#### Attendance & Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Vice Ch. Steve Olanoff.

Present: Planning Board members Steve Olanoff, Steve Rafsky, Bruce Montgomery and Chris Pfaff; Town Planner Nora Loughnane; Jack Wiggin was absent; and Planning & Land Use Specialist Janice Barba was absent.

# Public Hearing for Consideration of Special Permit and Environmental Impact and Design Review (EIDR) for Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) at DWWD Water Tank – 213 Fox Hill Street

Vice Ch. Olanoff opened the meeting by reading the legal notice of public hearing.

Present on behalf of the applicant, AT & T Mobility, was Jacqueline Swenson who gave a brief presentation on the application.

## Highlights:

- 2007 AT&T received site plan approval to install twelve antennas and associated equipment on the DWWD water tanks. Subsequently, the Decision lapsed in 2009 with only six of the 12 antennas having been installed.
- AT&T's application requests an amendment to the 2007 Decision to install the remaining six antennas and upgrade ancillary antenna equipment. (Ms. Loughnane clarified that this is a stand-alone application for EIDR and will not be considered as an amendment to the 2007 Decision.)
- Modifications to the WCF will be limited to the existing leased space on the water tank and ground space.
- Construction plans, drawings, renderings and photographs were presented.
- Antenna and cabling will be painted to match the existing paint on the tank.
- Ms. Loughnane noted that she received a memo from Health Director Linda Shea, stating that this application meets FCC requirements for radio-frequency exposure.

## **Board Questions & Comments:**

- How many antennae will be mounted and what is the purpose of these? (Answer: 6 antennas, 6 remote radio heads, 3 surge suppressors, 1 fiber junction box for the purpose of updating technology.)
- Will any cabling be removed? (Answer: No.)
- Board members agreed that the submitted plans do not depict exactly what the
  applicant is requesting, which is permission to install nine antennas.) Ms. Loughnane
  informed the applicant that the Planning Board does not grant approval for
  items/antennas needed in the future. If the applicant wants to install additional six
  antennas and ancillary equipment, it must return to the Planning Board for a new permit.
  An approval does not provide rights for a certain number of antennas.)
- There were many questions on specific GPS antenna heights and it was suggested that the applicant amend and replace plan Page A-2 & Page A-5 with information on heights of antennas and mounting poles.

#### **Public Comments:**

None.

#### Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve waivers of unnecessary requirements, as requested.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to close the hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the application with the standard conditions plus the following condition:

 The Applicant shall submit a revised set of plans which shall clearly show the antennas and equipment approved under this decision, along with the existing antennas and equipment proposed to remain, without reference to additional antennas and equipment which may or may not be approved by the Planning Board pursuant to a future application.

## Pre-application Conference for proposed Open Space Residential Development (OSRD) Proposal - 565 Gay Street

John Glossa, Glossa Engineering was present with resident Thomas Gerrity of 587A Gay Street and owner of 565 Gay Street. Mr. Glossa gave a brief presentation of a draft plans to subdivide 565 Gay Street under the Open Space Residential Development bylaw.

- Tract of land 266,452 sq. ft., minus wetlands area (72,180 sq. ft.) = 194,0000 sq. ft. 10% for roadways/infrastructure, leaving approximately 184,000 sq. ft. (2.1 acres) buildable area for two buildable lots, with required frontage.
- Existing house and one of two barns on Lot 1 would be demolished. Applicant requested permission to preserve one of the existing barns for minor restoration.
- Open space would be donated to the Conservation Commission or be otherwise be protected from future development through a conservation restriction or covenant. (133,000 sq. ft.) This open space would create a contiguous swath of land, linking to an existing conservation area.
- Two single driveways are proposed, as opposed to a shared driveway.

#### **Board Questions & Comments:**

- Does this proposed parcel meet the lot shape ratio? (Yes.)
- Will the barn stay in its original condition? (Yes, although the exterior will be aesthetically improved, retaining its original character.)
- A board member suggested that the applicant consider a shared driveway as opposed to two driveways to serve this development.
- A board member suggested that the applicant consider configuring the housing lots so that all wetlands on the property are included in the designated open space area.
- A board member asked Ms. Loughnane to seek an opinion from town counsel on the whether the barn requested for preservation will retain existing, non-conforming status.

**Public Comments:** 

None.

#### Motion:/Action Taken:

None needed. The applicant and his engineer will consider the Planning Board's comments in relation to the proposed plans and will file an application on a date to be determined.

## Consideration of Proposed Minor Modification to SRD Special Permit for Reynold's Farm

Mr. Musto was present to request the board's consideration to modify landscaping between the six, two unit buildings. Ms. Loughnane explained that the number and type plantings have not changed, only redistributed based on the previously amended building reconfiguration (from the combination of two and three unit buildings to all two unit buildings). In addition, Mr. Musto noted that the plans show one room on the second floor as an unfinished storage room, which he would rather identify as an office or exercise room.

Ms. Loughnane said the board's decision and the deed restriction requires that these units have a maximum of two bedrooms. Mr. Musto said this space could be used as a bedroom but with the deed restriction, this space cannot be occupied as such.

#### **Board Questions & Comments:**

- Is the ceiling is sloped in this unfinished room. (Yes, in the front.)
- Ms. Loughnane said the board would have to approve the unfinished space as a type of room, such as an office or exercise room to receive an occupancy permit.
- Ms. Loughnane also informed the board that the updated plans show handicapped access with an optional door for the lift. The previously approved plans called for a separate entrance for handicapped access. The amendment plan uses the existing landing and stairs for both conventional and handicapped access. This allows for more interior space for a closet in the laundry area, although shortening the garage stall length.
- Will a car fit with the shortened stall in a handicapped accessible unit? (Yes.)
- If the unfinished space is finished with insulation, HVAC and plaster then the space becomes a finished space. What will prevent someone from using this space as a bedroom? (Mr. Musto said that the space has no closet and the deed spells out that the units are only two bedrooms. In addition, he said that the window does not meet the building code for a bedroom.)
- A board member suggested expanding the master bedroom, moving the wall.
- A board member suggested that the walls in the storage room remain unfinished in order to prevent this from becoming another bedroom.
- Mr. Musto suggested eliminating the doorway from the hallway.
- Ms. Loughnane suggested holding this item until the next meeting so as to allow Mr.
   Wiggin, who is absent tonight, to comment on it.

#### Motion:/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the minor modifications to the SRD Special Permit for Reynold's Farm to modify the landscaping and handicapped accessible units.

Board members agreed that the plans should identify the room as unfinished in accordance with the conditions of the Decision, approved plans for this project as well as the deed

restriction.

Ms. Loughnane asked Mr. Musto to come back to the next meeting on January 22nd to discuss this final request for modification.

Board members signed the Decision previously made in August, which was held off from recording because of outstanding application with the Conservation Commission.

New Business – Reserved for topics not reasonably anticipated to be discussed None.

## **Next Meetings:**

Tuesday, January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 6:30 p.m., Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

### **Adjournment**

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Rafsky the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.

**List of Documents, Materials and Exhibits** None.