

---

## Planning Board Minutes 03-05-2014

### Mashpee Planning Board Minutes of Meeting

March 5, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

Waquoit Meeting Room, Mashpee Town Hall

Approved 4-0 on 4/2/14

**Planning Board Members Present:** Chairman George Petersen, Mary Waygan, Dennis Balzarini, David Kooharian, Joe Cummings

**Also Present:** Tom Fudala-Town Planner, Charles Rowley-Consultant Engineer, Selectman Tom O'Hara

**Absent:** Joe Mullin

### CALL TO ORDER

The Town of Mashpee Planning Board meeting was opened with a quorum in the Waquoit Meeting Room at Mashpee Town Hall by Chairman Petersen at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 5, 2014 and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES—February 19, 2014

The Chair indicated that he had some comments regarding the minutes and requested that they be reviewed at the next meeting.

### APPROVAL-NOT-REQUIRED PLAN

**Applicant: National Development**

**Location: Corner of Route 151 and Old Barnstable Road, Map 66, Lot 107 and Map 73, Lots 30, 31, 46 and 47**

**Request: Application for signature of 1-lot ANR Plan**

Mr. Fudala reported that the appeal period had not yet passed for the rescission document, filed with the Town Clerk on February 26<sup>th</sup>, but it would not be recorded until after that date. Plans were distributed to members of the Board. Ted Tye of National Development indicated that the purpose of the ANR plan was to remove the interior lines of the lot and to create the perimeter as a single lot.

**MOTION: Mr. Kooharian made a motion to accept the ANR. Mr. Balzarini seconded the motion. All voted unanimously.**

The plan was signed by Chairman Petersen.

### PUBLIC HEARING

**Hearing under the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 85, Sections 3A and 3B, to consider a proposed change in the name of "East Way" to either "Cottage Lane," "Cobblestone Lane" or "Cardinal Lane."**

The appointed time having arrived, the Chair opened the public hearing and read for the record the public hearing notice. Mr. Fudala indicated that the Address Working Group had requested the name change due to the presence of East Road, located in another part of town off of Pimlico Pond Road, creating a public safety issue for emergency services. Mr. Balzarini inquired about the number of houses on each of the roads and Mr. Fudala confirmed that the other East Road had more homes on it and had been established first. The Chair inquired whether a document had been prepared as an explanation to homeowners regarding what would need to be done and how the Town would assist with the name change. Mr. Fudala referenced a 2/14 letter from Tom Mayo addressed to the Sandalwood Association President and Chairman Petersen read for the record the letter describing the task of the Address Working Group, the more simplified street naming process and the potential for safety hazards. The Town will contact utility companies, the U.S. Postal Service, 911, Town departments and alarm companies regarding the street's name change. Copies of the letter were distributed to members of the public.

Chairman Petersen inquired about the timeline for implementing the name change. Mr. Fudala responded that it would be immediate upon the Planning Board's vote, adding that the Planning Board was responsible for reviewing name changes for private roads. Mr. Fudala indicated that abutters had been notified of the hearing and the Board was tasked with making the decision about the name. Public roads with conflicting names would be addressed by the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Fudala indicated that more street name changes were expected, and that this was the second name change (Postage Stamp Road) reviewed by the Board. Mr. Fudala noted that the Working Group had offered three potential names but also indicated that residents could submit a street name, provided it conformed to the street naming policy.

The appointed time having arrived, the Chair opened the Public Hearing for National Development.

**MOTION: Mr. Balzarini made a motion to continue the public hearing to 7:45 p.m. Mr. Kooharian seconded the motion. All voted unanimously.**

Chairman Petersen opened the Public Hearing for BCDM, LLC, regarding Blue Castle Drive.

**MOTION: Mr. Balzarini made a motion to continue the public hearing to 8:00 p.m. Mr. Kooharian seconded the motion. All voted unanimously.**

Board members returned to the discussion regarding the East Way name change. Ms. Waygan inquired about the number of homes impacted. It was confirmed that there were 7 homes (a total of 10 lots, some of which were unbuildable). Fire Chief Thomas Rullo, who sits on the Working Group, indicated that East Way presented a perfect case for efforts being made throughout the entire Town. Chief Rullo referenced the challenges associated with any confusion should safety responders travel to East Road instead of East Way, adding that GPS capabilities were not fail safe. In reference to local responders knowing the streets of Mashpee, Chief Rullo pointed out that the Fire Department receives assistance from surrounding communities who would be less familiar with the roads in Mashpee. Chief Rullo stated that this was a problem being faced nationwide and that Mashpee was making every effort to correct the problem in town.

Mark Kahn of 24 East Way inquired about the number of times that responders had traveled to the wrong location due to a similar name and Chief Rullo responded that, in his 2 years in Mashpee, he had heard confusion on 5 or 6 occasions, and credited his officers who questioned the dispatcher to clarify the confusion. Chief Rullo stated that a simple key stroke error could cause an anomaly. Reference was made to a prior incident in Mashpee and Chief Rullo stated that there was case history all over the United States regarding address confusion. Mr. Balzarini stated that one time was too many.

John Clark of 25 East Way suggested that technology should make the job easier for first responders. The Chief responded that it had improved but that responders used map books because the GPS mapping system was expected in the next 3-5 years, but was still not 100% reliable if there was a breakdown in communication with dispatch.

The Chief emphasized that firefighters outside of Mashpee may be the first responders to an emergency. Mr. Clark expressed surprise that GPS was not being used and the Chief responded that the system was not infallible.

Mr. Kooharian agreed that it was very inconvenient to be faced with a street name change but emphasized that the need for critical attention could be compromised without the name change.

Joan Nuisis, 18 East Way, indicated that she was opposed to the name change, along with all of the residents of the street, and asked that the Planning Board not make a decision at this meeting, allowing the residents to offer a street name. Ms. Nuisis indicated that she was faced with a similar change when she lived in New Seabury and expressed concern about the Post Office not forwarding the mail. Ms. Nuisis also stated that there were summer residents who were unable to attend the meeting and expressed concern that first responders were not utilizing GPS. Chief Rullo emphasized that the issue was not reviewing the map book but the potential of the responders being dispatched to the wrong road or neighboring departments responding.

Ms. Waygan indicated that she was impressed that the neighborhood was in attendance at the meeting and referenced the significance of the entire street wishing not to change the street name. Ms. Waygan stated that, as an elected official, she would have a hard time supporting the name change should the residents all oppose it and the entire street be willing to take the risk, though she would want the residents to have operating land lines for public safety purposes. Mr. Balzarini expressed concern that, should an emergency occur next week, the Town would be

liable for not acting on the name change for safety reasons. Mr. Kooharian inquired about new homeowners on the road who would not agree to accept the liability of maintaining the street name.

Mr. Clark expressed concern about the costs associated with the name change, such as re-ordering checks and suggested that the Board was imposing their viewpoint on the residents of the street. Mr. Kooharian pointed out that they would not be the majority on that road for the rest of the road's existence, since others would be living on the road in the future. Mr. Kooharian stated that the Town's safety officers and Town officials felt there was confusion and an issue of safety and that it must be then addressed. Mr. Kooharian pointed out that future families moving to the neighborhood would not have a vote to change the name which could make a difference in a life or death situation. Mr. Kooharian further noted that it may not be a resident making the call for help, but a visitor, and the extra time sorting out the location could be the difference between life and death.

Chairman Petersen referenced case law from Swansea, NH determining that the town had a responsibility to make appropriate changes should the potential for a safety concern be determined. Mr. Clark suggested that the meeting was a formality but Chairman Petersen stated that the meeting was a sharing of information and an opportunity to learn directly from the Fire Chief about the safety concerns.

Marshall McStay, 6 North Way, stated that he was the President of the Homeowners Association for Sandalwood. Mr. McStay indicated that he had been in receipt of a dozen emails from the neighbors who were opposed to the change. Mr. McStay added that there were other streets in Mashpee with similar names that were not yet being addressed. Mr. Balzarini responded that there would be other road name changes. Mr. McStay indicated that he was located on North Way and his mail was mixed up with North Street and suggested that he would want to know which road names would be changed. Mr. McStay recommended continuing the hearing so that the residents of East Way could meet to recommend a new name. Mr. Fudala stated that the meeting could be continued and the residents could suggest a name to be considered.

Jeff Tomchik, 20 East Way, questioned the complexity of the street name between East Way and East Street. Mr. Kooharian responded that the names were similar enough that the safety officials felt that in a time of crisis, there could be confusion, and that the time it could take to make the correction could result in tragedy. Mr. Tomchik insisted that the street had been established for 40 years and stated that inputting the correct street name in the beginning would resolve the issue. Mr. Kooharian stated that the problem was the confusion that could occur in the early stages of a call.

Ms. Waygan suggested that the discussion was about accepting risk. If residents wanted to accept the risk by retaining the name, they should be allowed to do so. Mr. Balzarini stated that the Town would be liable. Mr. Kooharian pointed out that the current residents could not speak for future residents. Ms. Waygan recommended continuing the meeting to the summer to allow returning property owners to participate in the discussion. Mr. Fudala pointed out that all residents received notice. Mr. Tomchik suggested that reasonable people come to reasonable decisions but that the request was not reasonable. Mr. Clark suggested the policy was setting up the Board for a lot of contention and his interpretation was that the policy was intended for new street names and that other residents would also choose to take the risk to maintain their original street name.

Chairman Petersen reiterated the issue of liability and emphasized that the Planning Board did not sit on the Address Working Group and recommended contacting the group with specific concerns. The Chair indicated that the hearing would be continued, affording residents the opportunity to discuss a potential street name, contacting the Town Manager, Address Working Group and Fire Chief with any additional concerns. Chairman Petersen stated that once the issue was established, the Town would be liable.

Mr. Tomchik responded that he felt it was hard to believe that the issue would suddenly become a liability because somebody brought it up. Ms. Waygan indicated that she struggled with understanding that the Town would hire people who would have difficulty differentiating between East Way and East Road. Mr. Kooharian responded that the assumption was being made that the information was correct when initially reported, adding that safety officials had identified it as a concern. Ms. Waygan stated that the Planning Board was not part of the Address Working Group, that it was not open to the public and questioned participation by an elected official. Ms. Waygan stated that it was unfair for the Planning Board to be faced with defending a policy in which they had no involvement. Mr. Fudala stated that it was a policy approved by the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Waygan recalled a meeting where one of the criteria of the policy was that the name could not be difficult to pronounce. Chief Rullo stated that the intent of the Address Working Group was not to make life difficult but to stop a known anomaly from happening. The Chief indicated that the Working Group had been meeting for a long time and wrestled with the challenge, but

changes were necessary. Ms. Waygan inquired whether the Group reached out to residents that would be impacted and suggested that consultation may have garnered more support for the effort or support for the GPS system.

Chief Rullo emphasized that the issue did not stem from GPS or his own people, but from dispatch and the 911 system. Mr. Fudala added that the issue arose with condominium projects without official street names and resulted in approximately 20 Planning Board public hearings over the last 6 years which created and renamed streets in order to provide an accurate address for emergency services.

Chief Rullo apologized to the residents who felt angry, but emphasized that he had a sworn duty and responsibility, along with the Police Chief, to ensure vehicles made it to the correct address, and asked that the anger not be directed at the Planning Board. Mr. Clark stated that they were being told to do something they did not want to do.

Judy Kahn, 24 East Way, stated that most people would rank safety as number one. Ms. Kahn added that she was a summer resident and resented the fact that there was suggestion that a summer resident would be less impacted by the address change. Ms. Kahn also felt railroaded by the strength of the committee and felt that the change was a done deal and questioned whether the residents' disagreement to change their street name might result in non-responsiveness to an emergency call, in order to be used as an example. Ms. Kahn added that she now felt that her safety was threatened and suggested that the issue be presented when all residents were available to attend.

**MOTION: Mr. Balzarini made a motion to continue the public hearing to May 7 at 7:10 p.m. Mr. Kooharian seconded the motion.**

Mr. Balzarini stated that the residents had no need to worry about the Fire Department responding to calls on the street and Ms. Waygan added that emergency responders were great men and women who served the town and were sworn to their service. Chairman Petersen recommended that residents follow up with the Town Manager, request additional information, including a public release of all street names, and recommended that other members of the Address Working Group attend future meetings. Mr. Fudala confirmed that this was the first public hearing since the Selectmen had adopted the policy. Selectman O'Hara agreed that this was the first public hearing and first opportunity for residents to express their concerns. Selectman O'Hara noted that improved communication from the Address Working Group was needed with the residents and he indicated that he would follow up with both the Town Manager and the Board of Selectmen.

Bob Goodwell, a resident of Sandalwood, inquired what was being done about improving GPS. Mr. Kooharian emphasized that it was not about technology and that it was an issue of human error. Ms. Waygan suggested that the residents should bring the issue to Town Hall.

**All voted unanimously to continue the Public Hearing.**

**7:45 Applicant: National Development**

**Location: Corner of Route 151 and Old Barnstable Road, Map 66, Lot 107 and Map 73, Lots 30, 31, 46 and 47**

**Request: Approval of a Special Permit for a 54 unit assisted living facility**

The Chair opened the National Development public hearing. The Chair also opened the BCDM, LLC public hearing.

**MOTION: Mr. Balzarini made a motion to move the public hearings for BCDM to 8:30 p.m. Mr. Kooharian seconded the motion. All voted unanimously.**

Ted Tye of National Development was present to discuss the request along with Attorney Eliza Cox and Sean Foster, Civil Engineer. Mr. Tye summarized that National Development appeared before the Board of Health where it was determined that no additional monitoring wells were necessary, confirmed that the roof runoff details were submitted and reviewed by Mr. Rowley and the survey at the entrance of Old Barnstable had been completed and modifications made to correct ponding, adjust the stop line and sight distances. Mr. Tye added that there were no comments from National Development regarding the draft decision.

Mr. Rowley reviewed the sketches submitted today and indicated that he was satisfied with the results, but that they needed to be incorporated into the full set of plans. Mr. Rowley noted that the roof runoff had been incorporated into the plan. Mr. Tye provided one set of plans that did include the striping and other existing conditions. Mr.

Rowley referenced sheet 101 which highlighted the existing striping to include the crosswalk to Southport, the turning lanes, the proposed stop line and proposed sidewalk. Mr. Rowley confirmed that the drip strip details were as Mr. Foster had explained, capturing the runoff from the roof down to the stone perimeter drain, encapsulated so that the runoff was distributed to the bio-retention areas and surface treatment. Ms. Waygan inquired whether the decision incorporated the dates of the plan and Mr. Fudala confirmed that it was dated March 5, though it was a different plan. The newest set of plans was time marked by Mr. Rowley. Regarding changes from the previous version of the draft decision, Attorney Liza Cox confirmed that some findings were duplicative and therefore stricken, and the roof runoff was corrected and some timing was changed under the conditions. There was no public comment.

**MOTION: Mr. Balzarini made a motion to close the public hearing for National Development. Ms. Waygan seconded the motion. All voted unanimously.**

**MOTION: Mr. Balzarini made a motion to approve the Special Permit decision as written. Mr. Kooharian seconded the motion. All voted unanimously.**

The decision was signed by Mr. Kooharian. A recess was taken at 8:25 p.m.

**8:30 Applicant: BCDM, LLC**

**Location: On and between Blue Castle Drive and Degrass Road, identified on the Mashpee Assessors Maps as Map 104, Blocks 14, 20 and 48**

**Request: Approval of a Special Permit for a 16 lot cluster subdivision**

**8:30 Applicant: BCDM, LLC**

**Location: On and between Blue Castle Drive and Degrass Road, identified on the Mashpee Assessors Maps as Map 104, Blocks 14, 20 and 48**

**Request: Approve 16-lot cluster subdivision Definitive Subdivision Plan**

The appointed time having arrived, Chairman Petersen opened both public hearings and read for the record the applicant's request. Matt Costa of Costa Associates represented the applicant, along with Attorney Brian Wall, and reported that sidewalks had been added to the plan and that they had reviewed the draft decision with no additional comments. Mr. Fudala stated that significant issues associated with the project had been included in the conditions.

Chairman Petersen expressed his concern regarding original documentation presented by the applicant and the inclusion of Blue Castle Drive in the project. The Chair read Attorney Wall's letter and questioned whether the subdivision presented matched what was described in the letter, adding that if the subdivision needed Blue Castle Drive, then improvement of the road was necessary or turnarounds would be required. Additionally, the Chair stated that for the Planning Board to make a decision, the road should be within its proper layout. The Chair also stated that it was an imposition to place on homeowners the cost to maintain the road. The Chair again referenced the original letter that stated that Blue Castle was not needed, which would then require turnarounds for emergency vehicles. Chairman Petersen stated that the Planning Board needed to determine whether the project was a subdivision needing Blue Castle or not needing Blue Castle, existing as its own development and requiring fulfillment of the subdivision regulations. The Chair read the subdivision regulations. Mr. Costa responded that there was confusion regarding the interpretation of the letter, stating that the letter addressed legal frontage, not just access. Additionally, Mr. Costa stated that by definition, it was not a dead end road. Mr. Costa also indicated that the road would be improved and was addressed in the decision as meeting the bylaws for fire and emergency vehicles and was already accepted by the Design Review Committee.

The Chair responded that the public expressed concerns about Degrass Road being impacted by additional traffic and suggested that Blue Castle may not be a viable means if two cars were unable to pass one another on the road. The Chair felt that the road should be designed and located within the proper layout. Mr. Fudala stated that it was presently a dead end, but once Carriage was built, it would no longer be a dead end. There was further discussion regarding the condition of the road. Ms. Waygan expressed concern regarding whether the Planning Board had the authority to require homeowners or the applicant to improve the road.

Mr. Rowley referenced Mr. Wall's letter stating that they did not need access to Great Neck Road South due to the rebuilt Blue Castle, Carriage and the town road. However, 2/3 of the lots were located on Blue Castle. Mr. Rowley suggested that it would be within the purview of the Planning Board to require an upgrade of Blue Castle, to the extent that it was deemed necessary. Mr. Rowley added that the Planning Board should not require any upgrades

outside of the limits of the layout, though Town Counsel had indicated that the applicant could obtain permission from the lot owners where the road was on their property. With the rights of easement to improve the road, the Planning Board would then have sufficient authority to require the changes. Mr. Rowley believed that, as a matter of public safety and the convenience of the residents, and due to the doubling of the number of homes, it was under the purview of the Planning Board to determine whether the road needed to be upgraded.

The Chair inquired why the road would not be located in its proper layout, particularly as ownership of the homes was likely to change, burdening the new owners. Mr. Costa stated that two of the abutters preferred that the road not be moved, adding that the draft decision offered a solution for most parties. The Chair inquired about potential future issues and future owners who would be responsible for maintenance of the road. Mr. Costa stated that the covenant would be in place requiring the association to be responsible for the road.

Ms. Waygan stated that there had never been consensus on whether the Planning Board had the right to require improvements outside of the road layout and how it could be accomplished. The options were to accept the offer of the applicant to regrade the unpaved portion of Blue Castle, with rights of easement provided by homeowners where the gravel road was located on their property or improve the road within its legal layout. Mr. Fudala stated that Town Counsel confirmed that the Planning Board had a right to require the improvement subject to acquiring an easement and if not secured, a modification could be sought. Mr. Fudala added that it would be a condition of the Special Permit. Mr. Kooharian indicated that no one wanted to change the current layout of the road.

Tim Dorsey stated that his deed indicated that he had a legal right down the road to Great Neck Road South and referenced the plan at the Registry of Deeds showing the legal layout. Mr. Dorsey expressed his opinion that he preferred the road be laid out in its legal layout. Mr. Costa reported that resident Ernest Virgilio, who recently purchased a lot across from 8 Blue Castle where the traveled way was outside of the layout, had expressed his preference that the road not be moved. The applicant also learned from other residents that there was a preference not to pave the road. Mr. Dorsey suggested that Mr. Virgilio might be liable for any injuries. Mr. Dorsey emphasized his preference that the road be properly aligned and expressed his concern regarding the narrowness of the road.

Mr. Wall referenced Mashpee's definition of a dead end street (1 access/1 exit), believing that cul-de-sacs were unnecessary since the roads were not dead end streets. Mr. Wall referenced his letter where he stated that the applicant had provided the legal frontage on the roads shown on the plan so Blue Castle was not needed for access. Mr. Wall further indicated that since it was not needed for access, the applicant should not be required to pave the road, but Town Counsel disagreed so the applicant then offered to a one-time improvement of the road with a crown and gravel. In an effort to appease residents, the applicant also agreed to establish a yearly maintenance program funded by residents of the sub-division, allowing abutting residents to also join the association. Mr. Wall referenced the draft decision, noting two proposed conditions to include the enhanced grading of the road, in compliance with the zoning bylaw, and with the granting of an easement from impacted homeowners and, if easements were not granted, a road 250 feet in length would need to be built in compliance with the zoning bylaws. However, Mr. Wall indicated that it was unreasonable to be forced to build the whole road due to the expense in relation to the access that was not needed. Mr. Fudala referenced the water taking plan in the findings showing the location of the road and the right of way. Mr. Fudala stated that the point of the improvements was to improve access for emergency vehicles, as requested by the Plan Review meeting, not for vehicle passage for the new development. Chairman Petersen emphasized that a new load was being added to the road and expressed his opinion that the road be located in its proper layout.

Eric Lubrano stated that Blue Castle was a dead end with no way for a Fire Truck to turn around or for two vehicles to pass one another. Mr. Lubrano requested that the road be widened to allow two emergency vehicles to pass one another. Mr. Costa responded that the existing road was dead end, but a secondary access would be provided when connected to Degross by Carriage. Mr. Costa further stated that the bylaw established the gravel width and the clearing width. Mr. Fudala stated that the standard was referring to access within a lot, not a road standard. The Chair reiterated his preference that the road be placed in its legal layout.

Mr. Kooharian inquired whether the Fire Department had reviewed the plan and it was noted that the Fire Inspector had reviewed the plan. There was discussion regarding relocation of the road.

Mr. Rowley inquired about the road adjacent to Great Neck Road South and the grading, and the amount of work that would need to be completed with the least impact to the abutters. Mr. Costa responded that they would prepare an adequate surface, review the gravel base and supplement as appropriate, review the drainage and add a drainage

swale to the north to capture the runoff. Mr. Rowley suggested that there would be less negotiation and concern about final result if it was in the layout of the road. Mr. Costa indicated that there would be significant impacts to landscaping and aesthetics that would need to take place in order to lay out the road in its proper layout. Mr. Rowley suggested the Planning Board may need a plan showing the conditions from the top of the rise to Great Neck Road South, in order to render a decision. There was discussion about whether the road should be relocated to its proper layout. Board members indicated a preference that more details be provided by the applicant to consider the layout of the road. Mr. Fudala referenced the condition and 12 feet width of the road and suggested that the Board may wish to reconsider the width of the road, which may require 16 feet for two vehicles to pass one another. Carl Lubelczyk of Tracy Lane inquired about the width of road and the typical 20 feet road width. The Planning Board was in consensus that the width of the new amended gravel road should be 16 feet. Mr. Fudala stated that both options in the conditions called for specifications and drainage improvements in the vicinity of 7 and 8 Blue Castle Drive.

Ms. Waygan referenced the traffic mitigation in condition 8 requiring the applicant to pay for Board of Selectmen approved 4-way STOP signs at Degross and Gia and Tracy. Additionally, \$3,000 would be donated to the Town to assist in the funding of a portable radar speed sign to help slow traffic. Linda Lubelczyk recommended that the sign be placed at Red Brick Road where cars cut through.

Ms. Waygan read condition 3 regarding affordable housing. Ms. Waygan requested that the transfer of land occur before 3 years and that the condition be added to the permit so that it did not transfer to open space.

Condition 11 involved water quality and would require either use of de-nite systems or contribute to an account for the purpose of planting shellfish quahog seed in Ockway Bay. In order to remove the anticipated nitrogen, 480,000 little neck seed would be needed and with 2/3 survival, within a few years, the anticipated nitrogen should be removed. Mr. Lubrano inquired about the need for future seedings and Mr. Fudala responded that the quahogs should re-seed themselves in Ockway Bay.

Conditions 13, 14 and 7 were referenced. Additional fees were requested in Condition 7 due to needed inspections extending out to Blue Castle. Mr. Fudala reported that the Conservation Commission voted to endorse the transfer of open space. Mr. Fudala also referenced the frontage and setbacks in the findings and conditions. There was consensus among the Board for the setbacks.

Mr. Fudala indicated that the deadline for acting on the subdivision plan was March 28 so an extension letter had been requested. Mr. Fudala noted that the decision included the sidewalk provision and there was also discussion about sheds.

**MOTION: Mr. Balzarini made a motion to continue both public hearings to March 19 at 7:10 p.m. Mr. Kooharian seconded the motion. All voted unanimously.**

## **BOARD ITEMS**

### **Old Business**

**Discussion of Greenways Proposal and Surrounding Commercial Property-No update**

**Community Preservation Committee-No update**

**MMR Military Civilian Community Council-Update of MMR Joint Land Use Study-No update**

**Environmental Oversight Committee-No update**

**Design Review Committee-No update**

**Charter Review-No update**

**Historic District Commission-No update**

### **New Business**

**C. Rowley Expense Vouchers-An invoice in the amount of \$95 was received for Southport.**

**MOTION: Ms. Waygan made a motion to pay the \$95 voucher from Mr. Rowley. Mr. Kooharian seconded the motion. All voted unanimously.**

Another invoice was received in the amount of \$1,197.50 for regular services for the month of February

regarding reviews and inspections for Bridges of Mashpee, Ockway Highlands, Cotuit Solar and Oceanside Subdivision.

**MOTION: Ms. Waygan made a motion to pay the voucher for Mr. Rowley for \$1,197.50. Mr. Kooharian seconded the motion. All voted unanimously.**

The vouchers were signed by Board members.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE**

- Notice of Waterways License application by Lorna C. Ibbitson for seasonal dock at 55 Pond Circle
- Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency – Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact and Notice of Intent to Request Release of Funds for “Mashpee Village Phase 2” (renovation including upgrades to accessibility, interiors, roof and fire protection and a new wastewater treatment system)

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Mr. Balzarini made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Waygan seconded the motion. All voted unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer M. Clifford  
Board Secretary

#### **LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

- Tom Mayo 2/14/14 Letter to Marshall McStay
- Bridges at Mashpee Special Permit Decision
- Charles Rowley 3/5/14 Letter Regarding Bridges of Mashpee
- Mashpee Board of Health 2/28/14 Letter to Stantec Regarding Bridges of Mashpee
- Stantec 3/5/14 Bridges of Mashpee Plan Review
- Stantec/Bridges of Mashpee Special Permit Plans
- Ockway Highlands Special Permit Decision
- Drew McManus 3/4/14 Letter Regarding Ockway Highlands Land Conveyance
- Traffic Logix Signage Information