



City Of Attleboro, Massachusetts

PLANNING BOARD

GOVERNMENT CENTER, 77 PARK STREET
ATTLEBORO, MASSACHUSETTS 02703
TEL 508.223.2222 FAX 508.222.3046

MINUTES

MARCH 8, 2021

In accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts General Laws Ch. 40A and Ch. 41, as amended, the Planning Board held public hearings on Monday, March 8, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. remotely via Zoom, relative to the following :

Planning Board Members Present: Chairman Paul Danesi, Vice Chairman Jason Gittle, Shannon Bénay, Jim Lewis, Sean McNamara, and Thom Morin

Planning Board Members Absent: Fred Uriot

The Board heard the application of W.B. Construction & Development, Inc. for the proposed eighteen (18) lot definitive subdivision plan entitled "BRIGHAM HILL ESTATES, PHASE IV," located on a portion of Brigham Hill Road and Lewis Lane, more specifically Assessor's plat #218, lot #6, and Assessor's plat #219, lot #3, located in the Single Residence-D zoning district, engineered by James R. Borrebach, R.P.E. of OHI Engineering, Inc., 44 Wood Avenue, Mansfield, MA 02048.

Jim Lewis recused himself from the discussion.

Speaking in favor of the application was Bill Blais of OHI Engineering who stated that a stormwater peer review work session had been held and that Horsley Witten Group determined that they had addressed all of the concerns raised. He noted that three waivers have been requested - (1) to allow sidewalk on only one side of Duffy Drive, (2) to eliminate the fire alarm box, as there are two located in Phases I and II within 1,600 feet, and (3) to allow for underground utilities to match the prior phases.

Senior Land Use Planner Stephanie Davies noted that there is one outstanding issue, which is the location of a cluster mailbox. She noted that prior phases were not required to install them, but that she anticipates the Postal Service will require one now.

Mr. Ayrassian suggested that the applicant could meet with staff in advance of a Subdivision Committee meeting for the project to work out the optimal location for a cluster mailbox.

Chairman Paul Danesi suggested that it could be requested of the Postal Service that the design remain consistent with prior phases and not have a cluster mailbox.

Mr. Ayrassian agreed that the Postal Service could be queried in writing, but he stated that he doubted they would agree, as similarly the Stone Field Estates subdivision was required to have cluster mailboxes for recent phases, despite the earlier phase not having them.

Speaking in favor was Bill Ward of W.B. Construction and Development who stated that there are approximately 75 houses in Brigham Hill Estates now with individual wood mailboxes and that he would like to keep it that way for this phase, as people prefer it. He noted, however, that if it is required by the Postal Service, it can be accommodated. He asked whether there are any specifications on how they should be designed.

Mr. Ayrassian agreed that the public prefers individual mailboxes, but noted that in the most recently approved subdivisions, the Post Office won't deliver mail to individual boxes and are requiring clusters. He noted that it is a requirement mandated by the federal government, not the City. He stated that staff have developed a list of criteria based on past practices that are proposed to be added to the Rules and Regulations soon, to help guide developers.

Mr. Ward stated his understanding that the Post Office has some standard details on how they would like to see them and noted that he had an issue at another subdivision where residents ended up blocking the road while trying to access the cluster mail box.

The Board agreed to hold a Subdivision Committee meeting on March 16th at 5:30 p.m. via Zoom to discuss Pike Estates and Brigham Hill Estates, Phase IV.

There being no one else to speak, the public hearing was continued.

The Board heard the application of One Thirty One Pleasant St, LLC for the proposed twenty (20) lot definitive subdivision plan entitled "STONE FIELD ESTATES III," located at 553 Oak Hill Avenue, more specifically Assessor's plat #170, lot #1A, located in the Single Residence-D zoning district, engineered by John C. Spink, R.P.E. of Spink Design, 59 Clay Street, Middleborough, MA 02346.

Speaking in favor of the application was Bob Catenacci of One Thirty One Pleasant St, LLC who stated that they have made some alterations to the plans, adjusting several driveways and moving the cluster mailboxes, as requested by staff. He stated that Public Works has recommended that a street light be installed at the intersection of Saveena Drive and Mary Rocha Way, which National Grid had original moved to a location close to 100-feet away in Phase II. He stated that they are finalizing the revisions and intend to submit for presenting at the next meeting.

Mr. Ayrassian asked whether any other revisions are pending.

Mr. Catenacci noted that the peer reviewer is also looking at several minor changes to the ponds.

Mr. Ayrassian noted his recollection that Public Works had concerns about the stormwater basin located in Phase III that serves Phase II.

Ms. Davies stated that she spoke with Conservation Agent Nick Wyllie and explained that the basins for Phase II and Phase III are very close to each other and it was unclear whether the grading was going to tie-in properly. She noted that there was also the potential for the flooding of existing lots in Phase II as a result of the design. She suggested that she can follow-up with Public Works and Horsley Witten Group to obtain direction in writing. She noted that prior discussions had centered around whether the two basins should be combined into one larger basin.

Jim Lewis noted that it's been close to a year since the Board has discussed this subdivision in any detail. He stated that he will want a plan up before them while discussing the ponds and that he would like the project's engineer, John Spink, to explain in layman's terms how they will work and the anticipated cost to maintain them.

Ms. Davies noted that a revised plan has yet to be submitted to the Board or presented to the public.

Mr. Ayrassian suggested that this project be omitted from the Subdivision Committee discussions on the 16th. He asked that fully revised plans be submitted no later than the end of the day on Tuesday, March 16th, so the Board has time to review the plans before they are presented on the 22nd.

Mr. Catenacci agreed. He noted his recollection that the Board had some questions relative to matters related to the Phase II subdivision.

Mr. Ayrassian replied that Mr. Catenacci's correspondence items on those matters just came in this afternoon and the staff and Board have not had time to thoroughly review them.

Mr. Catenacci noted his understanding that Public Works had wanted to see how the stormwater system and roadways were in the spring before issuing a release of funds, but that there has still been water in the system, so the review is still pending.

Ms. Davies directed Mr. Catenacci to submit a request for a partial release of funds in the standard manner, which can then be forwarded to Public Works, triggering a site visit and formal recommendation to the Board.

There being no one else to speak, the public hearing was continued.

The Board heard the application of Pike Avenue Acquisitions, LLC, Robert Heroux, and Erin Pilling for the proposed forty-nine (49) lot definitive subdivision plan entitled "PIKE ESTATES," located at 419 & 439 Pike Avenue, more specifically Assessor's plat #130, lot #81, and plat #123, lot #23, located in the Single Residence-D zoning district, engineered by Daniel R. Campbell, R.P.E. of Level Design Group, 249 South Street, Unit 1, Plainville, MA 02762.

Speaking in favor of the application was attorney Edward Casey who stated that he had submitted a letter requesting a waiver to allow the subdivision to be designed with a boulevard entry. He stated that it appears to be the only feasible option and that the more the design is scrutinized, the more favorable it appears. He stated that the most recent report from the traffic peer reviewer confirmed the Police Chief's comments in opposition to the use of stop signs on Pike Avenue. He stated that overall, he found the report favorable and that he intends to sit in on the Subdivision Committee meeting on the 16th to listen to the Board's discussion of details for the subdivision.

Jim Lewis noted in respect to the waiver request, he felt that the waiver was relative to eliminating the second means of access, due to the dead-end street regulations. He asked whether a second waiver specific to that is required.

Mr. Casey noted that his letter referenced Section 6.2(E), which describes the two means of access of a through street needing to be separated by a minimum of 300-feet. He stated that the waiver granting boulevard entry would result in the two means of entry being separated by only 15-feet, which he felt would overcome the issue.

Jim Lewis noted that 6.1(J) contains the section on dead end streets and suggested that a waiver be requested on that regulation, as well.

Paul Danesi asked whether the boulevard design saves more trees, reduces the amount of impervious, or benefits the open space configuration.

Mr. Casey replied in the affirmative.

Paul Danesi stated that he has reviewed the use of boulevards in other locations throughout the state and found there is a great precedent for beautiful work being accomplished using such designs. He asked whether the traffic peer reviewer and Police Chief are in favor of the boulevard design.

Mr. Ayrassian replied that the Police Chief was in favor of the boulevard design, but did not want stop signs on Pike Avenue. He stated that he has yet to review GPI's most recent traffic review report, but will go over it in advance of the Subdivision Committee meeting. He stated that he will also review the question relative to the subdivision waivers and will be prepared to make a recommendation to the full Board on the 22nd. He stated at that time, the applicant could be directed to submit a full set of revised plans.

Paul Danesi sought clarification on the site line issues, when looking from the proposed roadway out onto Pike Avenue.

Speaking in favor of the application was Dan Campbell of Level Design Group who stated that they are intending to maintain the previously dictated sight line easement, as a result of the area's topography. He stated that for that reason, they've proposed a small basin in the area, to ensure that it is always maintained. He stated that from GPI's report, they advised reevaluating the sight line to the north, due to the slight relocation of the roadway. He stated their intent for their traffic study engineer, McMann, to formerly respond to this comment.

Ms. Davies stated that addresses the view to the left, but pointed out Jim Lewis's concern with the view when looking to the right, due to the small hill in that direction.

Mr. Campbell replied that one of the additions to the site plan is installing sidewalks along the radii to create a place for school children to stand when awaiting the bus. He stated that this design cuts down the grade a bit.

Mr. Ayrassian affirmed that he had requested sidewalks on both of the curve radii for that purpose.

Mr. Campbell outlined other revisions, including the proposed stop lines for the new intersection per the Police Department's specifications, as well as splitting the primary island for the boulevard into three slices to allow driveway access to the bordering houses. He stated that currently, they are proposing 22-foot gaps, but that they could easily be made as small as 15-feet, depending upon the Board's preference. He noted that one driveway has also been shifted further from the proposed cluster mailbox to prevent any conflicts. He stated that they are proposing for the second island to be mulched and the first maintained with landscaping and irrigation. He stated that if the Board accepts the boulevard design, he will put together a full landscaping plan. He noted that one of the outstanding issues will be the location of street lights, which they are working with Public Works to determine.

Mr. Ayrassian stated his preference to see the boulevard island designed to be 20-feet long and 15-feet wide. He noted that the travel lanes between the small islands seem excessive, and he suggested reducing them to at least 18-feet wide.

Mr. Campbell suggested a reduction to 15-feet, as they are not meant for emergency vehicles and should just accommodate the minimum needed for cars accessing the homes.

Mr. Ayrassian advised Mr. Campbell to look at the design from the consumer's standpoint and ensure a smooth transition in and out of the driveways.

Jim Lewis asked what the issue with the 22-foot travel lane width is from a planning standpoint.

Mr. Ayrassian replied that a larger width gives the driver a lot of leeway to make the turn towards Paisley Way to exit. He stated that pinching that width down forces the driver to follow a straighter path out and a standard 90-degree turn, rather than merging into the traffic at a curve.

Jim Lewis sought to confirm that the design is meant to slow those drivers down and make the movement into multiple steps.

Mr. Ayrassian stated that the speed isn't necessarily the concern, but rather the latitude the driver has when moving. He stated that the goal is to make the movements more predictable for other drivers on the boulevard.

Mr. Campbell agreed with Mr. Ayrassian and stated that 22-feet gives a lot of latitude, 18-feet is the minimum for a firetruck, and 15-feet is the minimum width for a commercial driveway. He noted that discussion was previously had as to why the island protrudes out and explained that the design forces emergency vehicles to pull a little further forward, which allows them to accomplish a U-turn without having to drive around the block. He noted that GPI had requested a turning radius for that portion of the design, which will be provided.

Paul Danesi asked why vertical granite is proposed on the first island rather than sloped granite curbing.

Mr. Campbell replied that it provides a bit more of a visual barrier, so can better control traffic as it enters and exits Pike Avenue. He stated that this better protects the proposed landscaping, as drivers will actively avoid it. He stated that sloped granite is proposed on the second island as it transitions into the neighborhood, so an emergency vehicle can hop the curb if it needs to by-pass an obstruction, and that Cape Cod berm is proposed everywhere else.

Paul Danesi questioned what would happen if the obstruction was towards the front of the boulevard.

Mr. Campbell replied that the travel lanes on the boulevard are 22-feet wide, which will allow two cars to pass one another, if necessary.

Mr. Ayrassian noted that if the Board would prefer all sloped facing curbing along the islands, he wouldn't oppose such a design.

Paul Danesi stated his intent to investigate how the matter is handled in other boulevard designs.

Jim Lewis suggested the matter be discussed further at the Subdivision Committee meeting, as he felt there are pros and cons to both approaches.

Paul Danesi questioned the fate of the property that was originally obtained to design a second entrance to the subdivision, previously dubbed Azalea Drive.

Mr. Campbell stated that he was unsure of its future.

There being no one else to speak, the public hearing was continued.

The Board held a business meeting.

The Board discussed the application of John J. & Mary F. Donovan to extend Rambler Road 2-5 feet, as shown on the street extension plan entitled "RAMBLER ROAD EXTENSION," engineered by Daniel R. Campbell, R.P.E. of Level Design Group, 249 South Street, Unit 1, Plainville, MA 02762, dated March 1, 2018, revised through October 28, 2019. The subject premises are located on Assessor's plat #123, Lot #8 in the Single Residence-D zoning district.

The Board tabled the matter.

The Board reviewed the Form A plan submitted by Solaris Homes for 728, 734, and 750 Pleasant Street.

Ms. Davies stated that the property in question is a large parcel off of Pleasant Street and that Parcels A, B, C, and D are slated to be created with frontage on Pleasant Street.

Jim Lewis questioned where the frontage is located for the remaining parcel the others are being carved from.

Speaking was John DesVergnes who stated that Parcel A will create a 20,000 square foot lot for the existing house that currently sits on an 11.5 acre lot. He stated that Parcel B is a 20,000 square foot lot being carved from an existing 5.5 acre lot. He stated that Parcel C is proposed to be a 20,000 square foot lot containing an existing house that currently sits on 7.5 acres. He stated that Parcel D will make another conforming house lot out of a 7.5 acre parcel.

Jim Lewis asked what frontage remains for the parcel that "A" is being carved out of. He stated that it appears the back portion of the lot should be labeled "not a buildable lot".

Mr. DesVergnes explained that they intend to do further subdivisions in the future that will change the lot lines and make it buildable.

Jim Lewis asked who owns which parcels.

Mr. DesVergnes replied that the current owner is Haskell Bus and Farms, LLC and that he is the applicant who is purchasing the land from them.

Mr. Ayrassian queried the distance between Parcels B and C.

Mr. DesVergnes replied that he didn't know.

Mr. Ayrassian suggested that the Board table the matter so the applicant can revise the plan to label the non-buildable parcel and add the frontage distances.

Mr. DesVergnes requested an extension of time for the application to March 24th.

Jim Lewis made a motion to grant an extension of time to March 24, 2021. Jason Gittle seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

Chairman Danesi requested that Mr. DesVergnes attempt to develop the lots while maintaining as many existing trees as possible.

Mr. DesVergnes noted that it can be difficult to install septic systems and foundations without clearing trees, but that he will endeavor to maintain as many of the trees as possible.

The Board reviewed the Form A plan submitted by W.B. Construction & Development, Inc. for Pass Farm Road.

Ms. Davies explained that the application seeks to adjust the corner lot line for Parcel 310A, swapping it with a piece from Parcel 311A. She stated that there will be no resulting change in the frontage of either lot, so staff recommends approval.

Chairman Danesi sought to confirm that Parcel 311A is a buildable lot.

Ms. Davies answered yes, as it has adequate frontage and lot width on Slater Street, despite the driveway being off of Pass Farm Road.

Jason Gittle made a motion to approve the Form A plan for Pass Farm Road. Sean McNamara seconded the motion and all voted in favor with the exception of Jim Lewis, who recused himself.

The Board heard the appointment to speak of City Solicitor Cindy Amara.

Ms. Amara stated that the subdivisions the Board is seeking to perform on are long overdue and notice of the intent to perform was provided back in January. She noted that all of the letters were delivered, however the Post Office failed to fill out the certified mailing forms correctly. She noted that this is not necessarily an issue, as similar notice was appropriately provided about a year prior. She stated that the next steps involve determining the cost to complete the remaining work for each subdivision, and reviewing the individual security contracts for the submission of invoices.

Ms. Davies clarified that that the Board will need to vote to perform on each subdivision first.

Paul Danesi asked whether the City is accepting any liability in performing on the bonds.

Ms. Amara replied only if the remaining work is not performed correctly.

Paul Danesi asked who is liable relative to deficiencies from the original work done by the developers in years prior.

Ms. Amara noted that performing on the bond seeks the funds to complete the work that hasn't been done, but doesn't address past mistakes. She stated that there will be no liability to the City, as they didn't make the construction mistakes.

Ms. Davies asked the course of action if there are insufficient funds remaining to complete the work.

Ms. Amara stated that the City will have to do what they can with the remaining funds and then raise alternate funds to complete any outstanding work. She stated that the City could try to go after the developer, but stated that it is unlikely there would be success in obtaining additional funds.

Mr. Ayrassian stated that staff will set up a meeting with the City Auditor and Treasurer to get the accounting side of things squared away. He stated his assumption that the projects will likely have to go out to bid, as he didn't expect that Public Works would be capable of doing the work.

Ms. Amara stated that she is happy to coordinate with the bond companies and other parties, as necessary. She asked whether the Board is aware that they are in the situation of having insufficient security funds for many of the subdivisions.

Ms. Davies stated that there are likely at least one or two subdivisions that will have insufficient funds. She stated that due to the age of the subdivisions, there will likely also be additional repair work required to repair binder that has been exposed to the elements for many years.

Ms. Amara stated that the City can pick and choose what items to complete with the remaining security funds to get the most mileage out of it. She stated that in performing on the bonds, the City is essentially standing in the shoes of the applicant, as they are no longer part of the process.

Paul Danesi asked whether the City could end up in court if there is a challenge to performing on the security.

Ms. Amara stated that she couldn't predict whether a developer will bring a suit, but she can't foresee a clear legal means forward in doing so. She stated that she expects the residents will likely be grateful to see the work completed. She stated the City has given the proper legal notice and is fulfilling the tenants of the various forms of security. She noted that a portion of the liability will be on the bonding agency to properly release the funds for the work to be completed. She stated that in her experience, bond companies tend to be quick to respond and take matters seriously.

The Board reviewed the Notice from Kevin S. Freytag, Esq. of Toomey & Lehane, LLP, dated January 15, 2021, to Kevin J. Murphy of KJM Construction, Inc. of Default and Demand to Complete Work at River's Edge.

Jason Gittle made a motion to perform on the subdivision security for the "RIVER'S EDGE" subdivision. Sean McNamara seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

The Board reviewed the Notice from Kevin S. Freytag, Esq. of Toomey & Lehane, LLP, dated January 15, 2021, to Trustee David M. Wetterhahn of Milosh Realty Trust of Default and Demand to Complete Work at Milosh Acres.

Ms. Davies reminded the Board that at the last meeting, Andrews Survey and Engineering had appeared and informed the Board they were in the process of completing the site survey and street acceptance plans. She noted that she had also been assured of that over a year ago, without results.

Mr. Ayrassian recommended the Board vote to act on the security and that they can vote to retract the decision later if the engineer completes the outstanding work.

Jason Gittle made a motion to perform on the subdivision security for the "MILOSH ACRES" subdivision. Sean McNamara seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

The Board reviewed the Notice from Kevin S. Freytag, Esq. of Toomey & Lehane, LLP, dated January 15, 2021, to President Peter J. Deibel and Treasurer Kevin M. Joyce of Cedar Ridge Developers, Inc. of Default and Demand to Complete Work at Highland Estates .

Jason Gittle made a motion to perform on the subdivision security for the "HIGHLAND ESTATES" subdivision. Sean McNamara seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

The Board reviewed the Notices from Kevin S. Freytag, Esq. of Toomey & Lehane, LLP, dated January 15, 2021, to John E. Case, III of Case Development, LLC of Default and Demand to Complete Work at Rhodes Street Extension, Hillcrest Avenue Extension I, Hillcrest Avenue Extension II, and Bradford Estates .

Jim Lewis recused himself from the discussions.

Ms. Davies reminded the Board that they had received a letter from John Case giving an update on the construction status of each subdivision, but no actual progress appears to have been made in quite some time.

Speaking was John Case III who summarized the status of each project. He stated that Hillcrest I and Hillcrest II are all one street that is already paved. He stated that they just need to complete the as-built plans and street acceptance plans, as well as seal some seams on the roadway. He stated that Rhodes Street Extension needs a top coat and some bounds, which he can begin work on in April or May, in addition to the street acceptance materials. He stated that Bradford Estates just needs some repairs and to prepare the street acceptance. He stated that his intent is to hire a crew to get all of the work done at once when the asphalt plants open. He stated that he just finished Simpson Avenue Extension and has a few other subdivisions that he is just wrapping up.

Mr. Ayrassian asked whether Mr. Case is requesting that the Board not perform on the bonds for each development, as they are currently prepared to do.

Mr. Case stated that he is requesting the Board give him time for the weather to break so that he can complete the work himself.

Ms. Davies asked what is different about these subdivisions from any of the others on the list.

Mr. Case stated that he is here and ready to work with the Board to do the work, so the City doesn't have to.

Mr. Ayrassian stated that a specific extension date is required.

Mr. Case replied that he would like an extension for each subdivision to May 31st, when the paving can be guaranteed to be done.

Sean McNamara asked when the latest extension granted had expired for each.

Ms. Davies stated that for both Hillcrest Extensions and Rhodes Street Extension were approved in 2003 and the last extension expired in 2014. She stated that Bradford Estates was originally approved in 2000 and the last extension expired in 2014.

Jason Gittle stated he is inclined to let the developer finish these projects, rather than have the City take them on.

Sean McNamara agreed that the Board has already waited seven years, and asked what harm there could be waiting a few more months. He noted that the City can't do anything now due to the weather anyway.

Ms. Davies noted that no work has been completed since the notices were sent. She advocated that a serious deadline be set.

Paul Danesi made a motion to grant an extension of time to May 31, 2021 for Rhodes Street Extension. Sean McNamara seconded the motion and all voted in favor, save Jim Lewis who abstained.

Paul Danesi made a motion to grant an extension of time to May 31, 2021 for Hillcrest Avenue Extension I. Sean McNamara seconded the motion and all voted in favor, save Jim Lewis who abstained.

Paul Danesi made a motion to grant an extension of time to May 31, 2021 for Hillcrest Avenue Extension II. Sean McNamara seconded the motion and all voted in favor, save Jim Lewis who abstained.

Paul Danesi made a motion to grant an extension of time to May 31, 2021 for Bradford Estates. Sean McNamara seconded the motion and all voted in favor, save Jim Lewis who abstained.

The Board made clear that if all work is not completed and the street acceptance and as-built plans submitted by the deadline, the Board will automatically move forward with performing on each subdivision.

The Board reviewed the Notices from Kevin S. Freytag, Esq. of Toomey & Lehane, LLP, dated January 15, 2021, to Trustee Kathleen Lyons of CFDC Trust of Default and Demand to Complete Work at Burgess Estates .

Ms. Davies reminded the Board that the developer of this subdivision went out of business and that she was unsure whether the bond from back in 2005 will be valid. She stated that the last extension granted was to 2014.

Jason Gittle made a motion to perform on the subdivision security for the "BURGESS ESTATES" subdivision. Sean McNamara seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

Jim Lewis asked whose responsibility it is to ensure the subdivision securities remain in place. He noted that most bonds need to be paid on an annual basis.

Mr. Ayrassian stated that the bonds typically aren't relinquished without contact from the bank.

Jim Lewis asked whether the City would get notice if the bonds weren't paid.

Mr. Ayrassian stated that he was unsure how many outstanding subdivisions utilize subdivision bonds as their mode of security. He noted that in the past, the City has received contact relative to expiring bonds and the City Treasurer has worked to ensure they remain valid.

Jim Lewis stated that it's imperative that someone ensure that the bonds are kept active. He noted that he has seen instances in the past of being unable to collect on expired bonds.

Mr. Ayrassian stated his understanding that in such instances, the City Treasurer has always contacted the Planning Department.

The Board tabled the email and letter from Jude Gauvin of Andrews Survey & Engineering, Inc., dated February 17, 2021, in response to the notice of default letter for "Milosh Acres", as well as the letter from Planning Board Clerk Lauren Stamatis, dated February 10, 2021 to Public Works Superintendent Michael Tyler, soliciting a recommendation relative to the FINAL release of funds request for the "STONE HAVEN" subdivision, pending the submission of Public Works ' recommendation.

The Board tabled the letters and plan from Bob Catenacci of One Thirty One Pleasant St, LLC, received March 8, 2021, to Director of Planning and Development Gary Ayrassian relative to the drainage repair plans for the "STONE FIELD ESTATES II" subdivision, and providing a breakdown for the remaining subdivision bond for "STONE FIELD ESTATES II".

The Board reviewed all other correspondence.

The Board approved the pending minutes of February 22, 2021.

The Board voted to hold a public hearing on March 22, 2021 relative to the proposed amendments to the Rules and Regulations governing the Subdivision of Land.

The Board voted to hold a joint public hearing on April 6, 2021 relative to the petition of the City of Attleboro to discontinue a portion of Rathbun Willard Drive.

The Board discussed the new state zoning legislation, Act Enabling Partnerships for Growth.

Mr. Ayrassian requested that the Board members read through the materials and schedule an Ordinance Committee meeting to discuss things further in April. He noted that the Planning Board will be involved in voting to make the changes and that it involves more than just zoning and land use.

Jim Lewis suggested that after the meeting is held, it could be filtered through the New Business Study Group.

Ms. Davies agreed that it relates to some of the projects already suggested, like accessory dwellings.

The meeting adjourned at 8:46.