
TAUNTON PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
Meeting held at 15 Summer Street

DATE: January 6, 2022

BOARD MEMBERS: Anthony Abreau, Chairman Michael Monteiro
Bob Campbell, Vice Chairman John Reardon
Manuel Spencer, Clerk Dennis I. Ackerman
Brian Carr

ADVISORS:
Michael Patneau, City Engineer
Kevin Scanlon, City Planner

Roll Call: Ackerman, Reardon, Spencer, Monteiro, Carr, and Campbell present. Abreau absent

Vice Chairman Campbell opens meeting at 5:30 PM

Elections – Chairman, Vice Chairman, & Clerk

Manny nominates Tony Abreau for Chairman, Seconded by Dennis. All in favor. Tony Abreau was elected Chairman.

**Manny nominates Brian Carr for Vice Chairman.
John nominates Dennis Ackerman for Vice Chairman.**

Vote on roll call:

**Dennis Ackerman votes for Dennis Ackerman
John Reardon votes for Dennis Ackerman
Manny Spencer votes for Brian Carr
Michael Monteiro votes for Dennis Ackerman
Brian Carr votes for Brian Carr
Bob Campbell votes for Dennis Ackerman.
Dennis Ackerman was elected Vice Chairman**

**John nominates Manny Spencer for Clerk, seconded by Brian. All in favor.
Manny Spencer was elected Clerk**

Dennis chairs the meeting. He thanked the Board for their support and welcomed new member Michael Monteiro.

Bob made motion to accept of minutes December 2, 2021 with correction (delete 6,7,8 pages) seconded by John. All in favor

Highland Heights – E-5 - Release of lots & reduction of surety - holding \$157,276.76 and 1 lot.
Matt St. Germain and Andy Hopgood were invited into the enclosure. Letters from the City Planner, City Engineer and outside consultant Field Engineering were read into the record.

Manny made motion to reduce the surety to \$36,000 and release last lot. Seconded by John. All in favor.

Cont'd. Public Hearing – Special Permit – 175 South Walker St – A Special Permit/Site Plan Review from Section 440 Attachment #1 of the Zoning Ordinance for the construction of 4 mixed use buildings - Each building to have 5 residential units with one commercial/office space (Totaling 20 residential units with 4 commercial/office space) submitted by 175 South Walker Street, LLC

John DeSousa, NorthCounty Group was invited into the enclosure. Hearing opens at 5:32 PM Roll Call: Campbell, Reardon, Spencer, Monteiro, Carr and Ackerman present.

Vice Chairman Ackerman stated this will be an informational hearing. John DeSousa stated he wanted to hear from the board and neighbors. He will be continuing since the DIRB meeting was continued to Jan. 25th. They had their Conservation Commission meeting and that has been continued to March. Manny thought it should be continued but John wanted to discuss the proposal and get input from neighbors and board. John stated they originally had 31 units and after having 2 informational meetings with neighbors they reduced the number of units to 20 residential and 4 commercial units. They are proposing townhouse style , consisting of 4 buildings with 5 units in each. Each will have an office/commercial space in each building. The townhouse will have a 2 car garage in each one of them with dumpsters located in back. The DIRB suggested eliminating 2 parking spaces and eliminate interior sidewalk and move mailboxes to make room for trash vehicle. After the neighborhood meeting they have decided to fence the entire property and will provide landscaping. John stated the existing culvert is collapsing and they will rip out old and put in 3 x 3 culvert which will relieve some flooding. There is a huge tree that is uplifted and they will also re-do sidewalk. John stated the new proposal seemed better to neighbors than the original proposal. He stated the DIRB comments were minor in nature but they do have to go back to them Jan. 25th. Dennis asked what are the plans for the house in front? John stated they originally were going to tear it down but neighborhood wanted it to stay so they will save it. They don't have to go back to the Historic District Commission. Manny asked what is the zoning in this area and it was answered it's in the Highway Business District. They were under the impression the property was 4 acres but after a survey it was discovered it was only 2.6 acres. John asked how many bedrooms are they proposing? John D. answered 2-3 bedroom units. It will be on a slab. The units above the commercial space will be 2 bedrooms. John is not in agreement with the elimination of the sidewalk (per DIRB) in order to provide more parking spaces. John D. stated they have 23 parking spaces now and DIRB wanted 25 spaces plus garage. There will be 2 parking spaces per unit. John thinks the parking is not enough and will cause disturbances. Bob asked why did you show street opening and with driveway on other side? It was asked if these would be condos or apartments? It was stated condos and they will have recreation area. The placement of the dumpster being at the end of the parking lot will probably result with people having trash in front of their units. Where is the snow removal on the plans? Mike asked about the parking and lighting and hopes it won't interfere with neighbors. John D. stated they are proposing George Washington light poles which are about 10-12' tall. Brian agrees there is not enough parking and there should be an interior sidewalk. Brian is concerned about the size of the project in this area. All these residential developments will result in more children going to our schools. He would like to see the project downsized. He asked what type of construction would these be and John D. answers wood frame. Manny stated they are proposing 20 units with parking, recreation area on 2.6 acres and he too thinks it is too much for this site. John R. asked about the entrance on how would you enter the residential units and commercial unit? John D. answers they will have common hallway with a door on left to enter office and then you can go upstairs to residential unit. Bob asked what sidewalk did the DIRB suggest eliminating? Discussion took place relative the elimination of the interior sidewalks and interior landscaping . John D. stated they will have grass along the back. He stated that Capt. Bastis, Fire Inspector reviewed this initially and has no issues. Public input: Opposed: Bradford Carr, 181 So. Walker St. His

main concerns is the flooding and what they are proposing is alot for this site. The pictures presented at the Conservation Commission shows the flooding problem. The project is going from one residential house to multiple buildings on site. His concern is traffic too but is main concern is drainage. Lorraine Carr, 181 So. Walker St. also opposed. She stated if they are going to have 3 bedrooms they will not have enough parking. This proposal is a disaster. The flooding is 3 feet high. She stated the water is no intermittent it's a perennial stream and the project is not good for the neighborhood. Not enough parking and too congested. Victor Santos, 414 Winthrop Street also opposed. He references the definition of Highway Business District in the zoning ordinance. This project does not comply with the intent of the ordinance. He stated there is a water issue and adding this much development to the site will make it worse. He asked if there was a traffic study done? Did they look at any access from Winthrop Street? What is the environmental inpact and where is the water going to go The proposal is condos with an option to rent to buy? The neighborhood consists of all single family houses. Arthur Ouellette, 183 So. Walker St. opposed. He has lived there 53 years and the neighborhood has changed and now there is a lot of traffic and water issues has been there for years. When there is a heavy rain the water goes over the stone wall. The more they build the more water they get. He is totally against the project. Crystal O'Leary, 198 ½ So. Walker St. owns 200 So. Walker Street and her parents own 191 So. Walker St. She stated she has lived there for 53 years and she and her husband built their house at 198 ½ So. Walker Street. She stated this is a strong knit neighborhood. They fought Reed Farms to having development rights. This rural residential neighborhood does not let itself to apartments. The property abuts the stream and is a very unique property. She doesn't understand how the ordinance allows the number of units with mixed use. The property sold for less than \$250,000 and now they want to put this big development on an extremely busy street. This is the drive-thru to Dighton and we don't need any more traffic. She stated Dighton is dealing with another project consisting of 135 homes which would be an impact to this area. She stated 417 Winthrop Street used to have a business there and she has witnessed several accidents. It's an unsafe blind corner. She schools are already overcrowded. She stated the sewer has come half way up the street and they never had the option of sewer. She asked which way is the sewer going to flow? She stated all houses on Harold Street have water issues. Is there enough room for an emergency turnaround? She states the size and scope is too much. Dennis stated he has the same feelings as the neighbors do. He suggests having traffic study done, add parking, conduct water/sewer analysis, NPDES analysis, and stormwater mgt. plans and suggests reducing the number to 8-16 units. Doris Silvia, 229 So. Walker Street said this project is sickening and you are putting a parking community between the Westville neighborhood. She stated Lopes business has grown and they have been dealing with that and development needs to stop. Stephanie Backus, 420 Winthrop Street, also opposed. She sees all the traffic and finally they put lights at North Walker & Winthrop Street. She stated this is too much development for the area and says if they are renters they won't care about the property. It was noted the public input will be kept open. John R. stated it's too much and he would like to see just one more house on the property. Manny stated he has more acreage and he cannot see all this on there. John D. stated the water puddles across from Breno's Collision. Mike doesn't want to see the water problem worsen and he agrees it will overwhelm the area. Atty. John Zajac stated the intent is to improve the water problem and this project has its own stormwater management plan. Brian suggests reducing the height of the building. John R. suggests reaching out to the School Dept. (Bennett School) put your request in writing to show you did it. Mike suggests the applicant listen to all the concerns of the abutters. John D. stated the existing culvert is not fully functioning and they will help that. John R. asked if they need a NPDES Permit ? Bob asked about the location of the groundwater? John D. stated they had a mini excavator and went down 10 inches and found no water table. Manny also pointed out cutting down all the trees will affect the water.

Bob made motion to continue to February 3rd meeting, seconded by John R. All in favor.

Cont'd. Public Hearing – 128 East Water St. - Special Permit from Section 440 Attachment #1 of the Zoning Ordinance for a Three family dwelling in an Urban Residential District, submitted by Lynda Earley

John DeSousa was invited into the enclosure. He requested the petition to be withdrawn without prejudice. **Bob made motion to allow petition to be withdrawn without prejudice. Seconded by John. All in favor.** Atty. Fredericks asked to speak and the Board informed the petition was withdrawn. Abutter John Joyce stated it would have been nice if they knew it would be withdrawn as he paid his attorney to be here tonight.

Public Hearing – Proposed Zoning Map Amendment to amend the City of Taunton Zoning Map by changing the 25,800 sq. ft. portion of the property at the intersection of Middleboro Avenue and Pinehill Street, known as property I.D. Map 95 Lot 51 from Suburban Residential District to Business District.

Roll call: Campbell, Reardon, Spencer, Monteiro, Carr, Ackerman present. Hearing opens at 7:00 PM Dept. comments from the City Planner, Conservation Commission, City Engineer, and Bd. Of Health were read into the record. Atty. Edmund Brennan and Bill McCaffrey were invited into the enclosure. Atty. Brennan stated this property is on the corner of Pinehill Street and Caswell Street. The parcel is located in the Suburban Residential District and Business District. The proposal is to have the portion currently in the Suburban Residential District (25,800 sq. ft.) changed to Business District. The Board needs to forward a recommendation to the Council for their hearing. Atty. Brennan stated under the zoning by-law it allows 30 feet of the other district to be combined leaving only 20% left Suburban Residential. This proposal cleans it up and gives flexibility as to any future development. John asked if this property is on the market and it was answered no. They have no plans for it they just want to clean it up having it in one zoning district just makes it easier. Bill stated he has owned this property for over 30 years and just wants to clean it up. Public Input: Shannie Rei, 189 Middleboro Avenue stated she shares a driveway with this property and wants to know what will happen Bill stated he lets her use the driveway but she needs to know she needs to stay on her side. Bill stated apparently the previous owner of 189 Middleboro paved their driveway not aware where the property lines was. Filomena Faria, 2 Pinehill St. stated she lives across the street and is totally against anything being built there. Atty. Brennan pointed out 80% of the property can be used as Business District. Manny stated the proposal makes sense and the driveway situation is in reality the whole driveway is no hers and future owners might not be that generous. Bill stated the City approached him about putting traffic lights.

Bob made motion to close public input, seconded by John. All in favor.

Manny made motion to forward a positive recommendation for the proposed zoning change to the Municipal Council, seconded by Bob. All I favor. Hearing closed at 7:13 PM

Public Meeting -Modification of a Site Plan Review- 354 Winthrop Street for the Recreation Marijuana Dispensary -to increase the square footage of the recreation marijuana dispensary from 4,140 sq. ft. to 5,751 sq. ft. and an additional 1,090 sq. ft. hair salon. submitted by HTC Trinity LLC, owned by Weder Pereira.

Dept. comments from DIRB, Kevin Scanlon, City Planner, SP decision from Municipal Council, City Engineer, Water Dept., TMLP which were placed on file. Atty. William Rounds, Kyra Fernandes, and John DeSousa were invited into the enclosure. John D. stated the plans changed with the elimination of the hair salon. They updated the plans to reflect council approval with the removal of the hair salon. The City Planner's letter indicated the square footage was incorrect but John explained when they printed the updated plans they mistakenly put the wrong square footage in the block on the plans. He shows new plans with the correct square footage. Dennis asked where do they stand with the building permit? John stated they are waiting for P.B. approval before they go apply for permit. John stated they moved the building back 13 feet and added the foyer. They also moved the handicapped in front now that the hair salon has been eliminated. John stated the original AUL areas is 3 feet from cover and they brought fill into property. The pump chambers are in back and they will have to excavate to find the water table. They will do buoyancy calculations. The parking layout has not changed. Brian asked about the LSP and if they get copy of approved plans. John stated the LSP will be on site during construction per the AUL rules. Brian stated he drove by today and looks like they are lowering the land. John stated the previous owner brought fill into the property. The previous approval was for a hardware store. The LSP monitors the site. All contamination is gone and they have vent pipes and the DEP comes out to take air samples. Bob suggests working with the State Highway Dept. with regards to the sidewalk and he pointed out they need to put handicapped ramp in. John stated they are making us putting a new walkway in. Public Input: Deborah Carr, 175 Partridge Circle stated no one had the correct plans and suggests the Board take time to review the correct plan. Atty. Rounds stated the only correction on the plans is the data in the box regarding the square footage. It was noted the plans shown on the screen tonight are the correct plans.

Bob made motion to approve the Site Plan Review with dept. comments, and plans dated 1-4-2022 showing second floor being 1,351 sq. ft. for a total of 5,751 sq. ft. Seconded by Manny. All in favor.

Condition #1) That the plans dated December 10, 2020 and revised through January 4, 2022 shall govern with the following additional conditions;

Condition #2) Lighting shall not illuminate any portion of abutting properties

Condition #3) The site shall be kept clean and clear of debris

Condition #4) Two sets of as-builts shall be submitted upon occupancy for all work on site and shall include design engineer and land surveyor certification notes stating the development has been built according to the approved plans. Plans will show all construction of buildings, utilities, grades, setbacks etc

Condition #5) Two sets of updated plans shall be provided that conforms to this decision prior to Building permit showing correct square footage for second floor to be 1,351 sq. ft.

Condition #6) Dumpster shall be located on a concrete pad, be enclosed with a six foot stockade fence, be kept closed at all times and be emptied regularly

Condition #7) All of the doors shall be shown on the plan

Condition #8) The required ADA/AAB curb cuts shall be shown on the plan

Condition #9) DPW permits will be required including City Licensed Contractor, Road Opening and or trench permits for the proposed work

Condition #10) DPW Water Division Specifications will apply including design, materials, installation, testing, inspection and final approval

Condition #11) The force main sewer shall be relocated out of the AUL area

- Condition #12) The water table shall be established at the pump chamber location
- Condition #13) A hazardous materials permit is required from the Board of Health
- Condition #14) A surveyor stamp shall be provided on the plans
- Condition #15) The retail marijuana facility shall be a stand alone business. The total square footage shall not exceed 5,751 square feet

Vote:	6 In Favor
Dennis Ackerman, Vice Chairman	YES
Robert Campbell	YES
John Reardon	YES
Manuel Spencer	YES
Brian Carr	YES
Michael Monteiro	YES
Anthony Abreau	Absent

Public Meeting - Site Plan Review for property -Fremont Street - Map 30, Lot 97 – for the construction of a 8,000 square foot warehouse building with 11 parking spaces – Revision is the proposed 24 foot wide access drive has been added on Fremont Street with associated grading, and the re-location of 2 Leyland Cypress plantings to accommodate access, submitted by Future Fuel, LLC

Bob Field and Atty. Zajac were invited into the enclosure. Dept. comments from the DIRB, City Engineer, Velia Water, TMLP, Water Dept. and Tom Teger, Pres., Forekicks in favor. Bob stated they are proposing an 8,000 square foot building in an Industrial District. They met twice with DIRB and made some revisions and now have no issue with the DIRB recommendations. Bob stated they will meet all zoning dimensional requirements. He stated the lot initially had a statement of “Non-buildable” but there was a subsequent plan that did not have that reference. He prepared the initial plans for TDC and now the lot is buildable and there is no specific use at this time. They will build then look for an appropriate tenant. They have no intention of any solid waste business at this location. He said potentially it could be a storage/light repair for vehicles for the solid waste vehicles. Bob stated the existing detention basin will be used at stormwater to rear of building. They have provided stormwater report showing it can slightly be reduced and still work. The utilities will come from Fremont Street but will have truck access from the haul road. Brian stated he’s part of the neighborhood and has spoke to Mr. Tuesch and the lot was labeled as non-buildable and now it’s buildable? Atty. Zajac stated when it was purchased from TDC there was a reference on plan at registry of deeds in Plan book 399, pg. 18, and then a confirmatory deed plan in book 487, page 66 per the John Hancock Road Extension subdivision plan. Bob F. stated when the subdivision was approved perkins paper was under construction and this lot was looked at as the drainage lot. Once the drainage was designed they had remaining land. Brian stated he talked to Joe T .and he agreed to having the entrance for vehicles use Fremont Street and the plans show roadway goes to haul road. He suggests putting a gate because Aggregate closes their gates at specific times. Under the zoning ordinance they could possibly do a baseball facility, railroad car holding facility with approvals through local boards. Brian stated they have made some good concessions. He stated they have an easement and nothing more for Aggregate trucks from Gordon Foods. Mr. Tuesch has his trucks turn onto Fremont Street and will have a gate to be placed on his property to the haul road. The TDC had the subdivision approved and once they made the determination it was a buildable lot they had a full design done and it was determined they didn’t need the entire lot for the detention basin. Brian stated when Aggregate renewed the permit the City required Aggregate and Perkins to post \$250,000 towards making the road a public way. Brian stated the truck traffic is very heavy on the narrow dangerous road and he has some concerns. Bob C. asked if that section of John Hancock Road Extension has zero lots. He stated they never did the improvement to John Hancock Rd .Extension so this lot

is the collateral for the subdivision. He stated Fremont Street is not suitable for truck traffic. Bob F. said they have no intention of removing gate and they are in agreement with no truck traffic. Bob F. stated they will not have any solid waste no trash trucks. It was suggested meeting with the City Planner, Law Office to see if they can actually vote on this to see if this lot is surety for guaranty the completion of the road.

Bob C. made motion to open public input, seconded by John R. All in favor.

Mr. Frank Kotak, 67 Partridge Circle wants to know what they want to put in? Dennis said we can restrict to put it in the decision that no solid waste is allowed. Deborah Carr, 175 Partridge Circle, stated she has alot of concerns. She showed maps from Tibbetts Engineer in 2012 showing the detention basins be conveyed to the City of Taunton. She asked how can you build on a lot when it is supposed to be the City? Bob F. stated the plans says we have to convey an easement to the City. Deb pointed out there is a 10 foot easement all the way down the haul road. She stated 18 wheelers and tractor trailers use the haul road. She stated she wants someone to be responsible for the use of the haul road and she thinks TDC needs to enforce it. Her neighborhood should not suffer from this. She stated it's not a road it's only an easement and not meant for anyone to use it. It was only intended for Aggregate to use it. She contacted the Law office about the deed and they were unaware of the deed. She is happy to hear they won't put solid waste business in. She stated there is some discrepancy with the maps showing it's unbuildable on one and then the restriction isn't there on other plan. It was suggested having the applicant talk to the Law Dept., City Planner and the TDC attorney to look into the buildability status of this lot.

Brian made motion to continue to March 3, 2022, seconded by John. All in favor.

Public Meeting – Site Plan Review - 655 West Water Street - to allow a recycling company in the Industrial District with a 15' x 50' scale house and 6,500 square feet of outdoor storage, submitted by One Way Recycling Inc. - Requesting a continuance to March 3rd meeting

Letter from Atty. Brianna Correira requesting a continuance to March meeting.

John made motion to grant request for continuance to March 3rd meeting, seconded by Manny. All in favor. An abutter asked to speak and she was informed they continued the meeting as the request of the applicant and she left contact info with the Secretary.

Public Meeting - Site Plan Review 1,15-31 Main St. & 22 Merchant's Lane - for the renovation of a historic building in the Central Business District into a mixed use building with commercial units and 38 residential units on upper floors, submitted by Philip R. Giffie, Exe. Dir. NOAH and owned by James Dorsey and Michael Keene.

Atty. Edmund Brennan, Phil Giffie, Exe. Dir. NOAH, and Al Lambert, Drew Garvin, Engineer, was invited into the enclosure. Dept. comments were from DIRB, Veolia Water, Water Dept., and City Engineer were placed on file. Atty. Brennan stated they have no issues and accept the DIRB comments. He stated this is known as the Union Block Project. They are proposing a mixed use with businesses on first floor and apartment on 2nd & 3rd floors. They received ZBA approval in 2018 and 2019 and they appealed and it was remanded back to ZBA and they received approval in Dec. 2019. He stated most of the activity will take place in back with 39 parking places. He stated some are compact spaces and he asks for approval as presented. He stated this proposal will clean up the site and businesses will stay, no business will be displaced. Atty. Brennan stated the front and side of the building will benefit the city and has the support of the downtown BID Foundation. He stated the parking is tight but it works. Dennis referenced a case from 1970 and 1988 stating what can be asked for as part of the Site Plan Review process. He stated it has taken 2 ½ years for them to come for a Site Plan Review and a lot has changed. We have a new city hall, new traffic patterns, new businesses downtown and he feels the following is warranted: Traffic study, water

analysis including water usage, flow test and sprinkler, electrical Load calculations, Sewer analysis, peer review and have applicant pay for it and to make surer there is adequate parking. Atty. Brennan stated this property is unique because it's in the CBD and usually you don't get SPR for properties downtown. Dennis stated there was a major traffic done in the early 1980's. Atty. Brennan stated they are not proposing any infrastructure and this project has been reviewed by the depts. It was noted there is a transformer on the plans. Dennis asked why it took so long to come for a SPR? Atty. Brennan stated it's a complicated process and it's not that unusual for this type of project. They received their Special Permit in 2019. The applicant knows they have to provide adequate parking, sewer, electric, water to have the project work. Bob stated we don't normally ask for these types of information that Dennis asked for. The building dept., fire dept. will have to sign off for their departments. Bob stated we have never asked for electrical load information. Drew stated they are adding some green space to a previously approved area. They are proposing a transformer and if the departments requires certain things they have to provide it or they can't built it. He stated Veolia Water wants us to do CCVT testing and if more flow comes if they it will pump more frequently. The parking issues downtown already exists and they are allowed public parking taking into consideration. They have allocated those spaces. Bob asked about the other lot to the south and it was stated it's not part of this project. There is a parking lot on School Street within 500 feet of this project. The metered parking in front will most likely be used for patrons who utilize the businesses. Bob stated as a traffic engineer he doesn't expect much added traffic, most people will be walking or using bike. He stated 38 units in an existing building will not change the traffic pattern. John asked about snow storage and Atty. Brennan answers it will have to be trucked off site. He asked about the compact parking and if that was enough? Atty. Brennan stated part of their zba approval they are required to secure an additional 15 parking spaces off site of which they will. Brian asked why the applicant appealed and remanded? Atty. Brennan stated the ZBA granted it for 36 units and had condition requiring a recreation area and the wording caused some problems with the financing. So they appealed and it was remanded back to ZBA of which they approved it for 38 units with difference language that stated they provide an assembly/gathering room suitable for all residents. Brian stated he would like to see the development impact statements on anything more than 10 units. He likes a mixed use development downtown but wonders if this project will change the downtown. He wants to see the project be a vibrant project. Brian stated maybe we could require developers to contribute to some parking improvements downtown. He thinks this project will affect the parking downtown and wishes the City would implement an ordinance basically requiring development downtown to contribute towards more parking area downtown. Atty. Brennan stated this property is in the CBD and they have someone who is willing to invest in the City providing housing with this mixed development which goes along with the Master Plan. They will be required to meet all building code, water, fire, plumbing code requirements. Brian stated they won't be paying taxes like everyone else and Atty. Brennan stated the site has been sitting there vacant all these years. Manny has concerns about the parking but if done right this project can be great. If it's done wrong it will be an embarrassment to the City. Mike agrees with everyone that the parking situation is not the greatest. Atty. Brennan stated they will be paying for 15 off site parking spaces per the ZBA approval.

Bob made motion to open public input, seconded by Brian. All in favor. No one in favor or opposed.

John stated if there is a problem with the parking they will call the police. This project will have a management company to oversee it. They will be on-site property manager a few days, (not 7 days a week) All tenants will go through the vetting process and these types of developments are run by the State and they get monitored every year. John asked where is the entrance? It was dictated the main entrance will be in the rear which is the primary entrance to the basement. There will be 2 entrances off Main St (in the vicinity of 13 & 27 Main St.) and 2 smaller entrances for security purposes. The ambulance access would be from the rear. Dennis is only looking out for the residents and the betterment of the City.

John made motion to approve as presented with dept. comments, Including the parking as shown on plans. seconded by Bob. All in favor.

Condition #1) That the plans dated December 10, 2021 shall govern with the following additional conditions:

Condition #2) Lighting shall not illuminate any portion of abutting properties

Condition #3) The site shall be kept clean and clear of debris

Condition #4) Two sets of as-builts shall be submitted upon occupancy for all work on site and shall include design engineer and land surveyor certification notes stating the development has been built according to the approved plans. Plans will show all construction of buildings, utilities, grades, setbacks etc

Condition #5) Two sets of updated plans shall be provided that conforms to this decision prior to Building permit

Condition #6) Dumpster shall be located on a concrete pad, be enclosed with a six foot stockade fence, be kept closed at all times and be emptied regularly

Condition #7) Survey information shall be added to the plans

Condition #8) The parcel numbers shall be added to the plans

Condition #9) A confirmatory deed shall be filed for the parcels

Condition #10) The sidewalk encroaches on the public way and the travel way encroaches on the abutting parcel. Mutual easements must be agreed upon and recorded prior to building permits

Condition #11) The sewer shall have a CCTV inspection and a set of as builts shall be submitted prior to building permits

Note #1) Plans are required and need to be submitted to DPW for water services, fire service line, gate valves and curb stops. Permits are required for City Licensed Contractor, road opening and trench

Note #2) DPW specifications apply including pressure testing, materials, installation, new water meter with an updated radio frequency unit, inspection and approval. Any backflow devices must be inspected by the Plumbing inspector and prior notice is required before any city water work is to be performed and inspections are required prior to backfilling

Vote: 6 In Favor

Dennis Ackerman, Vice Chairman	YES
Robert Campbell	YES
John Reardon	YES
Manuel Spencer	YES
Brian Carr	YES
Michael Monteiro	YES
Anthony Abreau	Absent

Bob made motion to forward a letter to the Municipal Council to draft an ordinance to require developers who propose development downtown to contribute towards expanding parking or towards improvements to the parking downtown, seconded by John. All in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 9: 56 PM