

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Regular Meeting and Public Hearing
Monday, February 23, 2015
7:30 PM**

Mayor's Conference Room, Second Floor, City Hall, 562 Main Street

PRESENT: Carla Morelli, Anne DeSouza-Ward, Paul King, Michael Cassavoy, Robert Mercado, John Sadowski and Jack Welch.

ABSENT: Ed Cassidy, Sharon Petrillo

Denise Gaffey, Director and City Planner, Erin Zwirko, Assistant Planning Director, and Jessica Mitchell, Planning Coordinator, were present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 PM by Ms. Morelli.

MINUTES

Planning Board Regular Meeting, December 15, 2014

Mr. Cassavoy asked that a statement on the minutes that he had made be corrected.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of December 15, 2014 as corrected. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. Mr. Mercado abstained from the vote as he was not present at the meeting. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Planning Board Special Meeting, January 12, 2015

Mr. Mercado MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of January 12, 2015. Mr. King SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Design Review Subcommittee Meeting, December 18, 2014

Mr. Sadowski MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of December 18, 2014. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

BOARD OF APPEALS

Case 15-001, 24 Emerson Place, Joanne Markovitz

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals stating no objection to the petition. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 15-001

APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED PLAN

PB 14-01, 17 Forest Street

The Planning Board reviewed this case at their last regular meeting on December 15, 2015. At that time, the Planning Board asked Attorney Judy Clark to provide conclusive evidence that the two structures on the property were built prior to 1917 as required for a division of land to qualify as an ANR. Attorney Clark requested a continuance to the Planning Board's next regularly scheduled meeting on January 26, 2015. However, due to inclement weather, that meeting was canceled and all matters on the agenda were re-scheduled for tonight's meeting.

Attorney Clark stated that despite her attempts to find documentation of the construction dates, she has not located anything definitive. She reported that she met with the Assessor for the City of Melrose to review old maps in the City's possession. In addition the Melrose Public Library and the Registry of Deeds have been searched.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to DENY the application for ANR. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted to deny. None were in favor.

Document: PB 14-01, 17 Forest Street, Approval Not Required Plan and Form A

SITE PLAN REVIEW

Case 15-001, 40 Washington Street (Little Sprouts, LLC)

Mark Anderegg, the owner of Little Sprouts, LLC, presented the application to the Planning Board. Little Sprouts, LLC is a provider of Early Education services for children between the ages of 6-weeks and 6 years. It is a privately held company with 18 locations in Massachusetts currently and the proposed Melrose location will be the 19th. The center will be licensed for 90 children. Mr. Anderegg introduced the Architect for the project, David Silverman of Silverman Trykowski Associates, Inc.

Mr. Silverman presented drawings of the project and pointed out the various areas of proposed construction to the Board. The existing structure is currently vacant and formerly housed the Registry of Motor Vehicles and a café. In addition to the building, there is currently a drive through lane and a parking lot on the property.

The applicant has proposed to locate a playground area in the rear of the building. The children will access the playground area through a door in the rear of the building. They also intend to install removable bollards to close off the drive through lane and permanent bollards on the opposite side of the playground to protect the play area from the parking lot.

The existing parking lot contains 32 spaces. This number will be reduced to 29 in order to accommodate the play area and a fenced off area for a dumpster. The parking spaces will be proportioned as follows; eighteen spaces will be reserved for the staff; two spaces will be reserved for visitors; nine spaces will be reserved for parent drop off and pick up. The applicant presented a table that showed the peak hours of drop off and pickup and the number of parking spaces that are required at each time to facilitate drop off and pickup which takes approximately 15 minutes per child. The chart presented showed that the parking is more than adequate for their needs. In addition, it exceeds the amount of parking required in the Melrose Zoning Ordinance for this type of use.

Mr. Ray Dunetz of Ray Dunetz Landscape Architecture presented the plans for the playground area and other landscaping on the property. Mr. Dunetz said that the playground would follow a natural play environment design to facilitate an education component to the children's play. This means that the play structures would feature colors and structures that blend with the natural environment such as split log balance beams, boulders and wooden teepee structures. There would not be any brightly colored playground equipment. The playground area would be divided into three separate areas to accommodate the different age groups at the center.

The landscaping in the front of the building would consist of low bush shrubs that would not obstruct the sight lines of cars entering and exiting the parking area.

Mr. Silverman presented the lighting and signage plans for the project. The signage and the lighting will all be in accordance with the Melrose Zoning Ordinance. The signs will be illuminated by small LED

lighting. The existing standing pole sign will be removed. In addition, the two pole lights in the parking lot will be replaced with pedestrian scale lighting as recommended by the Office of Planning and Community Development.

Mr. Brian Jones of Allen & Major, the civil engineer for the project presented the engineering issues to the Board. He said there would be no changes to the sewer, gas or electrical systems. The project will require a fire suppression system to be installed. A new water line will be installed across Washington Street to facilitate this. The property has a functioning storm water system. In addition, they will be removing pavement in the area of the playground which will result in an overall reduction in the amount of impervious surface on the property. Mr. Jones concluded by saying that since the building and site are existing, there are not a lot of engineering concerns.

Mr. Anderegg concluded the presentation by thanking the Board for it's time and reiterating his excitement about the center's new location in Melrose.

Ms. Morelli opened the hearing for public participation.

A letter from Alderman Gail Infurna was read into the record. Alderman Infurna asked that dumpster removal occur after 9:30AM, but not prior to 7AM. Her concern is that Dumpster services are not a burden to residents and do not interfere with the morning drop off. She also asked that the lighting not impact the neighbors.

Mr. Anderegg stated that this concern was brought to his attention at the Department Head's meeting to review their application. He has followed up with the two dumpster removal companies that are being considered and they have both verbally agreed to the time restrictions.

Ms. Morelli asked if there were any members of the public that wished to speak regarding the application.

Bill Damore of 91 Green Street in Wakefield spoke. He stated that he is there to represent his mother in law who resides at 18 Brazil Street, which abuts the property in the rear behind the proposed playground area. She has concerns about the noise that will be created in the playground area. She is also concerned about the lighting on the site. Finally, she is concerned about parents parking on Brazil Street when demand exceeds the parking spaces available on site. They were especially concerned about Parent/Teacher nights and asked where parents of 90 children and the staff would park for those events.

Marianne Damore, also of 91 Green Street in Wakefield, added that her Mother is 92 years old. She asked how many recess periods would there be and what times would these be? She read on the company's website that they are open at 6AM and asked what the hours of operation would be in Melrose and how many people would be dropping off at 6AM?

Ms. Morelli asked if there were any other members of the public that wished to speak. Seeing none, Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to close the public participation portion of the meeting and continue the public hearing. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Ms. Morelli asked Mr. Anderegg to please present a typical day to the Board and address the questions asked of the abutters present.

Mr. Anderegg first addressed the issue of hours of operation. He said that across their other centers, very few people drop off at 6AM and that the center would not open that early if no one requested a drop off

time at 6AM. He said that drop off tends to be staggered between 7AM and 9AM and that it is fairly evenly balanced with a steady flow between those hours. The evening pick up is similar starting at 4PM and continuing until 6PM again with no concentrated rush time. He then stated that they do not hold a Parent/ Teacher evening where parents of all 90 children would be present. Instead, they use a Parent /Teacher conference model where parents are scheduled to meet with teachers for 15 minute increments throughout the day.

Mr. Anderegg commented that it was difficult to give specific times for recess because the schedule is dependent on the weather, which varies. He said he could offer general information on recess. The children tend to go out twice a day, once in the morning block of 10AM- 11:30AM and once in the afternoon block of 2PM to 4PM. He said the outdoor breaks are staggered and that all 90 children would not be using the playground at the same time.

Ms. Morelli asked about the lighting for the signs. Mr. Silverman responded that the signs are under the maximum size allowed by the Ordinance and will be illuminated in accordance with the ordinance. Ms. Morelli stated that the letter from the Building Inspector confirmed this and commented that the Sign Ordinance required the lighting to be downward cast so that only the sign would be illuminated.

Mr. Silverman stated that they would also be replacing the lights in the parking lot with smaller pedestrian scale lighting and that all lighting would be shielded and downward cast.

Mr. Dunetz added that a 6-FT stockade fence currently exists on the property between the abutters on Brazil Street and the playground area. He said that this fence would help reflect some of the noise back towards the center and away from the residents.

Mr. Cassavoy asked about the existing shrubs and trees in the front of the building and asked if they knew what they were and if they would interfere with the sight lines of drivers entering and exiting the parking area. Mr. Dunetz said that the plantings were chosen in consideration of the sight lines and that if the existing shrubs and trees were not appropriate, they would be replaced.

Mr. Cassavoy asked if the employees would be required to park in the spaces further away from the entrance. Mr. Anderegg replied yes.

Mr. Cassavoy suggested that perhaps the entrance would be improved if the handicap ramp were moved approximately 30-FT from the entrance to provide greater visual access for the entrance.

Mr. Cassavoy asked the age of the roof and rooftop structures and if the rooftop units could be replaced with low decibel rated equipment. Ms. Gaffey said the current building was constructed in the 1990's. Mr. Silverman said that they did not have any plans to replace the rooftop units.

Mr. Mercado asked if the driveway previously used for access to a drive through window could be removed to provide more pervious surface. Mr. Anderegg stated that he had no use for the asphalt area. Mr. Dunetz said that they intended to leave the area paved but to block its access with removable bollards so that they could be removed in case the Fire Department required emergency access. Ms. Morelli asked if the Fire Department had expressed any concerns. The Fire Department did not express any concerns related to leaving this area accessible. There was some discussion regarding the curb opening and if the site and neighborhood would be improved by closing this curb cut and removing the paved area.

Mr. Mercado asked about handicap parking and security for the Children at the site. Mr. Anderegg responded that handicap parking was available and that each parent was given a unique key code to access the building.

Mr. Mercado asked about cars entering into the center and if there would be a backup of traffic onto Washington Street. Mr. Anderegg responded that a rush did not occur that would cause a traffic backup since the drop off was staggered over a two hour period.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward said that she would prefer that the extra curb cut be closed instead of blocking off with bollards. Mr. Anderegg stated that he did not own the building and that the issue of closing the curb cut was an issue for the owner of the property. He stated that the solution of installing removable bollards seemed to be met with acceptance at the Department Heads meeting in which the site plan was reviewed.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked about the size of the snow removal areas and what would happen if snow fall exceeded the size of the areas? Mr. Anderegg replied that the owner of the building was responsible for snow removal and that if the snow exceeded what could be stored in those areas then the snow would be taken off site as part of their lease agreement.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked if a stop sign would be installed at the exit to the parking lot. Mr. Anderegg replied that he thought that was a good idea and he was happy to install one.

Mr. Mercado asked about the water line installation shown on the Utility plan. Mr. Jones replied that due to the limited space and the need to stay within the right of way, the connection was designed in a manner similar to the connection for the property next door, 2 Washington Street.

Mr. Sadowski asked about the fence between the playground and the rear abutters. Mr. Dunetz answered that the fence is existing and it is a 6-FT stockade fence. Mr. Silverman also stated that the grade pitches down from the site. Mr. Jones stated that the fence is on top of a concrete retaining wall.

Mr. Sadowski asked about the plan for the other curb cuts in the area. Ms. Gaffey replied that the curb cuts in the property across the street would remain in the same location and the only modification would be a possible reduction in width.

There was discussion amongst the Board about the additional curb cut on the project site and if the Board should require the applicant to remove the curb cut entirely rather than the current plan to block it's use with removable bollards. The Board generally thought that the traffic situation and the neighborhood would be improved if the existing curb cut was removed. Mr. Anderegg was concerned that because he is not the owner of the property, that he could only ask the owner if he would be willing to have the curb cut removed. Mr. Sadowski suggested that it was worthy of a conversation with the owner.

Mr. Cassavoy asked again about the age and condition of the current rooftop units and if the applicant would agree to replace the units with quieter units if they needed to be replaced. Mr. Silverman replied that they planned to use the existing units.

Ms. Morelli asked the Board about the request for waiver of requirements. The applicant requested three waivers. 1) Infrastructure Analysis; 2) Level of Service Analysis; and 3) Transportation Management Plan.

Mr. Sadowski asked about the unresolved conditions as they relate to the waivers. There was some discussion amongst the Board about the conditions. Ms. Morelli suggested that the Board vote on the Waivers and then discuss the conditions.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to Grant the request for waivers. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Ms. Gaffey read the full list of proposed conditions.

Mr. Silverman asked about the condition regarding the requirement for the Flow test. He explained that this was typically done by the sub-contractor and therefore not completed before the application for a Building permit. Ms. Gaffey suggested that the wording of the condition could be changed to "prior to the Certificate of Occupancy".

Ms. Morelli asked if the issue of locating the water gate valve in the street had been resolved. Mr. Jones said that it had been resolved and they could locate the valve in the street.

Mr. Cassavoy suggested a condition be added about installing low decibel rooftop units when the units are replaced in the future. He made it clear that the Board would not be requiring that the units be replaced now, but that if the units needed to be replaced, that they follow the guidelines. The Board discussed what the requirements would be. Mr. Welch suggested that the units should be replaced with High Seer units, which are high efficiency, low decibel units that meet the requirements of the energy code. Mr. Silverman asked how this condition would be enforced since it would not be tied to the current occupancy. The Board discussed this matter and agreed that it would be difficult to make sure that this was enforced. They decided instead to highlight this discussion in the Findings section of the Decision making clear the intent to replace the roof top units with high efficiency type units when scheduled for replacement.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward suggested that a condition be added about the hours of dumpster removal service and that the hours of dumpster removal should be expanded so that removal did not occur during the evening pick up time as well as the morning drop off time. The Board discussed the dumpster service. The restrictions would be 1) No service prior to 7:00AM; 2) Dumpster service between 9:30AM and 4:00PM.

Mr. Sadowski suggested that a condition be added about the parking spaces. The nine spaces reserved for parent pickup and drop off with a fifteen minute time limit would be located closest to the building and would be clearly marked.

The Board discussed the condition requiring the curb cut that was previously used for a drive through window to be closed. Mr. Anderegg said that he would be willing to do the work, but that if the owner of the building did not want the curb cut removed, that he could not. Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated she preferred that the condition be a simple requirement to remove the curb cut. Mr. Sadowski agreed that the Board should require the curb cut to be removed and that if the landlord did not want to close the curb cut, then the applicant would have to apply for an amendment to the decision and the Board would discuss the issue further if that occurred. The Board decided to leave the wording of condition 11 as stated.

The Board completed the discussion on conditions and concluded that the Site Plan would have twenty conditions in total; the eighteen as modified and two additional conditions.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to approve the Site Plan with the twenty conditions as modified. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN
53 Dexter Road, Brookstone Development

Ms. Morelli began the discussion by announcing to the members of the public that were present that this was not a public hearing and therefore there will not be a component of the meeting where the public would be asked to give comments. The meeting is open and the public is welcome to be present and to listen to the discussions. Ms. Gaffey added that the reason for this is because the application is for preliminary review and that if a Definitive Subdivision application is submitted, then a public hearing would be scheduled and abutters would be notified and asked to give comments.

Mr. Rich Williams introduced himself as the project designer and introduced the members of the team. Mr. Angus Bruce, the owner. Mr. Jim Mitchell, the Attorney. Mr. John Stone, the Architect.

Mr. Williams presented the plans for the proposed development. He stated that the site located at 53 Dexter road is 7.3 Acres and mostly wooded. Approximately one third of the site was exposed bedrock at or near the surface. The site is moderately to steeply sloped with some flat areas. Water and Sewer services are available from Dexter Road. He met with the City's engineer and has concluded there are no issues with the sewer system. A new water line would be installed from Dexter Road. Electric and Cable utilities would be drawn from Dexter Road and installed underground. The site is surrounded by undeveloped land owned by the City of Melrose except for approximately six abutters. He said that a paper Street, Hillside Park also abuts the property on the opposite side of Dexter Road. It is accessible, but is not an improved road. The proposed street rises uphill from Dexter Road. There are no wetlands located on the property, however an area of the property does fall within the 100-FT buffer zone of wetlands and any work in that area will involve approval from the Conservation Commission.

The plan proposes one road with sidewalk on one side and 15 house lots. The roadway is a cul-de-sac which measures approximately 900-FT from Dexter Road to the center of the cul-de-sac, and they will be requesting a waiver of the 500-FT requirement. They will also be requesting a waiver from a requirement to have sidewalks on both sides of the street if that is a requirement. The road profile varies in incline profiles between 5% and 10%. The premise of the development proposes to remove the material from the highest point in the hill and to use that material to fill in some of the lower portions so that the entire site is gently graded.

Mr. Sadowski asked what the largest profile slope proposed for the roadway was. Mr. William said the road would be at a 10% slope for approximately 175-FT.

Mr. Williams continued his presentation by discussing the proposed storm water management plan. He pointed out the locations of two storm water ponds, but said it was difficult at this point in the plan to know exactly how large these would need to be. He then pointed out the areas of the development that contained a sloped area greater than 25% and would be subject to the slope protection ordinance.

Mr. Jones presented a computerized model of the site so that the Board could get a better idea of what the slope of the roadway would be. Mr. Jones stated that the objective of the proposal was to create a better finished product by removing the highest point of the hilltop rather than avoiding working in the areas with the steepest slope. He thinks the proposed roadway produces less earth scarring and less impact on abutters.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward expressed concern about the long dead end and asked if a looped roadway option was explored instead of the long dead end. Mr. Williams replied that they considered an option to enter at

Dexter Road and exit at Hillside Park, but that because of the steep incline of Hillside Park, they decided to present the current proposal.

Mr. Cassavoy asked about the steepness of the lots and if they intended to fill the individual lots. Mr. Williams said that the proposed houses, which have not been designed yet, would likely be designed with walk out basements. Currently, they only proposed to fill two of the lots.

Mr. Sadowski asked what percentage of the area did they consider to fall under slope protection. Mr. Williams responded that the lots would be sloped instead of steep due to the leveling of the highest part of the hillside.

Mr. Bruce assured the Board that he has had a lot of experience developing projects with a significant amount of ledge and has significant roadway experience. He said he has developed projects in Amesbury, Wakefield, Acton and Hampton, NH. He said he intends to manage the project from start to finish through construction of the final houses.

Mr. Mercado asked if they had spoken to the Conservation Commission yet. Mr. Williams said they had not approached them yet as only a very small portion of the site was within the 100-FT buffer zone.

The Board discussed the issue of Slope Protection and about how many lots would be subject to ordinance.

Mr. Sadowski stated that his major concerns were the fact that they did not want to see steep slopes and the proposed 900-FT dead end roadway. He asked the other members of the Board if any dead end roadways of that length had ever been approved.

Mr. Cassavoy stated that it was difficult to conceptualize this plan without seeing the site and he would like a Site walk to be scheduled for the Board.

Mr. Welch said that he has walked the site and currently it contains large sections of shear mass of rock face. He guessed that currently, a large volume of water does come down the hill.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward said that she was concerned with very large and tall houses up on top of an already high hillside dwarfing the small houses below.

Mr. King asked about blasting plans.

Mr. Bruce responded that blasting would be necessary. He would blast and drill in sections and move the ledge with a front end loader. He would keep the majority of the fill on site and some of the materials would be crushed and used as fill for the lower areas. He did not anticipate that the crushing would take longer than a week as he would only crush what was needed.

Mr. Mercado said that the amount of slope is his major concern.

The Board discussed the steepness of the road and if the proposed slope was allowable. Mr. Sadowski said that 10% grade was allowable, but that it would be very steep and potentially dangerous during icy conditions. Mr. Williams reiterated that the portion of the road that would be sloped to that degree was small, approximately 175-FT. The remainder of the road would be gently sloped at 3-4%.

Ms. Gaffey stated that the Applicant had not asked for any waivers regarding the grade of the roadway.

Mr. Bruce said that he has spoken with some of the neighbors and that Dexter Road has some areas that are in very bad shape. He said that he has proposed he would make improvements to Dexter Road as long as it is economically feasible to his project. He also stated that he did not want to intrude upon people's yards or property and he did not see the need to install sidewalks on Dexter Road. He said there is a narrow section of Dexter Road that is bordered by land owned by the City of Melrose that could be widened.

Mr. Sadowski asked if the Fire Department has commented on the issue of the long dead end road way. Ms. Gaffey replied that the Fire Department has not commented on this proposal, but they only require that there be room for a fire truck to turn around at the end of the road. She said that objections to long dead end roadways are from a city planning perspective.

Mr. Sadowski asked about the water pressure in the development. Mr. Williams said that a flow test had not been completed yet.

Ms. Morelli said that her concern was about setting a precedent regarding building on this amount of slope and the length of the roadway.

Mr. Bruce responded that a precedent would not be set to allow long dead end roads because the development site did contain a second means of egress by way of the frontage on the paper road Hillside Park. He said that means of egress could be developed, but that the current plan was a better plan. He responded to the issue of slope by saying that this area was remotely located and out of the public view. He would work with the neighbors to minimize the impact of the development on them and create a win-win approach by offering improvements to Dexter Road. He also said that he would limit blasting and heavy trucking to the hours that children were in school so that it did not attract the children's attention and that the safety of the neighborhood children who tend to be very curious would be a major concern to him.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked about the slope again and asked about the lot area calculations relative to the sloped areas. Ms. Gaffey replied that the heavily sloped areas would not count when calculating the lot areas.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that she thought the houses needed to be built in an innovative way that blended them into the hillside so that they would not be towering structures. Mr. Bruce said that the houses in the computer model were not the actual houses being proposed and that those issues could be addressed when the houses were designed.

Ms. Gaffey reminded the Board that there was a time constraint for making a decision. She said that they had a 45 day limit from the last meeting on December 15, 2014 to vote on the preliminary plan. The review was originally scheduled for January 26, 2015, but the meeting was canceled due to inclement weather and the applicant had granted them an extension. Ms. Gaffey said that the Board could vote on the plan now or request a further extension.

Mr. Cassavoy reiterated his concern about scheduling a site walk so that they could see the site.

Ms. Morelli reminded the Board that a vote to accept the preliminary plan did not bind them in any way to final approval of a plan. It only allowed them to continue to the next step of the process where more exact plans would be developed. She then told the Applicant that the Board seemed to be indicating that they would like more information to make a decision.

Mr. Williams indicated that they would be willing to offer the Board an extension to the next meeting in March and to schedule a site visit. They could plow a path up the middle of the site so that the Board could see the majority of the site.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to continue the Preliminary Subdivision Plan review for 53 Dexter Road to the next meeting of the Planning Board on March 23, 2015. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

The Board scheduled a site visit on Monday, March 16, 2015 at 5:30PM at the location. It was stated that the site visit would be open to members of the public as long as they were willing to sign a waiver of liability.

Documents: Plan Sheet 1 of 1, Preliminary Subdivision Plan, 53 Dexter Road, Prepared by Williams and Sparages, dated November 21, 2014, revised January 15, 2015
Profile Sheet 1 of 1, Preliminary Subdivision Plan, 53 Dexter Road, Prepared by Williams and Sparages, dated November 21, 2014
Cross Section Locations, Sheet 1 of 3, Preliminary Subdivision Plan, 53 Dexter Road, Prepared by Williams and Sparages, dated January 8, 2015
Section A-A, Sheet 2 of 3, Preliminary Subdivision Plan, 53 Dexter Road, Prepared by Williams and Sparages, dated January 8, 2015
Section B-B, Sheet 3 of 3, Preliminary Subdivision Plan, 53 Dexter Road, Prepared by Williams and Sparages, dated January 8, 2015

OTHER

Draft 2015 Open Space and Recreation Plan

Ms. Denise Gaffey, City Planner reviewed the requirements for the Open Space and Recreation Plan to be accepted. She said that the Division of Conservation Services required a letter from the Planning Board supporting the document. A draft letter was distributed to the Board for review.

Documents: Open Space and Recreation Plan

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Site Visit for 53 Dexter Road

Scheduled for Monday March 16, 2015 at 5:30PM at 53 Dexter Road

Zoning Subcommittee Meeting

Scheduled for March 17, 2015 at 8AM in the Mayor's Conference room.

Next Regular Meeting

Scheduled for Monday, March 23, 2015

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 PM.