MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF AUGUST 7, 2006
SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m., Jeffrey Partington, Vice-Chairman, presiding.

Members Present: Jeffrey Partington, Rick Lemek, Bruce Ferreira, Michael Lupis, Jim Libby, Christopher Desjardins and Jeff Presbrey.

Members Absent: Leo Felice

Others Present: Ron Faford, Town Council Liaison, Tom Kravitz, Town Planner, and Christine Langlois, Recording Secretary.

II. ATTENDANCE REVIEW:

The Vice-Chairman acknowledged that Mr. Felice was unable to attend the meeting this evening.

III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:

The **minutes of the Planning Board meeting of July 10, 2006** were read. *A motion to accept the minutes as presented was made by Mr. Ferreira, seconded by Mr. Libby and carried unanimously by the Board.*

IV. CORRESPONDENCE:

- Planning Commissioner's Journal
- Memo from DPW Director regarding a site inspection of Smith Estates

V. OLD BUSINESS:

Pine Ridge Village Planned Development (Age-Restricted), Steere Farm Road & Mowry Street, Harrisville; Map 176, Lots 3 & 5; Map 177, Lot 30: ***Preliminary Major Plan Review/Public Hearing (continued from last month's meeting):*** Attorney Brian LaPlante, Dr. Lucien Benoit and Joseph Houle, Adam Gaudette and Cheryl Peterson, of Heritage Design Group, John Shevlin, of Pare Engineering, and Steve Guglielmo, of Saccoccio & Associates were in attendance to represent the request. Attorney LaPlante began discussions by stating that the RIDEM final approval for this project has not been received as had anticipated, and requested that the Board proceed to hear the presentation tonight even though the approval is not in hand. Mr. Partington informed him that it would be difficult for the Board to render any decision without the RIDEM permit. Attorney LaPlante agreed but suggested that the Board could go through the process and offer a decision subject to receipt of RIDEM approval. He then turned the meeting over to Adam Gaudette.

At this point, Mr. Jim McGovern, a member of the audience, noting that the wetlands permit had not been received, questioned whether the Board should hear this presentation or should they table it for another month. Mr. Partington told him that aside from the

wetlands permit, all necessary information for review has been received from the applicant. He added the Board has a choice to table discussions, and send everybody home, or hear what the applicant has to present and provide the wetlands permit to the Board upon its receipt. For the sake of the audience, Mr. Partington polled the members, and they unanimously agreed to hear the presentation.

Mr. Gaudette then began the presentation by offering a brief history of the progress of this process, noting that the request has been before the Board as far back as 2002. Based upon the Town's adopting of a village planned development ordinance, a formal pre-application was submitted in June 2004 allowing for 72 units. Based upon feedback from the Board, a Master Plan was filed in August 2004 for 72 units. In September 2005 Master Plan approval was received from the Board. The current application now allows for 61 units of senior housing – divided into two distinct neighborhoods- on 29 acres with 12 acres of open space and is compatible with the uses in the downtown and the VPD ordinance in terms of architecture, building locations and open space. (The project currently has 40% of open space and offers protection to the wetlands and the natural habitat on site.) There are two main access points (90 feet of frontage on Steere Farm Road and 50 feet of frontage on Mowry Street), with a "spine" road. The roadway is designed to be 22 feet in wide with sidewalks and curbing. (The 22'-width was determined by the local fire chief.) A 10' arch culvert is proposed as part of a design modification to lessen the impact to the wetlands at the Mowry Street entrance. The units, originally proposed for within the village commons at the Master Plan, have been relocated. A recreation/clubhouse proposed for meeting space for the association and other small events has been moved across the street and angle to allow for parking that eliminates backing into the roadway. Although it had been suggested earlier in the review that the developers provide a convenience store for the residents of the community, the developers felt it would become a burden to the association should the convenience store be non-profitable. The clubhouse has been placed where there are sidewalks and connectivity throughout the project, with an open space walking trail, that leads to the clubhouse, which ties into the Harrisville Village trail system.

In regards to stormwater management, Mr. Gaudette told the Board that the design has been reviewed by the DPW Director/Engineer and is design to capture stormwater within the street, with catch basins into a series of piping directed to the detention basins that have a combination of infiltration – allowing for a recharging of the aquifer and detain the stormwater to decrease the rate of runoff. This system helps to prevent any impacts to the neighbors downstream at a greater rate than what is occurring at the present time. The common areas will also serve to help the drainage and underground they contain a series of infiltration units designed to recharge the aquifer.

In regards to site distance on Mowry Street, Mr. Gaudette told the Board that because it is a country road and the entrance is located on a corner, because of a slight crest in the road, site distance is diminished. The DPW has requested that the developers lower the road so the crest is not as great in order to increase the site distance. He noted that common sense and the numbers point to Steere Farm Road as the better access to this

project. As this is an age-restricted community, residents would generally not be out during peak flow times. He noted that there would be a maintenance easement recorded for the roads and the detention areas to allow the Town access should the association fail to maintain the facilities.

In regards to permitting for the project, Mr. Gaudette noted that permits are required from RIDEM and RIDOT. The project does not require a soil suitability application and ISDS requirement because it is not a subdivision and because the project will have public sewer. A wetlands verification filing has been completed, by a wetlands biologist, in June 2005, and submitted to RIDEM. There are a few isolated wetlands on the property as well as a forested swamp and an intermittent stream that traverses the property in the northwest. This filing received approval from RIDEM. They then filed a wetlands alteration permit in July 2005 and have been waiting for their approval. Part of the wetlands filing included a habitat study to determine what type of habitat would be affected by the study. It was the intent of the developer to keep the entire development out of any wetland areas as well as the perimeter buffer zones. A filing was submitted RIDOT, for Route 98 (Steere Farm Road), for an alteration that will be conducted within the state right-of-way as well as a change of use to the access to the right-of-way. A Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) has been received and forwarded to the Planning Department. He noted that additional drainage has been added to the front entrance of the property, which will be discussed later in the meeting.

In August 2005 he noted that the project received approval to connect to the public water system. One requirement of the fire department was to have the water line extended up Mowry Street approximately 900 feet to an existing fire hydrant in order to create a looped system.

He noted that in February 2006 the applicants appeared before the Planning Board to request a recommendation to the Sewer Commission for a waiver from Article 16 of the Sewer Commission regulations. The Sewer Commission formally voted approval of this waiver in the spring and the project is currently in the design review stage. He noted a recent correspondence received from Beta Engineering and a subsequent follow-up response to their comments.

In summary of the permits, he stated that he believed they have covered the necessary approvals from sewer, water, RIDOT and RIDEM, having already received the approvals from each agency or are definitely forthcoming.

Referring back to the VPD ordinance, he stated that the ordinance was created by the Town to allow for different types of developments that were no previously allowed by zoning. The VPD allows for commercial or mixed use residential – adding that the proposed development would be for an age-restricted adult community. It would be a private community, with a homeowners association, not requiring any public maintenance responsibilities – no school children or school buses – no maintenance for the DPW. He noted that this type of development has low impacts to the Town than

typical single-family residential in terms of water usage, sewer usage, traffic. He then asked if there were any questions from the Board.

Mr. Presbrey asked if there were any guarantees that this would remain an age-restricted community. Mr. Gaudette told the Board that a restrictive covenant would be recorded with the property, which would be provided to the Town Solicitor for his review prior to recording the plan. It would contain restrictions such as age, overnight visitors, grandchildren, etc. but at least one member of the residence would have to be 55 or older and no children are allowed to live here. He added that there would be no Town burden in terms of maintenance – the roads would be plowed, every catch basin will be cleaned or maintained. Homeowner association fees would be set aside to cover any maintenance. Referring to the plan, on page 20, in regards to the soil testing, Mr. Presbrey questioned who "L. Anderson" was and his qualifications. Mr. Gaudette stated that Mr. Anderson is a certified soil evaluator and has been for the past 20 years. Mr. Presbrey then questioned the soil evaluation test pit #3 stating that the groundwater was weeping at 58" which establishes the groundwater elevation at 372', which is above basin B-4. Mr. Gaudette stated that because of their recent correspondence with RIDEM regarding soil testing and because the plan that the Board has reviewed was submitted about 120 days prior to this evening, a new plan has been developed and submitted to RIDEM addressing all of their comments. RIDEM may have already commented on the test pit. Mr. Presbrey pointed out other test hole and elevations problems. Mr. Gaudette suggested drafting a detailed letter of all of RIDEM's comments and their responses to those comments for the Board's review. Mr. Presbrey requested a new revised plan showing the test holes plan to be accurate and depicted as well as the narrative. He further pointed out the following problems:

- Test pit #7 with refusal at 401.1', building #10 basement floor at 393, would require 8' of ledge cut adding that RIDEM would not be discussing that issue.
- On page 23, the oil/water separator does not have detail for the diversion width. He further requested grease traps for the catch basins.
- On page 24, the ADF-steel animal/child guards require more detail.
- Stone riprap detail should show flare ends section. Also, the RIDOT detail M.10.03 does not match the RIDOT detail for riprap.
- On page 25, there is no detail for the anti-seep collar.
- On page 26, risers should be shown on the plan as to where and how many for each subsurface infiltration basin.

He further stated that he felt there were still too many buildings and that he would prefer more of a buffer for the abutters along Steere Farm Road. Mr. Gaudette explained that front and rear yards have been lost due to Roadway D, which the Board had requested in order to prevent each home homeowner from backing into Roadway A. The grading requires that the buildings be moved back more. He said that the buffer could be increased if the plan could be changed back to having access from the front of the buildings.

Mr. Libby questioned the distance from the proposed buildings, on the extreme right, to the abutters' property lines. Mr. Gaudette stated 50'. Mr. Libby stated that the buffer zone, in his opinion, was unacceptable, adding that more of the open area, which surrounds the wetlands areas, should be moved to provide more buffer area to the abutters. Attorney LaPlante stated that he respected Mr. Libby's opinion but the zoning requirements allow for a rear-yard setback of 30' and a minimum side-yard setback of 10 feet and that this development is almost double the requirement, noting that the developers, according to the VPD ordinance, could ask for a waiver from the setback regulations to decrease it even further. He suggested shortening the driveways to increase the buffers. Mr. Libby added that he felt the development is still too dense, given the property, to function property and this is the reason for their problems. Mr. Partington agreed with Mr. Libby's point and suggested the developers investigate a way in which to increase the buffers.

Mr. Lupis stated that he agreed with Mr. Libby and that it is the Planning Board's role to make sure future development fit in with the community. He also suggested revisiting the buffer issues. Mr. Ferreira suggested moving some buildings around to allow for more buffer area. Mr. Gaudette said that moving some of the buildings would open up a further problem as far as grading of the site, noting that RIDEM is adamant about staying out of the wetlands buffers. Mr. Lemek asked if the traffic study was conducted in conjunction with the Harrisville Village VPD. Mr. Gaudette stated that the traffic study was conducted with the Harrisville Village and Stillwater Heights development in mind. Mr. Lemek added that he felt that the residences that lived closer to Mowry Street would tend to use that road for access to the Downtown Pascoag area. Mr. Gaudette said that the traffic engineer was in attendance and turned the meeting over to John Shevlin, of Pare Engineering.

Mr. Shevlin stated that his firm had conducted a traffic study for this development and had taken into consideration the two new developments within the area. He noted that he had obtained current traffic counts information for all of the major intersections within the area, and had taken into consideration the roadway system and the layout of the Pine Ridge development. Based upon the current traffic volume and the distribution of traffic from the development, and other developments, the analysis shows that there will not be any significant impact from this development. He noted that he was in agreement with the DPW's recommendation of lower the roadway on Mowry Street near the Pine Ridge entrance in order to improve the site distance. Mr. Gaudette then turned the meeting over to Steve Guglielmo, of Saccoccio & Associates.

Mr. Guglielmo stated that based upon the Board's comments from the last meeting, the units were redesigned to incorporate more façade elements, more gable ends, dormers, and additional porches. On some of the units the garages were removed from the front and placed in the back, as requested. He displayed the revised architectural plans for the benefit of the Board. He noted that, for example, a three-unit building would now have two single-car units and one two-car unit; a four-unit building would now have two-single car units and two two-car units – taking into consideration the architecture in the

area (the shingle-style gable roofs). Mr. Libby commended the architect on the changes, improving the look of the development. He asked if it was possible to place the garages on the end units of the four-unit buildings on the side. Mr. Gaudette noted that there would be a grading problem if the garages are moved to the side. Mr. Libby then pointed out that every suggestion the Board has made tonight is something that can't be resolved and he felt the situations could be resolved by eliminating units. Mr. Gaudette responded by saying that it wasn't that easy and the fact that they have already eliminated about 10 units. The projects that they prepare are designed based upon the site, and if they attempt to incorporate every design suggested by the Board, the project will not go forward. Mr. LaPlante interjected to say that the developer is willing to take a look at what the Board has suggested to see if the suggestions will work with the development.

At the request of the Chairman, Mr. Kravitz then gave a brief description of the Village Planned Development Ordinance for the public and the reason for its adoption (within the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance) based upon the State mandates for the Affordable Housing requirement of 10% of the Town's current housing stock.

Mr. Partington opened the Public Hearing at 8:30 p.m. and asked that the speakers keep their comments/questions to five-minutes each.

Mr. Jim McGovern, of 50 North Hill Road, informed the Board that although they see an angry group of people before them, it's out of frustration because they don't understand the process for development and are relying on the Board to protect their homes and their interests.

Mr. Norman Gaucher, of 525 Steere Farm Road, voiced concern with current traffic conditions and what this development would add to the traffic situation. He asked about a building moratorium from 1986 that was to be in effect to control growth. Mr. Partington explained that at times the Town is driven by State law as to what is allowed within the community. A moratorium is not allowed by State law so perhaps it was just a discussion in 1986.

Mr. Al Carlow, of 375 Steere Farm Road, questioned how much water would the detention ponds be able to hold. Mr. Gaudette stated that the ponds are designed by a rate of runoff, known as "x" plus "y" for a 100-year storm. The detention ponds serve to removed the "y" and keep it at "x" during a 100-year storm. In terms of quantity, the amount is based upon the basin height, type of storm, and how many inches of rain happening over a 24-hour storm. Mr. Carlow asked for worst case scenario if they were to "block up". Mr. Gaudette said that it was difficult to determine it right now.

Mr. William Guilbault, of 109 Steere Farm Road, said that he had performed calculations for the detention pond proposed closest to Building 2 would have approximately 750,000 gallons of water. Mr. Gaudette stated that he believed it was a bit high. He explained that currently there is water coming down from all different areas of the property. The detention basin will be able to capture this runoff and direct it back to the wetlands areas,

not everywhere on the property. Mr. Guilbault argued the amount of water from the property. Mr. Gaudette noted that the development must not allow anymore runoff from the property than currently runs off now. In fact, the proposed drainage system would improve the situation. Mr. Partington attempted to explain that the detention ponds are design to leach and release the water in a controlled fashion. There is absolutely no control right now. Mr. Guilbault said that he had contacted RIDEM and spoke with the person reviewing this project; her comment was that the plan was excessive compared to the amount of wetlands on the property.

Mrs. Kathleen Leveille, of 30 Tall Timber Drive, voiced concern with increase traffic. Who will be monitoring the age limit in the development? Mr. Partington said that it would be monitored by deed. Mrs. Leveille asked if someone would be checking on the age-limit periodically, citing that a younger individual had been arrested earlier this year, in Ashton Court, for selling drugs. Attorney LaPlante stated that within the condo documents restrictions are placed on the ages for residents. Mrs. Leveille also questioned why the number of units can't be reduced. Mr. Partington explained that there is a permissible use that the developer is allowed. It becomes a point as to what can fit there. The Board is here to assure that the Town's regulations are complied with and to match what is here today.

Mr. Al Carlow, Jr., of 77 Railroad Avenue, in regards to the age enforcement issue, stated that people within the age-restricted developments are blind to what is going on around them. Bradford Court, an age-restricted facility has problems all night long. There's no way these things can be enforced. Nothing more than a paper document.

Mr. Jim McGovern said that every time a developer comes in, they make guarantees on the requirements that are being proposed and within two or three years no one pays any attention to it.

As there were no further comments or questions from the public, Mr. Partington stated that he would keep the public hearing open. When the developer appears before the Board with revised plans, if any member of the audience wished to speak again, they would have the right to. He noted that there would not be any notification but that individuals could check the Town's website, Town Hall and the Harrisville Post Office for the Planning Board agendas.

A motion to continue the Public Hearing and review of the Pine Ridge Village Planned Development Preliminary Plan was made by Mr. Ferreira, seconded by Mr. Libby and carried unanimously by the Board.

A five-minute recess was called by the Chairman at 8:52 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 8:57 p.m.

VI. NEW BUSINESS:

Land Development:

Granite River Village, Callahan School Street, River Street & Chapel Street, Harrisville; Map 142, Lot 21: ***Request for Extension of Master Plan Approval:*** Attorney Wyatt Brochu and Michael Coutu, principal, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Kravitz told the Board that the request was for a one-year extension of the Granite River Village Master Plan Approval, which had been rendered by the Board on August 24, 2005. *A motion to grant a one-year extension of the Granite River Village Master Plan approval was made by Mr. Ferreira, seconded by Mr. Lemek and carried unanimously by the Board.*

Harrisville Village, Steere Farm Road & Mowry Street, Harrisville: Map 160, Lot 34: ***Review & Discuss Elevations of Buildings 8 & 9; Walking Paths; Building Permits:*** Mr. Victor Bevilacqua and Mr. Mark Bard, of Harrisville Village LLC, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Bevilacqua stated that they had submitted revised sets of elevations for Buildings 8 & 9 for the Board's review. Mr. Libby noted that the revised sets included the various elements (dormers, etc.) that had been requested by Board in order to provide style variety. *A motion to approve the revised elevation plans for Building 8 & 9 was made by Mr. Libby, seconded by Mr. Lupis and carried unanimously by the Board.*

In regards to the proposed walking paths, Mr. Bevilacqua stated that they were still awaiting RIDEM approval of the crossings.

Harrisville Village, Steere Farm Road & Mowry Street, Harrisville: Map 160, Lot 34: ***Setting of Performance Bond; Acceptance of Irrevocable Letter of Credit:*** The Board questioned how the amount of the performance bond had been established. Mr. Kravitz stated that the amount had been set by the DPW Director based upon his estimates for the construction of sidewalks on Mowry Street and for construction of the recreational walking paths. *A motion to set the performance bond amount at $101,456 and to accept the Irrevocable Letter of Credit as the performance bond was made by Mr. Ferreira. The motion was seconded by Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously by the Board.*

Subdivision:

Ronald Caponigro & Rene Gagne, Gig & Pulaski Road, Nasonville; Map 131, Lot 19; Map 132, Lot 3 & 43: ***Administrative Plan Review:*** Mr. Ron Caponigro was in attendance to represent the request. He explained that he currently owns a 19-acre parcel fronting on Pulaski Road, which he would like to subdivide to create a 3-acre lot, fronting on Pulaski Road, for the existing house and join the remaining 16 acres with a smaller parcel of land on the opposite side of Pulaski Road, on land that he also owns. He stated that he would also like to swap land with an abutter, Rene Gagne, to increase Mr. Gagne's backyard and to provide access to the remaining 16-acre parcel for Mr. Caponigro. This plan would also require the abandonment of a paper roadway known as Burrows Lane. He noted that he has had conversations with the abutting neighbors who

stated that they did not have any problems with abandoning Burrows Lane. He also noted that there is no set width for Burrows Lane.

Mr. Partington informed the Board that they are also being asked to forward a recommendation to the Town Council on the abandonment of Burrows Lane. *A motion was made by Mr. Ferreira to forward a favorable recommendation on the abandonment of Burrows Lane to the Town Council. The motion received a second from Mr. Lupis and carried unanimously by the Board.*

Because there was some confusion as to where Pulaski Road is located in relation to the properties being reviewed, Mr. Partington requested that Mr. Caponigro have his surveyor mark out the location of Pulaski Road on the plan so that the Board can view its location in proximity to the proposed land swap. Mr. Kravitz also noted that the plan does not show the amount of land that each parcel would received when the roadway is abandoned. He further informed the Board that if they chose to approve the plan, it would require a variance from the Zoning Board in regards to its frontage. Although the lot is currently a legal, non-conforming lot, because the lot lines are being moved, its grandfather status is moot and would require a variance for frontage as the frontage requirements would not be met. *A motion was then made by Mr. Partington to forward the plan to Zoning Board, with a favorable advisory on the granting of a variance from frontage requirements, pending the Zoning Board's receipt of an application for a frontage variance by the applicant, as well as revised plans showing the location of Pulaski Road. The motion received a second from Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*

At this point, Mr. Lemek recused from discussions of the next item.

Virginia Sindelar & Dart Development Corporation, Jackson Schoolhouse Road, Pascoag; Map 206, Lot 10 & Map 225, Lot 23: ***Administrative Plan Review:*** Attorney John Reilly, Virginia Sindelar, owner of Grace Note Farm, Robert Woods and Patrick Wood, principals of Dart Development, were in attendance to represent the request. Attorney Reilly told the Board that a dispute arose between his client, Ms. Sindelar, owner of Map 206, Lot 10 and Bob Woods & Patrick Wood, owners of Map 225, Lot 23, which is currently unresolved in court. The administrative plan before the Board this evening is an attempt at settlement. He said that the plan shows a proposal to removed 1.6 acres of land from Lot 23 and add to Lot 10, with a perpetual easement for Lot 23 over the 1.6 acre portion. He pointed out the buildable area of land on Lot 23 which would allow for Dart Development to construct a house and any future owners of Lot 23 access to George Washington State Park through the perpetual easement. This plan would also serve to increase the side-yard setback of the existing barn (currently only 10 feet) from the property line. The area would also be used for parking guests utilizing the horse trails of Grace Note Farm.

The Board questioned whether the plan should receive the blessings of the court before coming before the Planning Board. Attorney Reilly stated that it was perfectly

admissible for the Board to approve the plan and submit the approved plan to the courts as their settlement of the issue. The Board then questioned the location of the perpetual easement on the plan. Attorney Reilly said that the easement would be included and outlined further in the proposed deed for the land transfer. Mr. Woods added that by giving Ms. Sindelar the land, he felt that the marketability of the property was diminished but by allowing the future property owner a perpetual easement for access to the State Park, it would give the value back to the property. He added that it is not an easement that can be described by metes and bounds but more-or-less a right of passage. The Board requested that a note be placed on the plan recognizing the fact that there is an easement for the property and is further noted in the actual deed for the parcel.

The Board questioned whether their approval of the plan would create an unbuildable lot due to the Note 6 on the plan. Mr. Woods stated that the land transfer would not affect that fact that a variance would be required anyway from the Town's setback requirements for lots containing wetlands- the buildable area remains in the front of the property with or without the property being transferred to Ms. Sindelar.

As there were no further questions, *a motion to approve the Administrative Plan for Virginia Sindelar and Dart Development was made by Mr. Ferreira conditioned upon a notation being placed on the plan in reference to the perpetual easement; that paperwork be provided from the Court that stipulates this plan is acceptable and that Planning Board's approval of this plan does not address whether or not Lot 10 is developable for a residential housing unit. The motion received a second from Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously by the Board*.

Mr. Lemek returned to the meeting.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

Report from Administrative Officer:

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the month of July, Certificates of Completeness were issued for: **Ronald Caponigro & Rene Gagne, Gig & Pulaski Roads, Nasonville** (Administrative – three lots); **Nicole Lavoie, Cherry Farm Road, Harrisville** (Administrative – two lots); **RI Housing & Mortgage Finance Corporation, South Main Street, Reservoir Road & George Eddy Drive, Pascoag** (Administrative – eleven lots); **Michael J. Gouin et al and Thomas Michael Lace et al, Grove Street, Pascoag** (Administrative per Court Decision – two lots); **Edward J. Pienkos, Jr., Family Trust & Margaret M. Pienkos, Family Trust, Camp Dixie & Knibb Roads, Pascoag** (Administrative – two lots); and **Jack Gallagher, Pine Crest #5, Victory Highway, Nasonville** (Minor Land Development – one lot). A plan for **Smith Estates, Hill Road, Pascoag** (Final Major Subdivision – 12 lots) was rejected as incomplete. The following plans were endorsed: **Nicole Lavoie, Cherry Farm Road, Harrisville** (Administrative – two lots) and **Edward J. Pienkos, Jr. Family Trust & Margaret M. Pienkos Family Trust, Camp Dixie & Knibb Roads, Pascoag** (Administrative – two lots);

Planning Board Discussions: Mr. Partington read into the record a letter of resignation from the Chairman Ray Levesque. He noted that Mr. Levesque had contributed a great deal to the Board during his tenure and should be commended for his service. Correspondence will be forwarded to the Town Council requesting a replacement.

Election of Officers: The Board proceeded to hold elections of officers. *Mr. Presbrey nominated **Mr. Partington for Chairman**. The nomination received a second from Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*

*Mr. Presbrey nominated Mr. Ferreira for Vice-Chairman. The nomination received a second from Mr. Desjardins. Mr. Lemek then nominated Mr. Libby for Vice-Chairman. The nomination received a second from Mr. Partington. During discussions, Mr. Ferreira declined his nomination. The nomination of **Mr. Libby for Vice-Chairman** carried unanimously by the Board.*

*Mr. Lupis then nominated **Mr. Ferreira for Secretary**. The nomination received a second from Mr. Partington and carried unanimously by the Board.*

At this time, *a motion to adjourn was then made at 10:07 p.m. by Mr. Lupis, seconded by Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*