

PLANNING BOARD
Regular Meeting Minutes
May 11, 2021 via Zoom

Members present: Mark Schafron/*Chairman, Robert J. Swartz/Vice Chairman (joined in at 6:48 pm), Steve Cormier, Robert J. Bettez, Sr., and Paul A. Cormier/Members, and Trevor Beauregard/Director-City Planner*

Members absent: *None.*

Also present: Chris Coughlin-*Engineering*, Christine Martines Fucile-*DCDP*, and Attendance Sheet on file.

ANNOUNCEMENT - Any person may make a video or audio recording of an open session of a meeting, or may transmit the meeting through any medium, subject to reasonable requirements of the Chair as to the number, placement and operation of equipment used so as not to interfere with the conduct of the meeting. Any person intending to make such recording shall notify the Chair forthwith. All Documents referenced or used during the meeting must be submitted in duplicate to the Director of Community Development & Planning pursuant to the Open Meeting and Public Records Law. All documents shall become part of the official record of the meeting.

Mr. Schafron called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 13, 2021 ~Public & Regular Meetings

Motion to accept public and regular meeting minutes as presented.

R. Bettez/P. Cormier.

Voice Vote –4 in favor.

2. NEW BUSINESS:

2.1 Special Permit: Heywood Hospital Infrastructure Project

T. Beauregard suggested voting on the 3rd party reviewer.

Motion to engage a 3rd party engineering firm, not to exceed \$7,100.00, to look at the plans and provide additional perspective consistent with Scope of Service.

M. Schafron/R. Bettez.

Voice Vote – 4 in favor.

(Mr. Swartz entered meeting after motion at 6:48 pm)

P. Cormier questioned if the 3rd party review scope was in agreement with Tighe & Bond, as well as Collier. C. Coughlin said primarily what the 3rd party reviewer, Fuss & O’Neil will be looking at is their compliance with our regulations, and if they are doing it within the regulations.

R. Bettez asked who pays for the 3rd party. T. Beauregard responded the Applicant.

2.2 Wilder Brook Subdivision:

T. Beauregard state the City received a request from Henry Cormier, and his attorney requesting the return of his surety. The surety was being held for the production of As Builts, and any maintenance required on the roadways due to the development taking place at the site. Further, now that the house lots have been built out, and after further review with the DPW and the City Engineer, all agreed the City can release those funds. C. Coughlin added the As Builts were submitted to him, granite bounds for all the curbs were installed, lights have been installed, and the top coat of pavement has been completed.

P. Cormier mentioned he thought at one time this was turned over to the City Solicitor, and asked what his opinion was on this. T. Beauregard replied he agreed with himself, the City Engineer, and the

Director of the DPW. Mr. Schafron asked if this required a vote. T. Beauregard said this process was already in motion, therefore, does not require a vote.

2.3 Ordinance ~ Development Overlay District I

T. Beauregard provided copy of Ordinance paperwork to Planning Board Members, and noted Councillor Graves submitted an Amendment to the Zoning Code to include “Section H” under the Development Overlay District I section, and would like it to read as follows:

H. The following areas have been designated by the City Council as Development Overlay District I. The terms and/or conditions not consistent with the general language of this Chapter 675, Section 530, if any, are referenced within the listing of the specific property to which such terms and/or conditions relate: [and then each property (with any terms and conditions – like 525 Parker Street’s) that has obtained Development Overlay District I designation will be listed, and the list will be continuously updated, in accordance with law]. T. Beauregard said he assumes Councillor Graves wants each new development overlay district, and all the previous ones, listed within the zoning code narrative. Currently, if there is an overlay district created, it is included on the zoning overlay map, and is available to the public. For example, there are four Development Overlay Districts shown on the map showing one at 525 Parker Street, three along Main Street where CVS is located, as well as the new Lasik Center building, and moving up more Main Street, as well as at the Price Chopper site, which is not shown on the map.

Every time a new one is created by the City Council, it is then included in the map layer.

Mr. Schafron asked if Councillor Graves gave a rationale for wanting this to be done in text, and does not understand the duplication. P. Cormier asked if he is asking for the Board’s opinion, or if a vote is needed.

T. Beauregard explained typically when there is a zoning code amendment request, it starts with the City Council, then the City Council refers to the Planning Board, the Planning Board either refers it back in the negative, or the positive. If positive, would request a joint public hearing. If negative, goes back to the City Council for them to handle as they prefer. Mr. Schafron again said, he is a little baffled as to why this is happening, and prefers to know more. Mr. Bettez agreed. Mr. Schafron added this is adding another administrative chore, which may not be necessary.

Mr. Schafron recommended taking no action until hearing from Councillor Graves. Mr. Schafron also recommended tabling this for now. T. Beauregard added he can reach out to Councillor Graves.

3. OLD BUSINESS:

None at this time.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS~~NEWS~~ARTICLES~~EVENTS:

Next meeting schedule for Tuesday, June 8, 2021 at 6 p.m.

T. Beauregard advised the he would like to let the Planning Board Members know at this point in time it is very important all be present at the upcoming meetings, especially with the Special Permit in front of us, because with a Special Permit, need four votes out of the five to approve a Special Permit. In addition, currently do not have Associate Member for the Planning Board, therefore, should think about adding one.

Further, the Mullin Rule is available if one meeting has to be missed, where the recording would be viewed, or read the transcript of the meeting, then sign a form stating this has been done in order to participate in the vote at a later meeting on that project.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn.

R. Bettez/R. Swartz.

Voice Vote – All in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

All documents referenced or used during the meeting are part of the official record and are available in the Department of Community Development and Planning pursuant to the Open Meeting and Public Records Law.