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The Stoughton Planning Board met on Thursday, September 26, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at the
Stoughton Police Department, Community Room, 26 Rose Street, Stoughton, MA 02072.

The following members were present:
Joseph Scardino, Chairman
Daniel Kelly
Jonathan Garland
Senesie Kabba
Lynne Jardin

Also present were: John Charbonneau, Town Planner; Craig Horsfall, Assistant Town
Engineer.

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to open the public meeting, seconded by Mr. Garland. Approved 4-0.

Chairman Scardino welcomed everyone to the Planning Board September 26, 2019 meeting.
This meeting is being recorded by video and audio. It is on tape delay and will be played later on
SMAC, so everyone should guide their actions accordingly.

Motion by Ms. Jardin to open Item 1, Chairman’s Comments, seconded by Mr. Kelly.
Approved 5-0.
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Chairman Scardino explained that he attended a joint meeting on September 16, 2019, with the Downtown Redevelopment Task Force; the Board of Selectmen; Planning Board; and Stoughton Redevelopment Authority. They discussed different issues including: the redevelopment of the Randolph Saving Bank building; grant of the EEOC; and various zoning issues. It was a very informative meeting and he will let the Board know when the next meeting will be held.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to open Item #2, (ANR) for GreyMax, LLC, seconded by Ms. Jardin. Approved 5-0.

Item #2. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan for GreyMax LLC, 15 Brazin Lane, Canton, MA 02021 for the property located at Assessor’s Map 37, Lot 4 West Street.

Ed Jacobs of Jacobs Engineering, Easton, MA introduced himself and explained he is representing GreyMax, LLC. This is an open field now with plenty of frontage. They are creating three (3) buildable lots which meet all the criteria for an ANR Plan. The 4th lot is being labeled non-buildable since it doesn’t meeting the shape factor. The location of this property is off of West Street; south of Westview Drive; and west of West Street.

Mr. Horsfall explained that these lots meet all criteria of the Rules & Regulations for frontage and area. He asked the Applicant to include the Wetland Protection Areas to the Plan.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to Accept the ANR Plan for GreyMax LLC, as presented to the Board seconded by Ms. Jardin. Approved 5-0.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to open Item #3, (ANR) for Thomas E. Shea and Patricia A. Shea, seconded by Mr. Kabba. Approved 5-0.

Item #3. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan for Thomas E. Shea and Patricia A. Shea, Trustees of the R.I. Realty Trust, 20 Highland Street, Stoughton, MA 02072 for the property located at 420 Highland Street.

Mr. Recupero of 420 Highland Street, introduced himself and explained that this is an oversized lot with two (2) access point and contains 10 ½ acres.

Mr. Horsfall stated that the lots meet the frontage and area requirements but there are wetlands and requested additional plan context since this plan is not complete.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to continue this hearing to October 10, 2019, seconded by Mr. Kabba. Approved 5-0.
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 26, 2019
Page 2 of 12

Chairman Scardino explained that he is taking the Agenda out of order.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to open Item #4, 760-770 Washington Street, seconded Ms. Jardin. Approved 5-0.

Item #4, 760-770 Washington Street (Malcom & Parsons Building), Discussion (Board of Selectmen Chair and Town Manager).

The Board discussed that at the Board of Selectmen (“BOS”) meeting held on October 1, 2019, a Special Town Meeting was announced and if any Articles are to be submitted, they should be drafted and submitted as soon as possible. The Board would like to manage a workshop with Department heads and the community so Town Meeting will work in cooperation with the Town. The Planning Board should be directed to be part of the working group to move efficiently though this process.

Mr. Kelly explained that we should have someone to identify with and to coordinate a joint meeting with the Chairmen and Vice Chairmen. We should be working together and participating in pre-meetings. Further, he would like to touch on the 760-770 Washington Street issue which is a not a problem. The Planning Board was engaged in this project and the BOS seems to want to correct what they feel are mistakes made by the Board, by scheduling a Town Meeting to correct this problem.

Ms. Grimm, Town Manager, explained that we were not able to get together on this issue and it is critical to get this project moving forward and the resolution to this problem is if the parking radius issue is resolved. The project needs to be finished and with a Fall Town Meeting, we can permit the developer to move forward.

Mr. O’ Regan, explained that he spoke with the Developer and if there is a problem, they will fix it and all committees are on board with this. We need to understand what steps are required to move forward. If we pre-screen with the Attorney General’s Office, and it can all be fine. We have had joint meetings together and he is glad this is happening, and it is a good thing.

Mr. Kelly explained that Articles regarding the radius issue were brought before the BOS on two (2) occasions and not allowed into the warrant. Why is that? He presented documentation showing the Articles were presented to the BOS and were not allowed into the warrant. Further, why was this matter brought up at meetings with the Developer, BOS, and Town Manager and why was the Planning Board not invited to attend these meetings. The Planning Board worked on this project, along with the Engineering Department and Building Department for months and months, and there was no issue. This project was approved in January and now there is an issue. There was a 20-day Appeal period after the Decision was signed and there was no opposition to this project.

Approved November 19, 2019
Mr. Kelly wanted to know where this is coming from. Why all of a sudden has this become an issue and why is no one talking to the Planning Board. He further explained that in the Attorney’s letter, the Attorney admits that he has not seen the Plans. These Plans were approved and the parking is NOT in the building, so this deletes what the attorney is saying. There are only three (3) members still on the Planning Board that approved this project, and with only three (3) members, this Decision cannot be changed. Why do we have to wait for a Town Meeting Article to be approved? Under the By-law and under the State regulations, we need to give the Applicant his permits to complete this project.

Further, Mr. Kelly stated that he doesn’t like that this was suddenly brought up against the Planning Board. This issue was on social media and in the newspaper. The Planning Board was bashed in the media with bad press. We were not notified of any of this; were not invited to any meetings. We need to work together and move forward.

Ms. Grimm stated that she invited the Board to a meeting and they never responded.

Chairman Scardino explained that he received an email on Sunday, September 15th and didn’t see it until Monday morning and had an appointment scheduled for that time. This was an unreasonable request, at the last minute.

Mr. Kelly stated that the Developer shouldn’t be held up since these issues do not exist.

Mr. O'Regan stated that the past articles were not allowed into the warrant because they didn’t understand the articles and the Planning Board voted against allowing them into the warrant.

Mr. Kelly debated that questions, and why would the Planning Board submit an article and not support it. That statement does not make sense.

Mr. Kelly recognized the Building Inspector, who was present, and asked him if the parking was within the Malcom Parsons Building envelope.

Mr. McGrath, Building Inspector, stated that the parking is not in the building and he was also not invited to any meetings with the Developer, and he has seen a copy of Town Counsel’s letter.

Ms. Grimm stated “I consult with my Staff” when asked about building codes and enforcing the By-Laws and Mass General Laws.

Chairman Scardino explained that there was originally one (1) store front, but that had been taken out to make four (4) additional parking spaces.
Mr. Kelly stated that he still does not understand why this issue is being brought up ten (10) months later, after all approvals and appeal periods were completed. Does the Town want to review all of our other projects, including the Drake Building; Frakes; and the Starlight? This project started in 2014 and it couldn’t get approved. We worked with the developer in order to move forward and get this project up and running.

Ms. Grimm then stated that she was very confused, and she and the BOS will draft an Article for radius parking.

Mr. Garland stated that we are here to get a good design in the downtown.

Mr. Charbonneau explained that the SCMUOD By-law needs to be substantially reworded. We need to hire a consultant with legal components, bring in the top guns to fix this area and no band aids. North Stoughton was a field of weeds for 35 years and look at it now.

Mr. O’Regan stated that we need to identify the trigger points and we have to find out what is frustrating developers from moving into Stoughton. We have an “armpit of a downtown” and we need to explore what needs to be done to bring in businesses.

Mr. Kelly stated that a Joint meeting is long overdue and why haven’t we had meetings before this? He stated that he respectfully disagrees and in the media it was presented that the Board members did something wrong and fraudulent. He will meet with anyone and if this developer is not allowed to build what was approved over ten (10) months ago, they will sue the town. We as a Board spent years on this project and he is personally offended that they are being accused of doing something fraudulent. Airing dirty laundry does help economic development in this town, it makes the Town the laughing stock of the state.

**Motion** by Ms. Jardim to open Item #8, Stoughton Recycling Technologies for “Site Plan Approval”, seconded by Mr. Kelly. Approved 5-0.

**Item #4. A continued public hearing will be held on the petition of Stoughton Recycling Technologies for “Site Plan Approval” under Section N entitled “Solar Power Overlay District” to build a ground-mounted photovoltaic solar facility on the Stoughton Landfill. The proposed project includes construction of a solar photovoltaic (“PV”) array with a DC nameplate generating capacity of approximately 1.1 megawatts (“MW”) on the Municipal landfill. As proposed, the ground-mounted solar array will occupy approximately 3.5 acres of the approximately 33 acre landfill footprint. Components of the system to be installed at the project site include solar panels, mounting substrates, system founds, wiring and connections, power inverters, service and metering equipment, and interconnection with the utility located at 100 Page Street (further identified on Assessors Map 104, Lot 003).**

Approved November 19, 2019
Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Popeo, Mr. Presley, and the Town Manager, Ms. Grimm were present for this hearing.

Chairman Scardino explained that the Board had an issue with the Insurance Policy and the Construction clause and liability was an issue. The Applicant has provided additional materials; an Eco System Contractor; and new policies for employees working at the site.

Ms. Grimm stated that poles were placed in the easement which she thinks the SRA owns. She is concerned because she was not notified and is not comfortable with the location of the poles; the insurance; and the environmental concern.

The Applicant explained that National Grid had the final as-built plan before they placed the poles in, and the DEP and the SRA was aware. The test pits were done by hand and were free and clear with no issue to the location of the cap. There is no issue or concerns and the cap is intact and there is no environmental impact.

Chairman Scardino was concerned with the language and that the poles might have damaged the cap.

Mr. Charbonneau explained that the SRA was not notified when the poles were put in. He did a field visit and there is some concern with one of the poles and the liner cover. He found a piece of material (which he presented) that might be a piece of the liner.

Assistant Town Engineer, Craig Horsfall, stated that we need reassurance that the cap is intact before moving forward. He was concerned with who dug the holes; and if any part of the liner was exposed. A new plan has surfaced with all new information and he would like to hear from Green Seal Environmental, that no part of the liner was damaged.

Mr. Forrest Lindwall explained that he would like to clarify that the cap is on the far side, further down the road. This is not an environmental issue and the cap is not active in the landfill. He does not know, if the last pole did any damage to an existing cap. Further, he had an agreement with National Grid that they notify him the day before. They were to be placed 43-46-50 feet apart. Further, he feels this is not an environmental issue and we are only here tonight for site plan approval for the solar and nothing else.

Mr. Zamanian explained that he went to see Mr. Charbonneau this morning. He saw the new plans and it could be possible that one (1) pole did possibly create damage to the cap, and he feels the Board should move forward, even though they have been “presented a piece of something.” If there is a problem, Mr. Kennedy will address this and will get it repaired.
Chairman Scardino explained that we need to ascertain if anything compromising has happened. We need a third-party credit manager, pending legal review. Once a Decision is signed and filed with the Town Clerk, we can rely on the appeal period and the LSP Report. Town Counsel needs to review the insurance and Green Seal needs to come up with conclusion.

Motion by Ms. Jardin to Approve the Site Plan of Stoughton Recycling Technologies, with the Decision to be written by the Town Planner with conditions, as stated and presented by the Board, and the Insurance Carrier will contact the Town Manager about the Policy, seconded Mr. Kelly. Approved 5-0.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to close the hearing on Stoughton Recycling Technology, seconded by Ms. Jardin. Approved 5-0.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to open Item #6 and #7, Green Acres Investments, seconded by Ms. Jardin. Approved 5-0.

Item #6. A continued public hearing will be held on the petition of Green Acres Investments, LLC for “Special Permit” under Section 6.4.9 and petition of waivers under Section 6.4 of the Stoughton Zoning Bylaw for the removal of earth materials associated with the construction of a new single family dwelling on the property located at Assessors Map 81, Lot 50 Pleasant Street; and

Item #7. A continued public hearing will be held on the petition of Green Acres Investments, LLC for “Special Permit” under Section 6.4.9 and petition of waivers under Section 6.4 of the Stoughton Zoning Bylaw for the removal of earth materials associated with the construction of a new single family dwelling on the property located at Assessors Map 81, Lot 71 Pleasant Street.

Chairman Scardino asked the Applicant, Sam Shoneye speak to the Board first and then we will proceed from there.

Mr. Shoneye stated that tonight should be a cake walk. He has done everything that has been asked of him and asked if he could read a letter into the record: "SPECIAL PERMIT HEARING FOR WAIVER FOR LOT 1 & 2 ON PLEASANT STREET SEPTEMBER 26, 2019, STOUGHTON PLANNING BOARD. I am here to present to you for the 4th time on the matter regarding the two separate lots known as lot 1 and 2 shown on a plan entitled “Approval Not Required Plan” recorded with the Norfolk County Registry of Deeds in Plan Book 541, Page 64. Lots 1 and 2 are identified by the Stoughton Assessor’s department as parcel IDs 81-71 and 81-50 (together the Lots). Green Acres proposes to construct two single family homes, one on each of the lots, with each home to contain approximately 2,630 square feet with 4 bedrooms, 2.5 bathrooms and 2 car garage, to be serviced by municipal water and sewer, as set forth in the plans and specifications submitted to the engineering department and to the building department."
My law firm, Rich May and I reviewed the ANR plan which divided the lot in 2011 prior to their purchase as two separate lots. According to the Stoughton Bylaws and our inquiries with the Town Building Department, will only require an application for building and other associated permits and “NO SPECIAL PERMITS ARE REQUIRED FOR THE PLANNING OR ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS.” It was requested that I apply to the Planning Board for a “WAIVER” of the special permit provisions set forth below so that we can keep everyone happy and do some minor remediation on the lots. Being a resident and property tax payer in the town of Stoughton, I obliged to go along so that we can have a good and smooth peaceful construction of homes in my neighborhood.

At the initial stage of this process, Section 6.4 of the Zoning Bylaw was put up as a defense for justifying the reason for the reasonable remediation. From the very beginning of this process, I have maintained that the law does not apply to this Lots. According to Section 6.4.2, the requirements of Section 6.4 of the Zoning Bylaws “...Shall not apply to a single, one family detached dwelling, but shall apply to a grouping of two or more one family detached dwellings.” I respectfully take this positions that the Lots are buildable as two single-family on two separate lots and are not a “grouping of two....dwellings, and each lot is less than one acre.” I could construct each home at different times under separate applications. This is not a subdivision or other development subject to Site Plan Review. There are no shared driveways, utilities wells or septic systems. Based on my many conversation and my attorney’s conversation with the Town of Stoughton Building Inspector onApril 5, 2019, issuance of the required Building permits were able to be granted by the Building Department in the normal course without need for further permits or approval.

For those who are complaining about cutting the tree down from the Lots, I would like to point your attention to the contours of these properties. The highest contour of the properties is 248.5 while the street level is 239 or 240 depending on which side of the street you are on. This is approximately 8.5 to 9.5 feet above the street level. He contours varies on all sides and in different directions. This is what necessitated the need to remove the soil and as such necessitated the removal of the trees in order to achieve the expected and approved purpose for the Lots. This was a not a flat lots with trees which in most cases will allow us to leave most of the trees in the parameters and build in the limited clearing space. Application of any section of the 6.4 of the Zoning Bylaws would mean a substantial detriment to our ability to utilize the land as was intended by the Bylaws of the Town of Stoughton.

Section 6.4.3 and 6.4.5: which generally address maintaining the natural topography vegetation would cause significant hardship as the Lots suffer from significant grade differential, requiring a long, multi-curve driveway and inability to achieve a landing before accessing Pleasant Street. It would also have meant an extensive addition to cost due to length of utilities line and pipes. The natural topography was impossible to maintain without clearing and grading which will allow efficiency in access of Pleasant Street and utilities. The grade contours also rendered the lots unmarketable since the driveways would be windy and difficult to plow; creating serious risk to future family entering the intersection onto busy Pleasant Street.
(a) In fact we will present to you that the visibility at the intersection of Pine and Pleasant Street was poor and has been improved by the clearing of the lots. There have been significant traffic accidents at this intersection which disrupts utilities but since the clearing and grading, the traffic has slowed down around the area.

(b) The Plans will not impact the character of the neighborhood and as you will see shortly we will propose a planting typical of the neighborhood.

Section 6.4.5, 6.4.6 and 6.4.7: are generally applicable to parking lots which does not apply since there is no parking lot proposed; in particular, subsection 5 also discusses dumpsters and compacters which are not to be installed.

Section 6.4.8: appears to be missing from the Bylaws – Perhaps a numbering issue.

Chapter 200. Zoning: Section 8.0 which was mentioned during the last hearing by one of the board members as a possible violation for removal of earth materials is also incorrectly been applied to this two separate lots. Section 8.0 IS A SPECIAL NONRESIDENTIAL REGULATION. I refer you to the hearing description and further to Section 8.3.1 which states that “General. For the removal of sand, gravel, quarry, or other earth materials other than that which is incidental to and in connection to building on a lot and for processing and treating raw materials, the following shall govern. This clearly is not a law that would apply to a “RESIDENTIAL BUILDING” and further, if it were, the removal of the earth material was required, due to the significant grade differential, requiring a long, multi-curve driveway and inability to achieve a landing before accessing Pleasant Street. It would also have meant an extensive addition to cost due to length of utilities line and pipes. The natural topography was impossible to maintain without clearing and grading which will allow efficiency in access of Pleasant Street and utilities. The grade contours also rendered the lots unmarketable since the driveways would be windy and difficult to plow; creating serious risk to future family entering the intersection onto busy Pleasant Street. Therefore, the removal was incidental and in connection to building on the lot, and as such Section 8 would not apply in either case and approval for special permit would not be required.

After a significant cost to hire a landscape architect, 3D architect, lawyers to do significant research on the regulations, many meetings with various town officials and stoppage of work, I will now provide remediation based on your recommendations, two landscape architects professional opinion and a conscious effort on my part to make everyone happy and I pray to God that tonight will be the end of the hearing and we can all walk out of her feeling that we have all given and taken a little. In conclusion, Green Acres Investments LLC reserves its right in its position that the lots are not subject to her requirement of Section 6.4 and 8.0 of the Zoning bylaws and even though Green Acres Investments LLC contends the same, we respectfully request a vote for the waiver tonight by the Planning Board of the provision of 6.4 and in addition the provision of 8.3, if it were being considered by this body and we hereby request that the Special Permit be granted as no substantial detriment will result from such issuance due to the bases present above.
We further request that no bond or fees be required as it will injure the applicant from selling or transferring title to the new property owners and put an unreasonable and significant undue burden on the applicant. Building Department should have the final say on the matter, whether we get our Occupancy Permit based on the promises we have made and fulfilled. Thank you, Samuel Shoneye, CEO Green Acres Investment, LLC.”

Mr. Shoneye then presented plans to show the Board and audience showing that he moved the houses and everything back 40 feet and showed his landscaping plan with new and taller trees.

Mr. Horsfall explained that he doesn’t have an issue with the positioning the driveways and the site distance. The position of the lots maximize the distance and balance of some of the other sites around town.

An abutter, Bob Mullen of 19 Clover Lane suggested not allowing a left hand turn out of these driveways.

Mr. Horsfall explained that we do not have the authority to enforce prohibiting a left hand turn. The issue was agreed by Mr. Charbonneau

Mr. McGrath, Building Commissioner explained that he had conversations about this property with the Applicant and felt there were two (2) lots that were buildable with the required frontage and area. The topography was challenging and his last conversation was about having shared driveways, which would have to go before the Zoning Board. Two (2) days after their conversation, the trees were removed. Town Counsel was ambiguous to enforce this and when the Applicant came up with his plan, the issues were debatable. It was then suggested that the Applicant go before the Planning Board and see if any permits should be issued. His hope is that the Applicant can do enough mitigation so he can complete this project.

The Board discussed that a lot of material was removed and shame on the Applicant for doing this, but we need to come to some agreement so this is not a total loss to the Town and the Applicant. We need to make progress to move forward and complete this project.

Dennis Johnson of 48 Old Maple Street stated that he would like to compliment Sam and the Plan looks great. He did everything that has been asked from him including: improving the street views; adding the cypress trees; presenting a letter from the Police Department; his character; and the impact of this project on the Town and abutters.

Mr. Kabba stated that this is all about compromise and the Applicant has done this.
Motion by Mr. Kabba to Approve the Site Plan and Waive the Special Permit of the petition of Green Acres Investments, LLC, subject to the Approval of the trees on the property and to do a walk with the abutters, seconded by Ms. Jardin. Approved 5-0.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to close the public hearing on Green Acres Investments, LLC, seconded Ms. Jardin. Approved 5-0.

Motion by Mr. Kelly to open Item #5, Heron Crossing Solar LLC, seconded Ms. Jardin. Approved 5-0.

Chairman Scardino read the public hearing notice into the record: “A Public Hearing will be held on the petition of Heron Crossing Solar, LLC for “Site Plan Approval “ under Section 9.6 entitled “Solar Power Overlay District, as amended by Article 46 of the May 6, 2019 Annual Town Meeting to build a ground-mounted photovoltaic solar facility on the property known as Assessor’s Map 89, Lot 142. The Site Plan Review Application and plans can be viewed at the office of the Stoughton Planning Board, Engineering Department, Second Floor, Town Hall, 10 Pearl Street, Stoughton, MA, during normal business hours. The petitioner and/or his representative, or any other persons desiring to be heard on this matter, should appear at the time and place designated. Town of Stoughton Planning Board Joseph Scardino, Chairperson.”

Attorney Jim Burke of 48 North Pearl Street, Brockton, MA, introduced himself along with Scott Reimer. This project is on 16 acres of land and a most vetted project. He has met exclusively with the Town Manager and Department heads including Conservation and the Assessors Department. This is a 1.5M capital investment and energy friendly project. Mr. Reimer is from Charlottesville and has been working through the SMART Program and MassSave. The went before Town Meeting and received great support. This project will supply energy to 30 homes, is a quiet neighbor, and will produce $35,000 per year in revenue. The panels will sit on the western portion of the site and the primary entrance is off Corbett and Shane Road. The panels will take up approximately 6.5 acres.

They have been working with Meredith Savage, an environmentalist with SWCA and Kevin McCaffrey, Civil Engineer. They have had many pre-application meetings and all comments were put into the Plans. There are wetlands on the eastern edge of the property, but the panels are over 200 feet away. They have presented an existing Condition Plan with a footprint of the project. There is emergency access for the Fire and Emergency personnel and there will be a knox-box. The area is forested and the stumps will be removed. No topsoil will be removed and the panels will be placed along the contours of the land.

Approved November 19, 2019
This is a Pollinator Friendly Solar PV. It is designed to encourage establishment and management of pollinator-friendly plantings under and around large solar photovoltaic (PV) arrays. There are two (2) catch basins on the property with low growing grass. The berm will be ten (10) feet high and ten (10) feet off-center with a screw mounted system. The panels are nine (9) feet and there will be a total of 6-8. This project produces no odor; waste; has battery storage; and a fire suppression system. They are seeking a waiver for chain link fence and they are upgrading the abutters fencing. Everything else that was mentioned has been put on the plans.

Mr. Horsfall and Mr. Charbonneau were in agreement and some stormwater information and calculations needed to be added to the Plan. There was a lot of outreach and communication on this project and a final set of plans will include everything including: widths of the road; add into the notes that the project is in a solar overlay; dimensions of the abutter in the industrial area; uses for the building; mark the residential areas; limits of work; limits of disturbance; erosion control (silt fence); and land surveyors numbers.

Mr. Horsfall further stated that he will take care of the outlet to the swale; and the access road that exists is used by National Grid.

**Motion** by Mr. Kel'y to continue this hearing until October 10, 2019 at 7:00 p.m., seconded by Mr. Garland. Approved 5-0.

Chairman Scardino stated on behalf of the Planning Board he would like to wish everyone a good evening.

**Adjournment**

**Motion** by Mr. Kel'y to Adjourn, seconded by Ms. Jardin. Motion Approved 5-0.