



## **North Woods Subdivision**

### **Major Subdivision – Flexible Design Residential Project South Road & Curtis Corner Road**

#### **Pre-Application Concept Plan**

<u>Received</u>	<u>Review Time</u>	<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Incomplete</u>	<u>Complete</u>	<u>Decision Time</u>	<u>Decision Deadline</u>
April 8, 2019	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### **April 23, 2019 - Planning Board Regular Meeting**

Earl Greco, Michael O'Brien, and Michael Greco, were present representing the application. The applicant stated that the property was previously approved for a minor subdivision which created three (3) conforming lots for development located along Curtis Corner Road, one (1) lot donated to the Curtis Corner Baptist Church for non-residential use, and one (1) remainder parcel. The applicant proposes a sixteen lot subdivision of the remainder parcel including 14 market rate units, and two (2) affordable housing units as required by the Town's inclusionary zoning requirements. The project is proposed as a flexible design residential project.

The Planning Board and applicant discussed the location and size of the proposed open space parcel. The open space parcel includes 6.25 acres of land, with approximately 3.5 acres of wetland. The applicant stated they have worked to design the future subdivision lots for development in such a manner that most lots conform to the dimensional standards of the R-30 district in which they are located while still utilized the flexible design residential project (FDRP) model to provide community open space.

The Planning Board and applicant discussed the buffer from the proposed development to South Road. As required by the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations a 100 foot wide buffer is required for FDRP projects with frontage along a public road. The applicant intends to seek relief from this requirement in order to reduce the width of that buffer below the required 100 feet. Board members noted that the existing buffer in that area appears to be dense, however removal of invasive species and clean-up of that area will likely reduce the effectiveness of that screening. Board members noted there is very minimal undergrowth in that area. Board member noted that supplemental planning to establish undergrowth within the proposed buffers should be considered.

The applicant noted that they are proposing to develop a private road to access the development lots, they stated they will request a waiver from the right-of-way width of the street from 40 feet to 30 feet, and will a waiver to provide an 18 foot wide travel way for the paved road. Board members noted that a reduced travel width may not be looked a favorably given the number of lots with access along the road.

The applicant indicated they intend to develop some no-cut buffers on the individual building site in some areas. The Board advised the applicant to keep the limit of disturbance and building envelopes tight on the developable lots.

The Board and applicant discusses water provision on the site. The applicant has proposed use of a public water system on the site. The applicant plans to use individual on-site wastewater treatment systems on the parcel.

Board members noted a concern with fragmentation of the open space parcel and the proposed reduction of the required buffers from both the public right of way and surrounding residential properties. Discussion ensued regarding potential opportunities to provide additional open space behind lots 8, 9, and 10.

The Board and applicant discussed the proposed low- and moderate income lots (LMI lots). Discussion ensued. It was noted that the parcel on Curtis Corner Road looks to be too narrow. The applicant stated

they intend to donate at least one of the LMI lots to the Curtis Corner Baptist Church. Staff noted that the applicant and church may want to meet with an approved monitoring agent for the LMI housing units early in the process to understand the requirements.

Ms. Mack invited members of the public to speak during the Pre-Application Concept Review.

Residents, John Underhill, Tim Handrigan, Jeff Naise, and Mike Harris expressed concerns regarding the reduced buffer between the proposed development and the existing residential development located off Henry Case Way, the location of the proposed development lots to properties along Henry Case Way, and impacts from the location of the proposed roadway associated with drainage, and safety concern relative to the location of the proposed road given the topography of the land and lines of sight along South Road.

The Planning Board and applicant discussed the location of the proposed roadway and its associated drainage requirements. It was noted that a traffic engineer will need to analyze and evaluate the proposed location of the roadway to ensure safe traffic conditions. It was noted that the proposed road may not create any increase in peak flow or volume of stormwater discharged from the property.

The Planning Board noted that the project should receive an advisory opinion from the Affordable Housing Collaborative during the Conceptual Master Plan stage of review relative to the proposed integration, location, and method of provision for the LMI housing units.

=====

**Conceptual Master Plan**

<u>Received</u>	<u>Incomplete</u>	<u>Complete</u>	<u>Decision Time</u>	<u>Decision Deadline</u>
August 29, 2019	September 6, 2019	--	--	--
January 31, 2020	February 10, 2020	--	--	--
February 28, 2020	March 9, 2020	--	--	--
March 12, 2020	March 16, 2020	--	--	--
March 20, 2020	March 26, 2020	--	--	--
March 30, 2020	--	April 9, 2020	90	<b>July 8, 2020</b>

**February 12, 2020 - Technical Review Committee Meeting**

*Representing the applicant was Earl Greco, Michael Greco, and Michael O'Brien.*

Mr. E. Greco stated the biggest issue with the previous proposal related to buffering along the roadway, providing access in the northeast corner, and the location of the low- to moderate-income lots. Entrance to the development was redesigned to the south end of the property based on Staff suggestions and concerns that have now been addressed. Design elaborates on the provided open space and walking trails while the lots have stayed the same mostly the only changes include roadway and curvatures. Mr. Greco stated that the access drives continue to promote more of a natural setting with a bit more privacy.

Discussion ensued as to the timing of construction, anticipated time of completion and the need for an overall development schedule in accordance with the sewer feasibility agreement. Mrs. Gray indicated that a proper yield plan, as defined in local regulations, is required. Mrs. Gray also suggested that viewshed photos would be helpful in showing what the post-construction conditions would look like in support of their request from the 100' buffer requirement. Mrs. Gray also reminded the applicant that open space management plan is needed to define open space use and management.

Discussion ensued as to the completion of the road as a public or private street. Mr. Earl Greco stated their first choice would be a private street but they needed to work out the details with Suez otherwise it

would have to be public and built to public standards. The applicant is waiting to hear back from Suez on this determination. Mr. Hiener stated that the road would need to be a minimum of 20' in width and private road hydrants will need to be maintained by the homeowners if Union Fire Department is to provide service. Mrs. Gray stated also that if the roads are private, school buses will not travel on them and encouraged the applicants to show any bus pick-up structures located on open space areas on the plans.

Discussion ensued regarding the low- to moderate-income properties and design requirements. Mrs. Gray explained that any restrictions of use of any open space (or any features in the development in general) would not be a positive component of the application. Mrs. Gray stated that inclusive rights/exclusion of fees are options for them to consider but HOA docs need to be setup before everything is finalized. Mr. Earl Greco stated that he would consult with the monitoring agent to determine if 80% LMI or 100% LMI would be worth pursuing relief from the Zoning Board for.

The Committee recommended the application move forward to the Planning Board for review once the applicant has been issued a Certificate of Completeness.

Item/Issue Discussed	Recommendation
Development/completion schedule	Provide overall development schedule for completion in accordance with the sewer feasibility agreement.
Yield Plan	Provide a proper yield plan as defined by local regulations.
Viewshed Photos	Provide viewshed photos of post-construction conditions in support of waivers associated with 100' buffer requirement.
Open Space	Provide a management plan defining the use, management and maintenance of the open space areas proposed.
Roadway	Determine if roadway will be public or private, determine and discuss any implication on utilities or services (i.e., water, sewer, fire, school bus access, etc.)

**May 28, 2020 – Planning Board Meeting**

*Representing the applicant was Earl Greco, Michael Greco, and Michael O'Brien with True North Land Company, LLC.*

The 14-lot subdivision on 21.42 acres of land is proposed as a Flexible Design Residential Project (FDRP) which requires 40% open space and perimeter buffer requirements. Mr. E. Greco stated that while the FDRP regulations allow for a reduction of lot sizes down to the R10 zoning requirements they are proposing lot sizes that are 2.5-3 times that size as they feel that this design is more compatible with the neighborhood and the open space adds to the quality and aesthetic of the development. Mr. E. Greco also indicated that a number of changes have been made based on input from Staff and discussions with the TRC. Mr. E. Greco described the project and stated that existing landscaping is being supplemented with infill plantings within buffer areas to enhance visual buffering.

Mr. DiMasi indicated that at the pre-application meeting the Planning Board had concerns with the reduction of the buffers along South Road and along the north side of the property however the buffer issue has not been addressed. Mr. E. Greco indicated that the buffers had been increased from 25' to 50' from the pre-application plan. Mr. DiMasi felt that the project is more representative of a conventional subdivision and that it doesn't meet the intent or the requirements as an FDRP project. Mr. DiMasi also noted that the proposed low- to moderate-income units still don't appear to be integrated into the development. Mr. O'Brien indicated that the infill plantings are proposed to increase and enhance the buffer by staggering plantings of native species to further enhance screening and preserve and enhance the visual aesthetics that the existing pastures exhibit.

Ms. Mack stated that she agreed with Steve that it was made very clear to the applicant that the board had concerns about the buffer and that FDRPs must conform to the requirements because the project is

enjoying the benefits of that type of development, therefore the conditions need to be complied with. Also, Ms. Mack indicated that she felt that the LMI units are not integrated at all into the site which is a requirement for approval.

Mr. Riendeau noted that a waiver was being requested from the required 24' pavement width to 20' and inquired if the roadway included a Cape Cod berm. Mr. E. Greco stated that the road included a right-of-way of 35' and Mr. Bourbonnais clarified that the actual roadway would be 20' with no Cape Cod berm. Mr. Bourbonnais questioned the waiver and whether it would be for width or for roadway classification as this would classify as a 'Local Street B' which requires a 50' right-of-way with 24' of pavement with a 1' Cape Cod berm on either side. Mr. Bourbonnais clarified that the waiver appears to be from the roadway classification however we have no other category for private roadways in major subdivisions. Discussion ensued on roadway design and classification and the fact that the Department of Public Services wouldn't want to see anything less than 40' for utility separation and future considerations. Mr. Bourbonnais stated that he doesn't have a problem with a 20' paved roadway with a 40' right-of-way while discharging water within the right-of-way itself. Staff also confirmed that school buses would not travel a private roadway to pick-up school children and that a bus shelter located 60' from the intersection with South Road may result in issues with school bus loading and is not close enough to South Road.

Discussion ensued on the proposed LMI units, their location and what they look like in compliance with the ordinance that requires these lots and units to be comparable and compatible to the rest of the proposed development. Mr. O'Brien stated that while the LMI units may not be comparable in (lot) size they will be compatible in (unit) design. Ms. Torello felt that the units aren't integrated and feels more like the units are being developed, and Ms. Rubinoff noted that one the LMI units is proposed as a duplex without any other duplexes in the development. Mr. E. Greco indicated that their intention is to convey Lot 15 to Narragansett Affordable Housing for development and that Lot 16 would be conveyed to the Curtis Corner Baptist Church for development. Discussion ensued regarding compatibility and timing of construction in regard to imposed conditions for construction phasing. Discussion also ensued regarding the impact on Home Owner Association (HOA) fees on affordability of the LMI lots.

Chairman Riendeau opened the discussion up to public comment and heard from the following members of the public: Paul Richmond (559 Curtis Corner Road) who was concerned with perimeter buffering, easements, and the entrance to the development at the South Road intersection; Charles Nystedt (Genesee Way) had questions regarding wetlands, seasonal stream, surface & ground water runoff, and preservation of vegetation on wetlands; Attorney William Landry, representing the Nystedt, O'Neill, and Ewing families (Genesee Way) had concerns regarding wetland vegetation, screening and buffering, and open space calculations; Attorney Patrick Dougherty, representing Henry Case Way residents, discussed open space calculations, flexible design, visual buffering, expert information, LMI units, and late submission of a report from Ashley Sweet; Mark Vacarro (Henry Case Way) had questions regarding restoration and maintenance of stonework and artifacts in the two historical cemeteries on the site.

The following motion, made by Mr. DiMasi and duly seconded by Ms. Mack, passed by unanimous poll vote (Aye - S. DiMasi; M. Mack; J. Murphy; J. Riendeau; P. Rubinoff; and E. Torello):

**Motion:** "The South Kingstown Planning Board hereby continues the Conceptual Master Plan Public Informational Meeting on a major subdivision, flexible design residential project – North Woods Subdivision to the June 23, 2020 regular session".

Discussion ensued regarding Mr. Dougherty's late submission of a report from Ashley Sweet, which had not been reviewed by all Board Members, and the fact that Ms. Sweet is unable to attend the June 23, 2020 meeting. Mr. Earl Greco, applicant, agreed to extend the Planning Board's Decision deadline to July 28, 2020.

### **June 10, 2020 – Technical Review Committee Meeting**

*Earl Greco, Michael Greco and Michael O'Brien appeared on behalf of the project for the applicant.*

The applicant submitted a new set of development plans on June 8, 2020 in response to comments received from the Planning Board on May 28, 2020. The proposed design changes include:

- increasing the road ROW from 35' to 40';
- relocating the entrance to the development to the south;
- relocating the single-family LMI lot to be better included in the neighborhood layout;
- increasing buffer widths along South Road and the northern property boundary using buffer easements on several lots;
- designating an area on South Road as a community bus stop; and
- creating a new residential lot near the end of the cul-de-sac to compensate for the lot lost to the creation of the bus stop.

The applicant reviewed the design changes in the new plans. The applicant also responded to comments made by abutters to the north and west during the Planning Board meeting. The applicant noted that the 50' buffer along the northern boundary complied with FDRP requirements and had been increased to 60' in two locations. The applicant also noted that the lot to the north was cleared to the property boundary. With respect to the abutters to the west, the applicant noted that he had surveyed the distances from that rear lot lines of the abutter's lots to the proposed rear lot lines for the residential lots in the new plat and that the open space between the lot lines ranged from 320' to 460' and that the distance between the structures would be even greater.

Mr. Riendeau commented that the Planning Board had expressed concern that the applicant was trying to develop the parcel with large individual lots akin to a conventional subdivision and was not adequately taking advantage of the FDRP criteria to be more creative with the development layout. Mr. Riendeau acknowledged the applicant's efforts to make design changes in response to the Planning Board, but felt that the lots were not small enough to make the most of the open space buffer. With respect to the use of the open space, Mr. Riendeau also commented about the limited access available to the open space. Staff noted that the FDRP criteria required that the largest possible number of lots abut the open space and that any non-abutting lots have reasonable access to the open space. Mr. Riendeau proposed adding an additional open space access easement near the end of the cul-de-sac that would provide access to the open space to some of the interior lots and create a "loop" for the walking path using the road.

The applicant replied that at least some of the lot size considerations were driven by topography and the need to comply with town requirements for a 150' wetlands setback for OWTs.

In response to TRC questions about routing the walking path through the northern 50' buffer, staff commented that (1) the plans needed to show the full proposed walking path and not leave it as an open-ended project, and (2) walking paths are really an element for areas designated for community open spaces and that putting a walking path in a designated "buffer" area might conflict with the buffer's purpose as an audio-visual screening element if the path reduced the buffer width below the FDRP requirement. Adding extra width to the buffer to offset the path would fix this problem.

Mr. Bourbonnais warned the applicant against making comments that no work would be performed in the open space areas as it had done in previous meeting to appease abutting property owners. Mr. Bourbonnais noted that the conceptual master plan proposal does not include adequate information on stormwater attenuation and that it is possible that the applicant may need to use locations in the open space parcel to attenuate peak stormwater volume in future design phases in order to meet town requirements. The applicant replied that their engineer believed that stormwater could be managed without impacting the open space parcel, but that if necessary it could look at subsurface attenuation structures. Mr. Parker noted that the FDRP rules only allow drainage structures in dedicated open space if they can be fully and coherently integrated into the design and the Planning Board had discretion to prohibit such structures if they were not in keeping with the spirit of the FDRP concept. Mr. Parker further noted that because FDRPs look at the project in its entirety, as a cohesive whole, the applicant needs to account for how future drainage designs might impact the overall project design or risk denial of the application. Ms. Gray noted that the Conceptual Master Plan should identify tentative locations for stormwater features in case those features wind up being necessary.

Mr. Parker made the following comments on behalf of the staff:

- The applicant is seeking a waiver from the FDRP requirement for a 100' buffer along a public road, notwithstanding the fact that there is more than enough area to comply with the 100' buffer requirement and create the requested number of lots. Mr. Parker opined that the applicant was making a *design choice* to ask for the waiver to accommodate larger lot sizes, rather than use smaller lots that would allow compliance with the FDRP buffer requirement. The applicant again responded that the lot size decisions were, in part, a result of the Town's 150' wetland setback for OWTSs. *(However, a review of the site plans indicates that the 150' OWTS setback would likely only impact system location on 1 or 2 lots.)* The applicant inquired about relief from the 150' setback requirement; however, Attorney Goins advised that an FDRP requiring a Special Use Permit could not also obtain a dimensional variance from the OWTS wetlands setback.
- The incorporation of buffer easements in the new designs needlessly complicates the plans with different buffer widths on each lot, and increases the enforcement burden on the Town to police the easements. Mr. Parker stated that a consistent buffer depth along South Road would be easier for the public to recognize and for owners to maintain. The applicant replied indicating that it would look at reducing the lot sizes along South Road to create a consistent buffer depth and to coordinate the buffers with property lines rather than use easements.
- The open space management plan mentioned a garden shed and a bus stop enclosure, but that those things were not included on the site plan. The applicant indicated that the plans would be revised to show those structures.

Ms. Gray made the following comments on behalf of the staff:

- The stormwater management system shown on the site plans included features located on private lots. The developable area of each lot needs to be reduced by any area occupied by drainage features.
- The application stated that 2 waivers were being requested – 1 for the buffer depth on South Road and another for road width. Ms. Gray clarified that no waiver was required for the road because the applicant was proposing a private road to which the public road standards did not apply. Ms. Gray noted, with Attorney Goins' concurrence, that for private roads the applicant must demonstrate, to the Planning Board's satisfaction, that the private road is adequate to support the intended use and vehicular traffic and will be maintained by the owners in the subdivision.

Mr. Flanders inquired about the potential for using pervious asphalt in the road. Mr. Schock and the applicant opined that it was not recommended. Mr. Schock stated that pervious pavement works well in southern climates, but in New England it is problematic with winter road treatments, particularly sanding. Mr. Schock also stated that pervious asphalt does not hold up as well as standard asphalt and that with maintenance of a private road being managed by a homeowner's association he felt that it would be too much of a maintenance responsibility. Mr. Schock said that pervious asphalt would be more appropriate for driveways.

Mr. Pimental stated that the wall of the cemetery parcel on South Road was in a deteriorated condition and inquired if that was the applicant's responsibility. Attorney Goins indicated that she would investigate the question of maintenance responsibility and report back.

Item/Issue Discussed	Recommendation
<b>Size of Residential Lots</b>	The site plan prioritizes large lot sizes over the requirements of the FDRP. The applicant should consider a design that fits the physical constraints of the lot and complies with the FDRP without requiring waivers. The Planning Board must weigh the applicant's design vision against FDRP requirements in granting any requested waivers.

<b>Walking Path</b>	The full scope of the walking path should be depicted on the plans. The open space and path should have at least 2 access points to allow for a walking “loop.” The applicant should establish an easement between 2 lots allowing the northwest end of the path to connect back to the road instead of dead-ending the path in the open space.
<b>Buffers</b>	The buffer edges should be consistent across abutting lots, rather than stepped or staggered, so that they are easy to discern by the public and maintain by the lot owners. Buffers should be coordinated with lot boundaries so that they are part of the open space lot(s) rather than being easements across private lots.
<b>Stormwater Management</b>	While the conceptual master plan does not require detailed stormwater designs, the applicant must anticipate stormwater management needs and how it will be incorporated into the overall design in keeping with the spirit of the FRDP. The area of any stormwater management features on private lots must be deducted from the lot’s buildable area, and potential locations for stormwater structures in the open space must be shown on the plans in case they are required.
<b>Open Space Improvements</b>	Any structures or improvements proposed for the open space lot must be shown on the site plan (e.g. gardening shed, bus stop).
<b>Road Width Waiver</b>	The waiver requested for road width is not necessary for a private road in a FRDP. Private roads in FDRPs do not need to meet public road standards. Instead, it is the applicant’s burden to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Board that the proposed private road is “adequate for the intended use and vehicular traffic and shall be maintained by an association of unit owners or such other means.”
<b>Pervious Pavement</b>	While not recommended for private roads, pervious asphalt could be considered for driveways.
<b>Cemetery Maintenance</b>	The applicant needs to investigate and establish its (and the future HOA’s) responsibilities for maintaining the 2 historic cemeteries on-site. Special Counsel Goins will report back to the Planning Board on the applicant’s legal obligations.

### June 23, 2020 – Planning Board Regular Session

Mr. James Callaghan, attorney for the applicant, appeared and reviewed the project, as well as revisions made to the proposed project. Mr. Kurt VanDexter, landscape architect, appeared and discussed the proposed buffers for the project.

Ms. Mack mentioned smaller lots allowing for larger buffers. Ms. Mack also recommended establishing a “well defined limit of disturbance”. Ms. Goins confirmed that property owners are not required to maintain any historical cemeteries located on their property. Ms. Goins also confirmed the Town Council approval is required to conduct any work within the 25’ buffer around cemetery. Mr. Earl Greco reviewed efforts to establish a buffer that all abutters will find favorable as well as implementation of recommendations from the TRC.

Discussion ensued regarding open space, road size, road drainage, conditions of approval, concerns about open space being used for drainage, and South Road side buffer. General consensus was the Planning Board would feel comfortable with a 70' buffer on the South Road side of property if it went across all three lots with the preservation of stone walls, good, healthy, maintained buffers, and protection of the cemetery lot.

Public Comment:

Paul Richmond, South Road resident and abutter, spoke in favor of the project.

William Landry, attorney for Genesee Way residents, spoke of concerns regarding buffers, open space, and landscaping.

Patrick Dougherty, attorney for Henry Case Way residents, spoke of concerns regarding insufficient buffers to provide visual and audio buffering on a seasonal basis, proposed open space, and the definition of an FDRP application. Availability of expert witness, Ashley Sweet. Request Planning Board members visit Henry Case Way and view project from that property.

Tim Handrigan, 80 Henry Case Way and abutter, spoke of concerns regarding many changes to the original proposal, maintaining open space, and buffers.

The new approval deadline was confirmed to be July 28, 2020. The board is in favor of 70' buffer on South Road and 60' buffer on North side of property. Applicant was requested to submit a map clearly defining open space designation as well as buffer designation. A correction to map showing 40' private way and not 35'. It was agreed a site visit would be scheduled by staff.

Upon motion made by Mr. DiMasi, duly seconded by Ms. Mack, the Public Informational Meeting was continued to July 14, 2020 by unanimous poll vote (Aye –S. DiMasi; M. Mack; J. Murphy; J. Riendeau; P. Rubinoff).

**July 9, 2020 – Site Visit**

The site walk commenced just west of South Road near the proposed road entrance to the subdivision road and the proposed school bus stop. The applicants then guided the site visit north following the direction of the proposed road pointing out the locations of the residential lots. Small white signs noting lot numbers were posted on trees. The group crossed over an E/W path identified as the former "cattle run" and turned west along the north side of an existing stone wall. The group then turned north along the proposed road, towards the terminus of the road at the proposed cul-de-sac and then on to the northern boundary of the lot marked by an E/W stone wall abutting the Handrigan property.

At the northern property boundary the applicant pointed out stakes designating the proposed vegetative 50-foot buffer and stakes designating locations for in-fill planting. The applicant's representatives noted existing native species that had been tagged to remain and proposed that invasive species would be removed by hand to make room for in-fill plantings. The applicant also noted that it would retain design control over the lots as they were developed, including landscaping, and that it was its intent to preserve significant, healthy examples of indigenous vegetation to the extent practicable.

The group turned west and proceeded to an existing N/S stone wall identified as being near the back of the western-most subdivision lots, but east of the property line between those lots and the open space. Beyond the wall the topography visibly dropped-off and the vegetation was fairly dense. Music was audible coming from somewhere (a residential lot?) to the west.

The group proceeded south following the stone wall to the right (west) and noting the increasing uphill topography to the left (east), until coming to the area of the proposed walking path and turning east. The group followed the location of the proposed path to the east passing the old historic cemetery and the location of the duplex LMI lot on the right. The tour went through several areas designated for community gardening use and then came to the point of beginning.

The group then re-traced the initial portion of the walk northward to the former "cattle run" and turned east towards South Road. Stakes were observed marking the proposed 70-foot buffer from South Road

in the “cattle-run” area. At the 70-foot stake the group turned north passing the cemetery along South Road through a grove of Larch trees and emerged onto South Road at the northeast corner of the lot.

At this time the applicant concluded its part of the site visit and Patrick Dougherty, attorney for the abutting property owner to the north, the Handrigan family, guided the group onto the Handrigan property to view the property boundary from the perspective of his clients. The group walked west up the driveway to the house and turned south to the E/W stone wall marking the boundary between the 2 lots. The group then followed the wall east, back to South Road.

**July 14, 2020 – Planning Board Work Session**

James Callahan, attorney for the applicant, Michael Greco, Earl Greco and Michael O’Brien all attended the meeting to discuss their project. The Planning Board gave feed back to the applicant, based on the site visit of July 9, 2020. Discussion ensued regarding plantings, buffers, LMI units, drainage, and open space. Mr. Bourbonnais advised the applicant as to what he will be looking for in regard to attenuating for storm water. The Planning Board requested an updated plan, as well as a landscape plan, before the July 28, 2020 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Patrick Dougherty, attorney for the residents on Henry Case Way, addressed the board expressing opposition to the proposed buffers.

Mark Hutchins, landscape architect and expert witness for Mr. Dougherty, addressed the board with his concerns regarding the plantings proposed for buffers.

William Landry, attorney for the residents on Genesee Way, spoke of needing more “robust” landscaping/buffering.

**July 28, 2020 – Planning Board Regular Session**

Upon request, the Planning Board approved the continuation of the Public Informational Meeting for the North Woods Subdivision, Conceptual Master Plan Review to the August 25, 2020 Regular Session of the Planning Board. The applicant agreed to this continuation and also agreed to the extension of the decision timeframe to the August 25, 2020 Regular Session Meeting.