

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF OCTOBER 2, 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, Chairman, presiding.

**Members Present:** Jeffrey Partington, Leo Felice, Bruce Ferreira, Michael Lupis, Jim Libby, Christopher Desjardins and Jeff Presbrey.

**Members Absent:** Rick Lemek.

**Others Present:** Walter Kane, Town Solicitor, Tom Kravitz, Town Planner, and Christine Langlois, Recording Secretary.

**II. ATTENDANCE REVIEW:**

The Chairman acknowledged that one member was excused from the meeting.

**III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:**

The **minutes of the Planning Board meeting of September 11, 2006** were read. *A motion to accept the minutes as presented was made by Mr. Presbrey, seconded by Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**IV. CORRESPONDENCE:**

- Zoning Board October 10, 2006 Agenda
- Zoning Board Decision Regarding Mapleville Main Street project
- Two RIDEM Notices of Insignificant Alterations to Wetlands

**V. OLD BUSINESS:**

**Land Development:**

**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, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Partington noted that the application has yet to receive the RIDEM permit required for the Board to make a decision on the project. He suggested, in the best interests of the applicants as well as the public, closing the public hearing and tabling discussions until the DEM permit has been received. Attorney LaPlante felt that the submission process is close to being completed and that there were just a few more items that address the Board's concerns which the applicants wished to present before tabling any discussions. Mr. Partington reiterated the Board's difficulty in approving the project before receipt of the RIDEM permit. Attorney LaPlante then asked for Mr. Gaudette to submit the remaining items, including information addressing the concerns of the buffer area with the Steere Farm Road neighbors.

Mr. Gaudette stated that at the last meeting the Board had requested that the applicant provide information regarding several issues: the tree-line behind the residents of Steere Farm Road and the proposed units of the development, different design constraints – buildings, grading, utilities – and where they are situated, need for the drainage, soil testing and changes in details sheets, which has been provided for the Board’s review. He also noted the submission of RI Landscape Architect stamped plans in regards to the proposed landscaping. Based on previous discussions, he noted that in regards to the proposed buffer, they have provided a “no disturb” buffer easement between the proposed units of the development and the abutting neighbors along Steere Farm Road, with a recorded deed description preventing any disturbance in that area. Notes have been included on the plan that state this area will be staked out prior to construction and inspected by the Town to be sure the area remains undisturbed. He then stated that this final item completed the presentation and asked if the Board had any further questions.

Mr. Libby noted that the proposed driveways for the units located along the buffer area are approximate 12 to 15 feet longer than the other proposed driveways. He suggested moving the units back by the 12 to 15 feet, which still allows for sufficient parking for at least two cars per driveway per unit and would then allow for a much greater buffer area by an additional 10 feet, not affecting the proposed grading. Attorney LaPlante noted that this adjustment would also diminish the space for the backyards of the units, but that they would take it under consideration.

As there were no further questions, *a motion to continue the Preliminary Plan Review and Public Hearing to the November 6, 2006 Planning Board agenda was made by Mr. Felice, seconded by Mr. Libby, and carried with six members (Mr. Felice, Mr. Partington, Mr. Presbrey, Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Libby and Mr. Lupis) in favor and one against (Mr. Ferreira).*

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS:**

### **Land Development:**

**Granite River Village, Callahan School Street, Harrisville; Map 142, Lot 21: Preliminary Major Land Development/Public Hearing:** Attorney Wyatt Brochu, Mr. Michael Coutu, applicant, Mr. Brian Thalmann, of Thalmann Engineering, and Ed Wojcik, Architect, were in attendance to represent the request. Attorney Brochu told the Board that there have not been many changes to the plan since they last reviewed the Master Plan stage. The plan still proposes three buildings, with Buildings Two and Three being strictly residential and Building One being a mixed use of commercial/residential. He noted they were able to work out details with the Sewer Commission for connection to the public sewer system as well as being able to obtain the necessary RIDEM approvals. He then turned the meeting over to Brian Thalmann for an update on the project.

Mr. Thalmann, noting that the Master Plan had been before the Board approximately 18 months ago, stated that the plan has gone through all the permitting stages, and that they

are here to request the Preliminary Plan approval in order to begin construction. For the benefit of the Board and Public, he outlined the permitting process:

- RIDEM submission as a formal wetlands application, later downgraded to an Insignificant Alteration and permit granted
- Curb-cut permit through a Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) from the DOT
- Harrisville Water District letter of approval for public water connection
- Sewer Commission approval for connection to public sewer system, with Buildings Two & Three being constructed and connected; Building Three connection contingent upon the Sewer Commission's upgrade of the local pumping station.

He noted that the Board had requested access be provided to Chapel Street over the old "raceway" of the former Granite Mill and that this access be included when filing the application with RIDEM. He stated that RIDEM has indicated, at this time, that the access be placed on hold, until the site is built out. Once the build-out is complete, the access request should be revisited as a dual application with the Town and the new owners of the condo association. The Board questioned the reason for the delay. Mr. Thalmann said that RIDEM has said it was not necessary for the development at this point in time.

Mr. Presbrey noted a Neenah foundry curb inlet and asked its location on the plan. Mr. Thalmann pointed out its location and explained that with the low points in the roadway, a transition curbing is put in place to meet the cape-cod berm, which allows a full curb width at the inlet. It helps to avoid "ponding" during a heavy rainstorm and allows the inlet to catch up. Mr. Presbrey questioned when the additional crossing would be pursued – after construction of Buildings Two & Three. Mr. Thalmann said that upon completion of the entire project. Mr. Presbrey then asked how the Town could be guaranteed that the crossing would be addressed upon completion of the project. Attorney Brochu said that RIDEM doesn't realize that the crossing was a part of this plan approval. Mr. Kravitz told the Board that they could always request a fee in lieu of the causeway crossing, but that he had no idea now how much that fee would be – that he would have to contact the Tax Assessor and then calculate it. Attorney Brochu added that everyone was in agreement that the crossing should be undertaken.

Mr. Libby questioned the length of time for Phase II to be constructed. Mr. Thalmann stated that the Sewer Commission felt they would have a new, updated pumping station on line within a year. Mr. Libby asked how much infrastructure would be completed in Phase I. Mr. Thalmann stated that it was Mr. Coutu's intention to complete the site work as quickly as possible to alleviate a remobilization. Mr. Libby noted that near the entrance drive, the Callahan School Street sidewalk on the southern side comes in, and curves around the inside the project, but on the northern side it does not. He asked if it would be possible to design the northern side sidewalk in the same manner, especially since the retail is located facing Callahan School Street in that vicinity – to encourage pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Ferreira said he didn't feel comfortable with Building Three being within the 200-foot wetlands buffer. Mr. Thalmann stated that approval was received from RIDEM as well as relief from the Zoning Board. Noting zoning relief from the wetlands setback and height of the proposed buildings, Mr. Partington questioned if there was any other relief. Mr. Thalmann listed the relief that was received from the Zoning Board: Section 11-7.9 Mixed Use Buildings; Section 11-6.1 Table of Dimensional Regulations; Section 11-7.2 Multiple Structures on One Lot; Section 11-7.3.c Lots Containing Wetlands; Section 11-7.9 Mixed Use Buildings (1) Standards and Requirements; (b)(ii) Density Limitations; Section 11-8.2 Aquifer Zoning (4) Lot Dimensional Requirements; Section 11-8.5 Regulation of Flood Hazard Area; (4) Requirements and Restrictions (j) Floodway Setback Line; and Section 11-7.6 Off-Street Parking and Loading (A)(1) Off-Street Parking. The decision was recorded on August 30, 2006.

Mr. Thalmann noted that two of the proposed units will be affordable. Mr. Kravitz added that the developer would be able to sell units for up to 120% of AMI.

At this point, Mr. Partington opened the Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m. for comments from the public. Having no comments or questions from the public, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:41 p.m.

Mr. Presbrey requested an easement be provided in the Final Plan for the proposed crossing access in the future. Attorney Brochu said they would have no problems working with the Town to accomplish the goal of obtaining this access. Mr. Kravitz told the Board that he could work with the Town's engineer to establish a cost to construct the crossing and it could be bonded.

*As there were no further questions from the Board, a motion to approve the Preliminary Minor Land Development Plan for Granite River Village was made by Mr. Presbrey in accordance with RIGL Sections 45-23-30 and 60: the subdivision is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan particularly Chapter V Housing & Affordable Housing Strategy, Implementation Action V.1.a.2 and V.1.f.1; Goal V.3 and Policy V.3.a; Chapter IX Land Use, Goal IX.1, Policy IX.1.a; Goal IX.2, Implementation Actions IX.2.b.1 and IX.2.b.3 and Policy IX.2.d; the land development is consistent with the Town's Zoning Ordinance; as evidenced by the applicant's RIDEM Insignificant Alteration Permit, there will be no negative environmental impacts as a result of the development; the development will not result in the creation of unbuildable lots; and all lots in the development have adequate and permanent physical access to a public street; conditioned upon an easement for the crossing being provided by Final Plan submission; and access construction costs worked out between the Town Planner and the Town Engineer, or the Town Planner to calculate a recreation fee in lieu of the crossing. The motion received a second from Mr. Felice and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**Subdivision:**

**Hill Farm Estates, West Road, Pascoag; Map 72, Lots 11 & 12; Map 73, Lots 1 & 2: Preliminary-Final Minor Rural Residential Compound Review/Public Hearing:** Ms.

Betsy McKenzie, of EMAC Engineers, and Mr. William McIntosh were in attendance to represent the request. Ms. McKenzie began by stating that the owner of the property is attempting to create a quality development by minimizing impervious areas, and maintaining a drainage system that will not require subsurface structures or detention ponds, but allowing for grass swales along the roadway. She noted the property contains approximately 55 acres, with an F-5 zoning designation, which could have easily accommodated 10 house lots; however the owner has chosen to request a five-lot subdivision as a rural residential compound. In a conceptual meeting last spring, she noted that the Board had reviewed the plan and made several comments, which she was prepared to address this evening. The first comment was in regards to the gas easement and whether the utilities should be underground or overhead. The plan has been revised to show the utilities overhead; however they have had discussions with Duke Energy who has agreed to encasement to allow for underground placement. She requested that the Board allow the developer permission to place the utilities underground as a condition of approval. She pointed out that the Board's materials include the approval from Duke Energy as well as the site suitability approval from the state on all five lots. The soils perc'd very easily – the water table general deep – percolation rates ranging from 10-15 minutes per inch, which also aids in drainage. She added that the materials also contained an approval letter from RIDEM in regards to the wetlands; their one comment was to locate a limit of disturbance on the plans, which has been added to the plan as well a soil erosion and sediment control plan around the complete perimeter of the areas being disturbed.

In regards to lighting, she stated the only lighting proposed, illustrated on the landscaping plan, is two small lamps at the entranceway. In regards to frontage of Lot 2, she stated the conceptual plan displayed a “pork chop shaped” lot with no frontage, with a long straight driveway. Comments from the Board requested providing frontage for Lot 2, which is illustrated on the preliminary plan.

One change on the plans, she noted, was there are no culverts crossing underneath the roadway and check dams have been added every 50 feet. The slope of the swales, the velocity on bare soil (2 feet per second - permissible velocity for a swale at 5% with established vegetation on these soils were 5 feet per second), and the addition of the check dams for a 25-year storm with about 10 cfs provides a flow velocity of 2.5 feet per second. Once the swales are established, the check dams will make sure that there is no erosion during construction and the establishment of vegetation will bring the 25-year peak flows down below erosion velocities.

She stated that another comment from the Board was in regards to the width of the proposed driveways and access for emergency vehicles. The driveways have been regraded, to 20 feet in width, and the radius and turnaround areas adjusted to accommodate emergency vehicles access. The slopes have been graded not to exceed 8% and the turnarounds are graded to not exceed 4%.

Ms. McKenzie then addressed the comments from the DPW:

1. Have any soil suitability for ISDS and/or well tests been completed, verified and included in the application? *RIDEM ISDS Site Suitability received and approved.*
2. Has a wetland edge verification or wetlands alteration permit been issued by RIDEM for the subject parcel and forwarded to the Planning Board? *RIDEM Determination of Non-Jurisdiction received and approved. No work will take place in the wetlands, nor the wetlands buffers.*
3. The applicant shall be required to provide a letter of consent from Duke Energy for premises over the natural gas easement with the proposed road. As a recommendation, access gates should also be provided at the crossing of gas easement with the subdivision road to prevent illegal access to abutting properties. *Letter of consent received from Duke Energy. She stated that she believed Duke Energy would require the installation of access gates as a condition of their approval.*
4. The drainage impact report and plan does not include any provisions for soil erosion, sedimentation control and definition of the "limits of disturbance" as an area is not provided. The drainage design must conform to the subdivision regulation requirements. *Comment 4 has been addressed with various details and revisions. Additional details would have been provided if more than four lots were proposed. They are using hay bales, silt fences and check dams during construction.*
5. The drainage report refers to check dams to be installed within the roadside drainage ditches. No callout or detail is provided on the plan set for the inclusion or spacing of check dams. Given the slope of the road and soil conditions, check dams shall be required to reduce runoff velocities within the roadside ditches, therefore minimizing erosion potential. *Comment 5 has not been addressed. A detail of the Check Dam shall be provided on the recorded plan set. She stated that they would be happy to provide the detail on the plan. She referenced a note Sheet 4 of Drainage that "proposed riprap check dams to be place every 50 feet along drainage swales – use 6 to 12 inch diameter riprap. The check dams to span full width of swale 12 to 24 inches in height at low point in center of swale and extend 3 to 6 feet along access of swale.*
6. After review of the proposed roadway, the proposed drainage swales on each side of the roadway discharge directly onto Lots 3 & 4 in the form of channel flow. How will this water be controlled at the point of discharge? Additional grading within the Lots 3 & 4 is required to prevent nuisance drainage problems onto those properties. *Comment 6 has not been addressed and additional grading and storm water controls may be required on Lots 3 & 4 to control storm water runoff from the roadside drainage ditches, unless demonstrated otherwise. She said that upon reviewing the peak flows emanating from both roadside swales, discharging into a mature, wooded forest floor and with a check dam located at the point of flare-out for each of these ditches, her professional opinion is that additional work is not necessary. She offered to provide additional information on the peak flows for a 2-year, 5-year or 25-year storm, if the Board wishes.*

7. Underground utilities, i.e. electric, telephone and cable are not depicted on the plan view or the cross section detail in accordance with the subdivision regulations. *Underground utilities have been added to the plan view, but HOWEVER are not shown in the detail of the typical cross section. She stated that was correct and if the Board wished to see these details, she would add them to the plan. Electric, telephone and cable will all be underground. There will be no water in the street because there will be individual wells for each lot.*
8. Site lighting is not shown on the plan view and no details are provided. *Comment 8 has not been addressed. Should period lighting be required, details approved by the local utility company shall be submitted. At a MINIMUM a street light shall be required at the intersection of West Road and the proposed subdivision street. She noted that the landscape plan displays a cobblestone roll strip with either side having curbstone walls with posts that have lighting with hoods to reduce glare and light pollution. Mr. Felice suggested that this particular area is extremely dark at night and suggested that the developer consider some type of lighting on the roadway, maybe in the vicinity of each driveway. Mr. Presbrey pointed out that a street light must be provided at the intersection and display the light location on the plan.*
9. A stop sign is required at the terminus with West Road and a street name sign in accordance with new street sign design standard shall be called out on the plan view. *Comment 9 – may be bonded upon approval of the Director of Public Works. Mr. Presbrey requested that the stop sign be shown on the plan.*
10. A paved apron, 10-ft length minimum is required at the terminus with West Road. The 10-ft. apron shall be paved with 2-inches of modified class I-1 binder bituminous pavement and 2-inches of class I-1 top course bituminous pavement. *Comment 10 has NOT BEEN addressed, called out or detailed on the plan set. She said that this was something that could be addressed by the Director of Public Works. Mr. Presbrey requested that the apron be shown on the plan.*
11. Many details are missing that prevent a complete review of this submission. Proposed grading for the subdivision lots is vague, limits of disturbance shall be shown and a soil erosion/sediment control plan with detail(s) shall be provided. *Comment 11 has been addressed. She stated that her professional opinion is that this is a simple subdivision and does not warrant that extensive a presentation.*
12. After review of the site in the field, a roadway culvert shall be required at Sta. 1+25 +/- to allow continued flow of surface water from West Road to flow into the existing culvert, also not shown, on West Road near the northeasterly property corner. *A culvert has been shown on the plan view, but NO information on pipe size or material has been indicated on the plans set or profile. She stated that the last time she was on the property, she located a culvert in place, larger than what it's feeding the drainage to, and that she could provide this information on the plans if the Board so desired.*
13. No access is provided to the open space area located towards the rear of parcels 2, 3 and 4. It is recommended that the Open Space parcel not be land-locked and access be provided between lots 3 and 4. *Comment 13 has NOT BEEN addressed. She outlined the location of the open space in comparison to the proposed lots for*

*the benefit of the Board and public. She asked the Board if they would like to discuss the location for access as well as ownership. Mr. Partington said that it would be discussed later.*

14. A landscape plan is not included in the plan set with locations, details and notes stamped by a registered landscape architect. *Comment 14 has been addressed.*

Mr. Ferreira stated that even though Ms. McKenzie considers this a “simple subdivision”, the Board requires all necessary details on the plan to ensure the safety of current and future residents. Mr. Libby pointed out that if the Planner conducts an inspection of the property during construction and he notes that a check dam is not located in a particular area, the developer could say that the check dam was not displayed on the plan so he doesn’t have to construct it. Mr. Ferreira also suggested that she investigate the area where West Road and the proposed subdivision roadway meet as it has historically been a collection area for drainage. Ms. McKenzie noted that the proposed roadway contains a high point approximately 200 feet in from West Road so that water should not be flowing in from West Road. Mr. Libby also noted that some of the water runoff in the spring is much more intense than she anticipates and that the proposed roadway swale will bring the water straight down to Lot 3; and suggested that she address the concerns of the DPW. Mr. Ferreira also suggested the consideration of lighting along the proposed roadway.

Mr. Libby further added that the open space should have some sort of easements provided for the residents of the compound. Ms. McKenzie pointed out several possible access locations: near the intersection with West Road, along the north property line; or at the end of the proposed road. Mr. Presbrey noted that the open space access is proposed to be 40 feet, but felt that 20 feet is sufficient. The Board discussed possible access locations.

Mr. Presbrey suggested submitting a waiver from the underground utilities should the application not receive approval from Duke Energy to place the utilities underground in the gas easement location, although the developer has stated that they want to have underground utilities. Mr. McIntosh stated that the representative from Duke Energy had expressed his opinion that the utilities should be underground. Mr. Partington reiterated that the Board would need the letter of approval from Duke Energy. Mr. Presbrey also noted that the application would have grass swales along the roadway and asked for the grass swales to be added to the cross sections on the plan.

Mr. Kravitz told the Board that based upon the comments from the applicant’s representative, it was their decision whether they would grant condition approval of the preliminary plan, but not an approval of the final plan. He suggested deferring the final approval to him as the Administrative Officer. He noted that the Pascoag Utility District has not responded back as to the electrical service. He stated that the Pascoag Fire Chief has the ability to ask for a means of fire protection for the development, sometimes in the form of underground water storage tanks.

Mr. Partington then opened the Public Hearing at 8:30 p.m.

Robert Cody, of 1085 Hill Road, stated that his property immediately abuts the subdivision and asked if there were any setbacks for the roadway from the property line. He also asked that the Board consider not requiring paving of the proposed roadway and lighting. Mr. Felice told him that the roadway was not going to be paved as a rural residential compound is generally a graveled roadway.

Dennis Lavalley, of 255 West Road, stated that the developer had purchased a parcel on West Road in order to gain access to his land in the rear. He said that Mr. McIntosh had told him that he was looking to build one house for himself and his wife. Now there are several houses going in. His second concern was with drainage in the area. He told the Board that on June 7 there was a heavy rain storm and when he came home from work he had a flood in his basement. He has lived there for 19 years and never had water in his basement. He added that the DPW had given Mr. McIntosh permission to install a culvert underneath his proposed roadway that allows the water to wash onto his property and into his basement. He asked if the property that was purchased conforms to current zoning codes as part of the property was taken for access to this proposed subdivision. He voiced concerns with the well situation and leach field situation as their property abuts almost every one of the lots. Mr. Partington told him that the rural residential compound will allow only five lots, with a perpetual open space, so nothing else will be built beyond the five houses. In regards to the intersection, Mr. Partington pointed out that the landscape plan illustrates lighting at the entrance to help the visibility. The site distances (230 and 340) listed are adequate for the development. In regards to the zoning, Mr. Partington explained that the house, by itself, on West Road had sufficient frontage. With the construction of a roadway, the original house becomes part of the rural residential compound and would access through the new roadway.

Peter Hoistman, of 230 West Road, stated that the culvert drains directly onto his property and has concerns with excess water being on his property. Mr. Partington stated that he believed the applicant is aware of the drainage issues.

Tom Daigle, of 445 West Road, said that his property abuts proposed Lots 1 & 2, that they have horses that graze in their fields and were concerned with water draining from the development into the fields and washing out the fields. He wanted to know if the Town is going to prevent this from happening. He stated that he doesn't have a problem with development as long as everyone is protected. He asked if the residents would be meeting with the gas company also and whether there were any restrictions with blasting. Mr. Felice, noting experience with blasting, told him that every precaution is taken prior to blasting (seismic testing, photography) but they are especially cautious where there are gas lines.

Mary Elliott, of 345 West Road, stated that she also has had water in her basement. She questioned whether the wells and the aquifer in the area would be affected by this development. Mr. Partington told her that first, the development would only require 4

wells, which is not a significant amount, and second, when wells are dug there is a certain amount of water required from a well before it is approved. The aquifer should also be fine.

As there were no further questions, the public hearing closed at 9:01 p.m.

The Board felt that more information was needed before they could render a decision. *A motion to table a decision on the Preliminary or Final Plan to the November 6, 2006 was made by Mr. Presbrey. The motion received a second from Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**Land Development:**

**Harrisville Village, Steere Farm Road & Mowry Street, Harrisville: Map 160, Lot 34: Final Major Plan Review:** Mr. Mark Bard and Mr. Victor Bevilacqua were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Bard told the Board that they were seeking Final Plan approval for Harrisville Village, having submitted materials to the Planning Department earlier. He noted several items missing from the submission and that he wished to address them this evening. The first item he addressed was a request from the Town Solicitor to *adjust the covenants for the condo documentation* to reflect that “at no time shall the Town be expected to maintain or own said roads, utilities, community center or other infrastructures”. He noted that the change had been made, and Mr. Kane agreed that the change was correct. The second item he addressed was the *location of the proposed affordable units within the development*. He handed out to the Board a layout of the project, designating the location for the affordable units (Bldg #1-2 units; Bldg #4-2 units; Bldg #5-1 unit; Bldg #6-1 unit; Bldg #7-1 unit; Bldg #8-1 unit; Bldg #9-1 unit; Bldg #10-1 unit; Bldg #11-1 unit; Bldg #13-1 unit; Bldg #16-1 unit). Mr. Kane voiced concern with the development constructing only the market rate units, should the real estate market slow down and told the Board members that they should tie him into a schedule for construction of the affordable units as the development progresses. He suggested for every five certificates of occupancy received, one must be affordable. Mr. Kravitz added that it was important that the affordable units are spread throughout the development.

Mr. Bard addressed the next item, which was the recreation fee in lieu of the walking paths in the amount of \$78,964. He requested the Board consider allowing him to break the recreation fee into four payments to the Town, maybe on a quarterly basis. Mr. Partington asked for the timeframe of the payments. Mr. Bard stated that the schedule depended upon the market; however he said that they were looking at a two-year to two-and-a-half year period. He suggested for every 15 certificates of occupancy issued, a quarterly payment would be made to the Town. Mr. Kane suggested that the Board not release the currently held \$200,000 performance bond until all the quarterly payments have been made. Mr. Bard offered to also leave the \$101,456 letter of credit to cover the walking paths and the sidewalks on Mowry Street in place as proof for the quarterly payments. Mr. Kane suggested a written agreement stating that the condition of the approval is that the infrastructure bond will not be released until the recreation fee

payment has been satisfied. Mr. Partington further requested a letter stating when each payment would be received (upon the issuance of every 15<sup>th</sup> certificate of occupancy). Mr. Kane requested that the developer draft this letter and he would review it. Mr. Kane reminded Mr. Bard that the Sewer Commission had requested a modification to the as-built drawings that were submitted. Mr. Bard said he would take care of it. Mr. Kane also requested verification of the bonding company who issued the \$200,000 performance bond for Harrisville Village.

*As there were no further questions from the Board, a motion to grant Final Plan approval of Harrisville Village was made by Mr. Libby based upon the applicant's disbursing the affordable housing components as presented on the handout to the Board; the performance bond and letter of credit will remain in affect until the quarterly recreation fee has been paid, at each 15<sup>th</sup> closing; and to set the performance bond fee at \$200,000 – the inspection fee at \$4,000 – the maintenance fee at \$10,000 and the recreation fee (in lieu of walking paths) at \$78,964. The motion received a second from Mr. Lupis and carried unanimously by the Board.*

## **VII. OTHER BUSINESS:**

### **Report from Administrative Officer:**

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the month of September, Certificates of Completeness were issued for: **Granite River Village, Callahan School Street, Harrisville** (Preliminary Land Development – 12 units), **Hill Farm Estates, West Road, Pascoag** (Preliminary-Final Minor RRC – 5 lots); **Harrisville Village, Steere Farm Road & Mowry Street, Harrisville** (Final Major Land Development) and **George Fenley III & Daniel Greene, Gazza Road, Mapleville** (Administrative – 2 lots). There were no plans rejected as incomplete. The following plans were endorsed: **Smith Estates, Hill Road, Pascoag** (Final Major Subdivision – eleven lots) and **George Fenley III & Daniel Greene, Gazza Road, Mapleville** (Administrative – 2 lots).

**Planning Board Discussions:** There was nothing further to discuss.

*A motion to adjourn was then made at 9:32 p.m. by Mr. Ferreira, seconded by Mr. Felice and carried unanimously by the Board.*