

**Webster Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 26, 2023**

A meeting of the Webster Planning Board was held on Monday, June 26, 2022 in the Board of Selectmen Meeting Room, 2nd Floor, Webster Town Hall, 350 Main Street, Webster, MA.

Present: Vice Chairman Michael Dostoler, Clerk Dan Morin, Members Cathy Cody, Jason Piader, and Associate Member Caroline Fritz.

Absent: Chairman Paul LaFramboise

Also present: Ann Morgan, Director of Planning & Economic Development; Chuck Eaton, CHA Companies

1. Call to Order: Vice Chairman Dostoler called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m

2. Action Items

- a. Approval Under Subdivision Law Not Required (ANR) Plan – 3 Ragina Avenue – Assessor ID 44A-13-35 – Michael Rancourt (Applicant / Owner). Ms. Morgan reviewed the plan noting that it met all the requirements. Mr. Dostoler asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Motion to endorse the ANR plan for 3 Ragina Avenue and to direct staff to sign it on behalf of the Board made Mr. Morin, seconded by Ms. Cody. Motion passed unanimously.

- b. Draft Decision: Modification of a Site Plan - Sales and Commercial Parking - 300 Thompson Road - Three Hundred LLC (Applicant / Owner); Assessor ID 34-A-6-0; Site is located in both a Business 5 (B5) zoning district. Mr. Dostoler noted that this item is rescheduled to July 29th. When asked why he explained that Mr. LaFramboise was absent that he would need to be present to discuss the draft decision.
- c. Public Meeting and Draft Decision: Stormwater Permit Application – Substation Site Improvements – 52 Worcester Road – New England Power Company (Applicant Owner); Assessor ID 87-A-2-0; site is located in an Industrial (I) zoning district. Continued from 5/22/23. Ms. Morgan noted that the applicant has requested a continuance as they are still working on the final details of the easement and other key factors that need to be in place before the Board can make a decision. This item was continued to July 29th meeting.

3. Public Hearings

- a. Special Permit Application – Add an Electronic Message Sign to an Existing Sign – 63 East Main Street (Assessor ID 15-G-25). Signarama Worcester (Applicant); East Main Street Management (Owner). Site is located in a Business 4 (B4) zoning district.

Mr. Dostoler opened the public hearing. Ms. Morgan reviewed the site. She had spoken with the Building Commissioner. She noted that the applicant is seeking to add an electronic message sign on an existing structure but that structure is not on the actual property of the business requesting the sign but on the abutting property. At one point the two properties were all one site but were divided at some time. It's unclear how those were divided since there isn't enough frontage for the property known as 63 East Main Street.

Stephanie Wood of Signarama Worcester was present to discuss the application on behalf of the business. She stated that the business wants to get some visibility because the business is so far set back. The sign structure is leased or rented from the abutting neighboring owner. They are looking to add a digital display below existing sign on the pylon. They can't get their cars up front because of shape of the lot. The ability to get their cars up on a digital sign would be a great asset to the business owner.

Mr. Dostoler asked if they are leasing the sign to which the answer was yes and they have a sign for their business already there and are looking to add the digital sign. The current sign is pre-existing non-conforming leased to Webster Auto Sales. Mr. Dostoler asked about potential blockage for people coming and going onto the main road. Ms. Wood stated that she didn't believe so and that sign is twenty feet from the road. She noted that the proposed sign would not be any bigger or flashier than the sign down the road at Webster Realty.

Mr. Piader asked if there were any other electronic signs on the property to which the answer was no, not on that pylon sign or elsewhere on the property. Currently it is the only signage that they have. Their building is set way in the back. Mr. Dostoler asked if the proposed sign conforms with the size requirements. Ms. Morgan noted that it doesn't conform by the fact that it is a leased sign that is not on the actual property of where the business is operated. There is also a rule about the amount of illumination from an electronic sign that spills onto neighboring properties. There is to be zero light spillage onto abutting properties and the roadway. No information was submitted regarding this requirement. The Building Commissioner has confirmed that you can not have a sign on somebody else's property advertising your business.

Mr. Piader stated that the applicant should be the owner of that property to which Ms. Wood stated that she represented them. He asked if she represented both property owners to which she apologized and said no, just Webster Auto Sales. She noted that there are several digital signs along East Main Street including neon signs in the windows of businesses nearby. Mr. Piader stated his concern that something is being proposed for someone else's property. He noted that there could be a scenario where the abutting property owner might object since they didn't seek their approval assuming that there is a license agreement. He wasn't sure that the Board could legally take an application involving someone else's property. Ms. Fritz asked if they could ask the other property owner if they could do that to which Ms. Wood stated yes if that meant that her client could get their visibility. Ms. Fritz noted that it would be difficult to approve something based on a lease.

Ms. Wood asked if the next step would be to have that property owner with the existing sign apply along with Signarama as the installer. Ms. Morgan noted that the By-law doesn't allow for the advertising of businesses that are not on your property. Ms. Wood asked if the existing sign could be considered grandfathered in. Mr. Dostoler asked if that would make a difference. Ms. Morgan noted that she spoke with the Building Commissioner and that would be his determination. Mr. Piader stated that he would like to start with the Applicant being the property owner. Ms. Cody asked about the lease. Does it have verbiage regarding the size and placement of the sign. Ms. Wood stated that the width of sign was 60 (inches) and that's what they had to go with for the proposed digital display. Otherwise they would have to go with a whole new pylon. Ms. Cody noted that the Board does not have the verbiage from the lease that would allow for adding an additional sign and the proposed height which might be a hindrance for getting onto the road. Ms. Wood stated that she did not have that with her and that there was plenty of visibility.

Mr. Dostoler suggested a continuance so that the other owner could sign off on it and other information such as if the sign would be on all night. Ms. Wood stated that they would conform with Town rules. Mr. Piader cited the By-law section which outlines all the requirements and suggested that they start there. Ms. Wood noted that she was an abutter if they meant anything. Mr. Piader stated that he had questions about the ownership and that the Board would need to see what is outlined in the requirements. Ms. Wood asked what needed to be done. Ms. Morgan stated that they should submit the documentation to the office.

Motion to continue the public hearing to July 29th made by Ms. Cody, seconded by Mr. Morin. Motion passed unanimously 4-0.

3. Public Meetings

- a. Modification of a Site Plan - Construction of a New Garage - Commercial Parking - 114 Point Breeze Road - Assessor ID 46-A-9; Berthiaume Contracting Corp. (Applicant) - WEF, Inc. (Owner); Site is located in both a Lake Residential (LR) and Lake Watershed Protection (LWP) zoning district. Continued from 5/22/23.

Mr. Dostoler read the information presented on the agenda. Ms. Morgan stated that no new information has been submitted. The Chairman had spoken with the property owner at the last meeting letting them know that they still needed to apply for their variance with the Zoning Board of Appeals which is required to make the project work. Nothing has happened so far. The Board's options are to either close the public meeting and direct staff to draft a decision or continue to the next meeting when the Chairman could be present. Mr. Piader suggested that the public meeting be continued. Mr. Dostoler agreed. Mr. Morin made a motion to continue. Someone from the audience asked to speak before the Board voted on the motion to which the answer was yes.

Charles Hanko, 96 Point Breeze Road, addressed the Board. He stated his frustration and thanked the Board for hearing him. He first asked about the continuances. He asked if this was arbitrary and how many continuances can be given to someone. This would be the third, maybe fourth granted. A lot of people have been making an effort to be at the meetings to participate in Town government just to be asked to go again. This isn't a business for them. Is there any reason that it keeps getting continued? Mr. Dostoler asked staff how long this has been going on. Ms. Morgan stated that she believed that this was the fourth continuance. She noted that this is a site plan which is not bound by any State law that limits the number of continuances. It's not like other permits that have a statutory deadline and is at the discretion of the Board to continue as often as they want. Mr. Dostoler suggested that the Board offer one final continuance. Mr. Hanko pointed out that they had been told that the last time. He asked that the Board consider denying the request and deny the application without prejudice and let the applicant apply again as it is getting difficult to keep up with. Mr. Hanko noted that the Applicant is a good neighbor but it's becoming cumbersome for the neighborhood. It seems that this isn't above board and it's frustrating. Ms. Cody asked what the options were and Ms. Morgan stated to continue or to close the public meeting, direct staff to draft a decision, and make a decision at the next meeting. Ms. Cody asked if the decision would be based on the information they had so far to which the answer was yes. Ms. Morgan reiterated that no new information had been received and that there were still some outstanding items not addressed in the engineering review. Ms. Fritz asked if the applicant could keep this hanging and that he still hasn't submitted a bunch of information. If he's going to get it done then he should do so. Ms. Morgan noted that the applicant had been spoken to and was informed that one of the steps that they need to do including applying for a special permit from the Zoning Board of

Appeals for the use. The two permits don't have to be tied together but it was recommended to the Applicant. She reviewed the process which includes the fact that once a special permit from the ZBA is applied for, the Planning Board has 30 days to take action on a site plan. The Applicant can work to get site plan approval which is good for two years. If they get approval from the ZBA then the site plan goes with that. If the Planning Board denies it without prejudice then they can start over and work with the statutory deadlines. They can submit the same application. If the Board denies it with prejudice then they need to come back with something new. Mr. Hanko stated that everyone deserves a second bite at the apple but that the applicant should come to the meeting and show a little respect.

Mr. Dostoler stated that with missing information that this might get the applicant moving and get the information that needs to get to the Board. The Board discussed the merits of denying it without prejudice and the next steps.

Motion to close the public hearing made by Mr. Piader, seconded by Ms. Cody. Motion passed unanimously 4-0.

- b. Site Plan Review and Stormwater Management Application - Renovation of Bartlett High School, Grounds, Playing Fields and Other Site Facilities at 52 Lake Parkway, Webster, MA - Assessor ID 12-E-16 - Webster Public Schools (Applicant/Owner). The site is located primarily in a Single Family Residential (SFR) zoning district and partially within a Business 5 (B5) zoning district.

Mr. Dostoler read the information presented on the agenda. Mr. Morin read the public meeting notice. Ms. Morgan noted that the applicant has a presentation which must be submitted as part of the record. The Board did receive an engineering review. The Applicant submitted their response to review just today. Mr. Eaton of CHA has not seen those responses but he can speak to those items but they will still need to be addressed in advance of closing the public meeting. Mr. Dostoler asked if the Board should hear the presentation in the absence of the next engineering review. Ms. Morgan stated that there were people present who might want to speak to the matter. It was noted that there might not be a resolution tonight due to outstanding issues.

Vince Dube representing the architects spoke to the Board. He noted that he had other members of team, civil engineer, landscape architect, sports field designer, present who will discuss different aspects of the project and provide an update. He reviewed the presentation including existing and proposed conditions including reducing the High School footprint by approximately 20,000 square feet. After his review, he turned the presentation over to the landscape architect. Mr. Dostoler asked if there were any questions from the audience first.

Deb Keefe, 25 Third Street, addressed the Board. She asked if the District offices were going to be moved to which the answer was no. She reviewed the floor plan with the architect about the District offices, the cafeteria and the Pre-K rooms. She noted that now the Pre-K students will be mixed with the High School students and wanted to know how we got there. Ms. Keefe reviewed past discussions about Park Avenue Elementary where the Town was told that they had to get the Pre-K out of the High School. A lot of money was spent to move the Pre-K to Park Ave Elementary and now they're proposing to move them back to the High School.

Ramon Ibarlucea, landscape architect with Stephen Stimson Associates, presented an overview of the landscape plan. He reviewed the site relating to the existing access / egress road, reconfiguring the parking at the existing district office for the new Pre-K program including a new parent drop off area,

and site circulation. He reviewed staff parking and a new loading dock area that will including space for a transformer, generator and space for loading and off-loading vehicles which will be screened. They plan to add six new accessible parking space to the existing parking area in the front of the building. These are not new spaces but rather existing space that is being regraded to bring them into compliance with the code. Mr. Ibarlucea reviewed the rest of the parking program as well as a new bus drop off loop and playground for the Pre-K program. He reviewed the planting concept noting that they plan to keep as many existing trees as possible. Mr. Ibarlucea reviewed the planting plan, pedestrian circulation and access plan as well as the emergency access to the athletic fields.

Deb Keefe asked about site circulation as it relates to entrances and exits specifically along Poland Street which is a disaster during pick up time. People don't pick up their kids in front of the school but rather on Poland and Third Street. The buses come in and out onto Poland Street and then there's the double stop signs. It's crazy at drop off and pick up. Can there be a change to make it one way in, one way out. Mr. Ibarlucca stated that they are studying the matter with the civil engineers. Ms. Keefe asked if the playground would be a solid surface. Mr. Ibarlucca stated that they are proposing a bouncy solid surface.

Steve Maria, Lake Parkway, noted that he abuts the entrance. He noted that there were survey makers along the area and wanted to know if they were planning on widening the entrance to which the answer was no – there were not plan to widen the entrance but the parking lot would be reconfigured. He expressed concern about the trees separating his property from the High School and wanted to make sure that they weren't going to remove any of those trees.

John Bolduc, 10 Lakemont Road, noted that he has tried to view the plan with no luck. He wanted to know if there would be any expansion of the existing footprint to which the answer was no expansion. Mr. Ibarlucca reviewed the plan with Mr. Bolduc noting that the building itself is not growing in any direction. Mr. Bolduc noted that the letter he received as an abutter listed a number of project components. He cited access roads and expansion of fields and wanted to know how it all stays within the parameters of the existing site. Mr. Ibarlucca stated that someone else can address his question about the fields but that there would be no change to the other components of the site. Mr. Bolduc noted again that the lack of available material in advance of the meeting would make the process go slower. He was concerned about the cost of moving the Pre-K out of one place to put it in another place. It didn't make any sense to him.

Mr. Dostoler asked where the temporary buildings were going to be placed. Mr. Ibarlucca noted that the modular classrooms will be placed in the existing parking lot. Mr. Dostoler asked how many portable buildings would be placed in that area. There will be 17 buildings but they will be in one block. Mr. Dostoler asked if all 55 parking spaces would be taken as a result to which the answer was yes. Mr. Dostoler asked about the proposed bus drop off area. Mr. Ibarlucca stated that it was basically the existing footprint. There will be a separate Pre-K drop off area between the proposed playground and parking lot.

Ms. Morgan noted that, for the benefit of the audience, that all the project material is posted on line and has been since May 22nd. Any new material, including tonight's presentation, will be posted as well. It was noted that there has been a lot of interest in this project and that the material is posted on both the Planning Board and Conservation Commission webpages. Links are provided for the Planning Board application and the Notice of Intent filed with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Bolduc stated that he couldn't read the material on line. To him it appears like an artistic ink blob. It is virtually

impossible to identify anything. The pictures on the website are terrible. Ms. Morgan noted that materials are available for viewing in the office. The plan set submitted was too large in file size to put on the website and that it had to be reduced in size to get it on the website. Full size copies can be made in the office. Mr. Bolduc stated that he was told no. Ms. Morgan stated that she didn't know who told him that but yes, copies can be made and that they were a public record. Mr. Bolduc stated that he would come into the office.

Jonathan Charwick, Activitas, Inc., the sports field designer, presented the athletics plan. He reviewed the existing conditions. The proposed change is to hold the west end of the track and widen it inside the field about 30 feet the reason being that the existing field is narrow which is good for football but not other sports such as soccer. Widening the field makes it more available for multi-purpose use. The number of lanes will be added along with a new shot put, javelin, and discus areas. The field will be renovated into a grass field. Drainage issues will be addressed. A rubberized red track surface will be added. The existing building to the east will stay and the expansion will be heading towards that building.

Brie Arsenault, 32 Eastern Avenue, asked about the specific expansion of the track. Mr. Charwick reviewed the plan showing the expansion to the east of the existing track. She asked about all the flags that appear around to the site. Mr. Charwick noted that those were wetlands flagging. She asked if trees would be coming down. He noted that the civil engineer would speak to that. Mr. Charwick noted that when you expand a track in width it shortens the ends a bit and he further reviewed the plan again. Mr. Dostoler asked about the other athletic fields and if there were any changes proposed to which the answer was no. Just the track and field area.

Sue Cazeault, Eastern Avenue, asked about the fencing for track area. Mr. Charwick noted that there would be a four-foot-high chain link fence around the perimeter of the track to keep spectators out of the track & field area and there will be a walkway around the fence. Ms. Cazeault noted that there is an access road from her neighborhood which generates a lot of traffic and that kids cut through the property to get to the field. The neighborhood will be bombarded if activities are scheduled for the weekends with traffic coming down into their parking lot. Ms. Cazeault noted that there is a problem with water in the basements now. Will any of the construction digging or changes in the site plan push more water towards their property? Mr. Charwick stated no. There is a wetland to the north and to the southeast of the field. He reviewed the drainage which goes through a pipe with an outlet to the south. That will not change. What they will be doing is addressing inadequate drainage on the field. They are adding more catchbasins to get more water off the surface of the field. Ms. Cazeault asked about the access road. Would they be adding a new access road to the other end of the track? There is already an access road coming up behind the storage shed off of Kosmas Street. Mr. Charwick noted that the existing walkway is being enhanced at the request of the Fire Department. The current gate at Kosmas Street will remain and will be a secondary means of emergency access. There will no additional access added.

Mr. Bolduc asked about bleachers. Mr. Charwick noted that there would be no bleachers, no lights, no press box.

Alicja Zukowski, civil engineer with Samiotes Engineering addressed the Board. She noted that the emergency access isn't going to change. The enhancements were requested by the Fire Department for emergency vehicle access to the fields. She reviewed the soil erosion control plan and the stormwater management plan. Stormwater will be directed to the wetlands or the pond on Poland

Street. They are proposing five infiltration systems which will improve the quality of the existing wetlands. The existing sewer lines will be replaced with PVC pipes.

Deb Keefe asked if the existing drainage was going to remain to which the answer was yes. Ms. Keefe asked if more drainage would be added to Poland Street to which the answer was no, they were only adding infiltration chambers. No new flow would be added. Ms. Keefe noted that the existing drainage system can't handle the existing flow on Poland Street. Would the water from the parking lot, which is currently grass, be directed to Poland Street? The answer was not, that they were adding new catch basins and the water would be directed to the drainage system existing in Poland Street. Some water will infiltrate into the grass before it's directed to the drainage system. Ms. Zukowski reviewed the chamber system.

Ms. Morgan noted that the project team had submitted their response to their engineering review but that it was only received tonight. Mr. Eaton noted that there was a number of technical questions to be answered and that it wouldn't be worth going through them all. Mr. Dostoler stated that he agreed, there needed to be answers which could be reviewed at a future meeting. There were no objections from the Board.

Motion to continue the public meeting for site plan review and stormwater management for 52 Lake Parkway to July 29th made by Mr. Morin, seconded by Mr. Piader. Motion passed unanimously 4-0.

114 Point Breeze Road – Mr. William Thistle, 120 Point Breeze Road asked to address the Board. Ms. Cody asked if that agenda item had been closed to which the answer was yes. Mr. Thistle stated that he had a procedural questions noting that the public meeting had never been opened. The meeting has been continued a number of times but wasn't actually officially opened. Mr. Dostoler stated that the Board had opened it and continued it for more information. Mr. Thistle noted that it was pointed out that the application was deficient at this time. If the meeting is closed then there is no more public comment allowed. He asked if the applicant could cure his deficiencies. Ms. Morgan noted that the meeting was opened a few meetings ago and then closed which prohibits the submission of any new material or comments from the public or the applicant. Ms. Morgan reviewed the process noting that the Board will take up a draft decision at a future meeting to either deny or deny without prejudice. Mr. Thistle noted that there has been no opportunity to speak and that the Applicant hasn't made a presentation to show exactly what he is proposing. There was some discussion as to the timeline of the public meeting what was or wasn't presented at those meetings. Ms. Morgan stated that she would have to go to past notes for an answer. It was her opinion that the meeting was opened and people had an opportunity to speak to the matter in past meetings. Mr. Thistle disagreed. The Applicant has never presented what his plan is and it was continued. The only comment made was earlier in the meeting (Mr. Hanko) after which the Board closed the public comment period. Ms. Cody thought the public meeting was opened about four meetings ago, a presentation was made and that there were public comments were allowed. Mr. Thistle questioned if you can close a meeting that never was opened. There was further discussion about the Applicant's ability to cure their deficiencies and that it would be up to the Board to determine if they wish to proceed given those deficiencies. Mr. Thistle asked for further clarification in that if the Board denies the application without prejudice the Applicant would be required to start all over again to which the answer was correct. Mr. Thistle asked if the Board would let the project to proceed if there were deficiencies to which the answer was it was up to the Board to make the decision. Mr. Thistle noted that a number of people have been present at each continued meeting and they have confirmed that the public meeting was never opened. He stated that, technically, the meeting was opened an hour ago and then closed. Mr. Dostoler stated his belief, based

on what he's been told by staff, that there are a number of outstanding issues. Until those are resolved, the Board can't make any movement on a resolution on the modification of the site plan. Ms. Morgan noted that the Applicant doesn't have any more opportunity to submit new material or fix the deficiencies as they stand now. Mr. Thistle stated that if the Board denies the application without prejudice that the Applicant would have to start all over. Ms. Fritz noted that if he resubmits then he can start over to which the answer was yes. Ms. Morgan noted that they would know that there was a new application because public notice will be sent to the abutters again. She added that in order for this project to work the Applicant would be required to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals which also involves public notice.

- c. Modification of a Site Plan - 74 Worcester Road, Webster - UHaul - AMERCO Real Estate Company (Applicant / Owner); Assessor ID 88-B-42-41; Site is located in a Business 5 (B5) zoning district.

Mr. Morin read the public meeting notice. Mr. Dostoler opened the public meeting. Mike Scott of Land Design Collaborative was present to discuss the application. He reviewed the history of the project and current work tasks on site. Since the original approval, they have noticed a significant problem with water at the rear of the building where there is a lot of rock and ledge. Test pits have been dug and there's only a few feet of soil before they hit rock. Previous owners had installed a concrete swale to direct water away from the building but it has proven ineffective. They are proposing changes to drainage at the rear of the building. In addition, they would like to modify some of the parking layout in the front by getting rid of some of the landscaping area and then reconfigure other landscaping areas. He reviewed the proposed landscaping changes. They would like to eliminate some of the curbing to reduce the number of flat tires on the rented equipment. The other change would be to other than leaving the stormwater to dump onto the surface and run overland on the right side of the building they've asked to install a storm drain system at the rear of the building and pipe all that run off into the front of the site and connect to two subsurface detention system currently in the parking lot. This will entail some rock excavation at the back of the building.

Mr. Scott noted that had received Mr. Eaton's review letter today. He will review the question asked about where the water was going to originally. He noted that a significant portion was running around to the right side of the building. The proposed change would bring the water around to the left side. He will verify if which of the two underground systems the water will be diverted to. Mr. Piader asked if the water is being diverted into the parking lot. Mr. Scott noted that there are two drains that run out of the back of the building approximately 5 to 6 feet above grade. These drains spill water onto the concrete or the ledge behind the building. The water flows to a ditch on the right side and then enters the drain system. They want to bring the flow to the other side via pipe instead of flowing overland as it is now. Mr. Morin asked if that would be between the two buildings to which the answer was yes. Mr. Scott reviewed existing conditions and the system that runs around the back to the north and the proposed condition.

Mr. Scott noted that some other modifications have been made at the request of the plumbing inspector and DPW. The sewer system at the front of the building was a roller coaster and clogged. The sewer system at the front of the site is being repaired. These modifications will be picked up as part of the as-built plan submission.

Mr. Piader asked if there would be any new lighting to which the answer was no. Mr. Scott noted that the lighting would remain in its current locations. The lighting heads have been replaced with the previously approved fixtures. They don't want to go to the expense of removing those structures and

rewiring the whole parking lot. The reconfigured curbing and striping enables them to retain the existing lighting structures.

Mr. Piader asked Mr. Eaton to provide his review. Mr. Eaton reviewed the plan noting that they are introducing some grading to the eastern side of the building where the roof drainage and piping are proposed. Mr. Scott reviewed the plan noting that there splitting the drainage flow between two existing underground systems existing on site. Some of the existing system was added later to the site when a new building was added. He reviewed the slope at the rear of the site. Site work at the rear of the building is required but when complete will allow them to get a vehicle behind the building if there was a need for maintenance. Mr. Piader asked if there would be sedimentation at the rear of the site. Mr. Scott reviewed the temporary erosion control measures. Mr. Eaton added that it would be needed at the concrete swale until the stabilization of the slope to ensure that no sedimentation flows down into the paved area.

Mr. Dostoler asked if there were any other issues that Mr. Eaton could identify. Mr. Eaton noted that Mr. Scott had addressed most of them. The site has two detention systems and it appears that the roof run off is being diverted around the building to the lower subsurface detention system. The question is, which detention system should the roof runoff be diverted to? Mr. Scott stated that Mr. Eaton was correct. He went through some of the historic plans. Drainage was added when they added to the south side of the building. He will either reconfigure the plan to have the drainage go into the system where it is effectively going today. They will either replumb it accordingly or determine if the other system is adequate enough and will document it as such.

Mr. Eaton noted that procedurally a modification is like a new site plan application. All the information must be included. If you had requested waivers previously then you'll need to show that again on the plan. Mr. Scott noted that he understood.

Mr. Dostoler asked if there were any other comments or questions. There were none from Mr. Eaton or the Board.

Motion to continue the public meeting on the modification of the site plan at 74 Worcester Road to July 29th made by Mr. Piader, seconded by Ms. Cody. Motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

4. Discussion Items

- a. Engineering Update - CHA Companies – Mr. Eaton noted that went by some of the projects and had a brief update as follows:

13-15 Old Worcester Road – a building is up but no other site work has been done. Mr. Morin asked if there is a building there to which Mr. Eaton responded yes. United Medical, Worcester Road – he had recently sent out an inspection report to the Board. The site has been rough graded. The foundation is in. There is an erosion issue at the entrance to the site. Goya – not much happening, the grass is coming in, otherwise they haven't done much.

Ms. Cody asked about the Batten Street solar project. Ms. Morgan noted that the Town has been working with Town Counsel and the applicants to come up with a solution to the flooding that is happening at the southwestern part of the site. We've been working with DPW, Town Counsel and the owner's engineer. There is a potential solution which everyone is waiting to see if it's a success

before moving to make it a permanent solution. There will be an update next month. Ms. Cody asked about the noise coming from what she believes is the generator. Ms. Morgan noted that the Town has been in a standstill over the flooding and the wetlands issues but that the owner knows that in order to finish out their open special permit with the Planning Board that all outstanding issues will have to be addressed. The owner has been told that there is a noise issue but we haven't heard back from them. We are continuing to work with them to get the as built submitted. If the noise issue is not addressed before then, it will be addressed when you take up the as-built plan review.

Mr. Dostoler asked about the noise complaints from the neighbors regarding the intersection of Cudworth Road and Goya Drive. Has the issue of noise from the trucks and refrigeration units been resolved? No new complaints have been received. Mr. Eaton stated that he didn't know if the issue has been resolved. He believed that Goya had been working with the neighbors including sound experts that were working with them. We have not heard from Goya or the neighbors.

- b. Odor Mitigation Update – Marijuana Cultivation Facility – 30 Worcester Road - Curaleaf. Ms. Morgan noted that a brief update was provided saying that they did get equipment and things have been installed. They have applied for their building permit to replace the roof. She will asked that they be present at the next meeting to provide further information.

Judith Lewinski, Sitkowski School Apartments, addressed the Board. She noted that she's been a resident for about 5 year and didn't know there was a marijuana manufacturing facility in Town. She outlined a medical episode that she believed was caused by marijuana odor. This resulted in her having to put herself into assisted living at the cost of \$25,000. The episodes stopped when she went to assisted living and then she moved back. She noted that the smell of marijuana is so bad that she can't open her windows and that it sometimes starts at 5:00 a.m. She was outraged that more people were not up in arms, in particular the people attending tonight's meeting who left. Ms. Lewinski noted that the doctor couldn't find anything wrong but she believed she was physically impacted by the marijuana odor and she would bring a lawsuit against the manufacturer if she could prove it. Mr. Dostoler noted that the Board had received complaints but nothing this extensive. Mr. Piader noted that there have been complaints from Price Chopper which is next door to the grow facility. Ms. Zelinsky wanted to know how long the facility has been in Town to which the answer was 2016. Mr. Piader briefly outlined the steps being taken to address the problem including an air quality study that could provide some science and facts to consider. Ms. Zelinski expressed concern about the number of schools within one mile of the facility and wanted to know why more people weren't taking this seriously. Mr. Dostoler noted that it was continual process for them. Ms. Zelinski wanted to know what the manufacturer was doing. Mr. Morin noted that they were providing monthly reports to the Board and Mr. Piader reviewed the current efforts. Ms. Zelinski stated that she was going to go to the facility to talk to them and that she would be attending future Board meetings.

Ms. Cody thought that this issue was on the radar of the Cannabis Control Commission. Ms. Morgan noted that MassDEP had issued Curaleaf a temporary permit and that they have been looking at the materials posted to our website. The Central Region has also been on Curaleaf for this as well.

- c. 56 Worcester Road — Violation — Clearing exceeding 10,000 square feet. Caitlyn Condon, Attorney for the property owners, Six Kids Trust, provided the Board with an update. A virtual meeting with Ms. Morgan was conducted in early June to discuss the issues. Since that time, they have been working to find an engineer to come and look at the site so that they can apply for a stormwater permit. This has taken longer than expected. She's had conversations with Conoco Engineering who were

going to look at the site and hopefully she will have something by Wednesday to get things moving. She noted that National Grid was working on their stormwater permit application and that they had been working on the property. They have had soil tested by Tighe & Bond which has tested clean. National Grid will move that soil off site once a plan has been developed together. A lot of things are in process. An easement agreement between the two property owners (52 and 56 Worcester Road) is in the final stages and it should be ready for the next meeting. Ultimately her client wants to get this resolved immediately but a lot of the engineering firms gave them a 2 to 3 month time line.

Mr. Dostoler asked if this agenda item required a continuance. He asked if Mr. Eaton had anything to add who responded that he wasn't sure how much they wanted to get into it. Ms. Morgan noted that this would be a standing agenda item until the stormwater permit application has been received. If new information is received before a permit is filed, the standing agenda items gives the Board the opportunity to discuss it. The standing agenda item doesn't mean that it has to be discussed at every meeting but rather provides an opportunity to speak to it if the Board wants to. Ms. Condon noted that they would get the application in as soon as possible and provide any substantive updates before then.

5. Next Meeting Date - Monday, July 29, 2023.

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Mr. Piader, seconded by Ms. Cody. Motion passed unanimously 4-0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Minutes Approved: _____



Daniel Morin, Clerk

EXHIBITS

Special Permit Application – Add an Electronic Message Sign to an Existing Sign – 63 East Main Street (Assessor ID 15-G-25). Signarama Worcester (Applicant); East Main Street Management (Owner).

- Application Packet submitted May 23, 2023 including the following:
 - Certified Abutters List; 3 pages.
 - Special Permit Application Form; 3 pages.
 - Signarama Graphic, Proposed Sign; 1 page.
 - Public Hearing Notice Filed with the Town Clerk on May 23, 2023; 1 page.
 - Department Comments – Highway Department; received June 5, 2023; 1 page.
 - Department Comments – Building Department; received June 5, 2023; 1 page.
 - Department Comments – Fire Department; received June 5, 2023; 1 page.
 - Site Maps and Photos; June 26, 2023; 3 pages.
- Public Hearing Notice filed with the Town Clerk on May 23, 2023; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Highway – received 5/23/23; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Building Department – received 5/23/23; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Fire Department – received 5/23/23; 1 page.

- Site Maps and Photos; June 26, 2023; 3 pages.

Site Plan Review and Stormwater Management Application - Renovation of Bartlett High School, Grounds, Playing Fields and Other Site Facilities at 52 Lake Parkway, Webster, MA - Webster Public Schools (Applicant/Owner).

- Application Packet submitted on May 2, 2023, includes the following:
 - Certified Abutters List; 10 pages.
 - Map – Building Use within 500 Feet
 - Map – Land Use
 - Map – Wetland Delineation
 - Map – Zoning
 - Plan Set; 50 pages.
 - Project Narrative; 2
 - Site Plan Application Form; 4 pages
 - Stormwater Permit Application Form; 3 pages.
 - Stormwater Report; 199 pages.
 - Waiver Requests; 1 page.
- Public Meeting Notice, filed with the Town Clerk on May 23, 2023; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Assessor; received June 5, 2023; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Fire Department; received June 5, 2023; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Building Department; received June 5, 2023; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Highway Department; received June 5, 2023; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Water / Sewer Department; received June 5, 2023; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Conservation Agent; received June 6, 2023; 1 page.
- Revised Site Plan; received June 200, 2023; 47 pages.
- Correspondence from CHA Companies, Engineering Review; received June 19, 2023; 4 pages.
- Correspondence from Samiotes, Response to Engineering Review; received June 26, 2023; 6 pages.
- Presentation to the Planning Board, Planning Board Submission; received at the June 26, 2023 public meeting; 17 pages.

Modification of a Site Plan - 74 Worcester Road, Webster - UHaul - AMERCO Real Estate Company (Applicant / Owner)

- Application Packet submitted on June 5, 2023 including the following:
 - Certified Abutters List; 6 pages.
 - Drainage Report; 6 pages.
 - Modification of a Site Plan Application Form; 4 pages.
 - Plan Set; 13 pages.
 - Project Description; 2 pages.
- Public Meeting Notice Filed with the Town Clerk on 6/5/23; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Fire Department – received June 6, 2023; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Highway Department – received June 6, 2023; 1 page.
- Department Comments – Police Department – received June 6, 2023; 1 page.
- Correspondence from CHA Companies, Engineering Review; received June 26, 2023; 2 pages.