshivos, Zoning Board of Appeals; dated August 24, 2016; received August 24, 2016; 1 page.
- Request for Modification of A Special Permit (SP 2015-3.1) & Site Plan Approval – Hilltop Self Storage Facility – 100 Milford Road – Rocco Addeo, Jr. D/B/A Hilltop Self Storage of Grafton, LLC (Applicant / Owner); includes the following:
 - Application for Modification of Site Plan Approval; dated August 12, 2016; Received by the Town Clerk on August 18, 2016; received August 18, 2016; 1 page.
 - Application for Modification of Special Permit; dated August 12, 2016; Received by the Town Clerk on August 18, 2016; received August 18, 2016; 1 page.
 - Certificate of Good Standing; dated August 18, 2016; received by the Treasurer/Collector Office on August 18, 2016; received August 18, 2016; 1 page.
 - Certified Abutter’s List; Signed by Assessor’s Office Manager on August 17, 2016; received August 18, 2016; 8 pages.
 - Email Correspondence; Subject: 114 Merriam Road; sent from Katrina Koshivos, Zoning Board of Appeals; dated August 24, 2016; received August 24, 2016; 1 page.
- Major Residential Special Permit (MRSP 2016-4) – “The Ridings” Subdivision – Steven Venincasa Casa Builders & Developer’s Corp. (Owner/Applicant) – 88 Adams Road; Email Correspondence to request a continuance to October 3, 2016; Subject: Revised Plans for The Ridings; sent from James Tetreault, PE, CPESC; dated September 12, 2016; 1 page.

These minutes were approved by the Planning Board on: September 26, 2016