

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER**

September 15, 2010

WORCESTER CITY HALL – LEVI LINCOLN ROOM

Planning Board Members Present: Anne O’Connor, Chair
Scott Cashman, Vice Chair
Stephen Rolle, Clerk
Andrew Truman
Satya Mitra

Staff Present: Joel Fontane, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Lara Bold, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Luba Zhaurova, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Jody Kennedy-Valade, Department of Inspectional Services
Michael Traynor, Law Department
Jennifer Beaton, Law Department

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Anne O’Connor called the meeting to order at 5:52 PM.

**REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES, EXTENSIONS OF TIME, POSTPONEMENTS,
WITHDRAWALS**

1. Arboretum Phase V on property located at Keach Ave, Marlana Drive, Camellia Court, Forsythia Trail, and Elderberry Circle – Definitive Subdivision Plan Approval (PB-2010-061): Hossein Haghanizadeh of HS&T Group, representative for Robert Gallo, the petitioner, stated that the petitioner has requested to continue the public hearing to October 6, 2010 in order to allow time to respond to the DPW&P comments. Mr. Adams stated that the initial response by the petitioner for the DPW&P was inadequate and stated that continuing to October 27, 2010 might be better. Mr. Haghanizadeh was amenable to that. Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 5-0 to postpone the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision Plan Approval to October 27, 2010.

Exhibit A: Letter re: Request for Continuation [Postponement] of the Public Hearing to October 6, 2010. From Crystal Carr of HS&T. Dated September 10, 2010.

2. 98 Wigwam Hill Drive - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-058): Ms. Bold read out a letter (Exhibit A) received from Kevin Quinn, representing Medway Lumber and Home Supply, Inc., the applicant, requesting continuation to October 27, 2010. Miguel Salerno, an abutter, was opposed to the proposal. He stated that he believed the lot was too small to build on and that developers proposed to develop it three times already. Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted to postpone the Definitive Site Plan to October 27, 2010.

Exhibit A: Letter re: Request for Continuance [Postponement] to October 27, 2010 for 98 Wigwam Hill Drive. From Kevin Quinn of Quinn Engineering, LLC. Dated September 13, 2010; received September 13, 2010.

- 3. 805 West Boylston Street – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-062):** Attn. Todd Brodeur, on behalf of Gas Development, LLC, applicant, stated that the applicant is requesting a continuation to October 27, 2010 in order to allow the Zoning Board of Appeals hearing for the site to take place first. Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 5-0 to postpone the item to October 27, 2010.

Exhibit A: Letter re: Gas Development, LLC/805 West Boylston Street; Request for Continuance [Postponement] to October 27, 2010 for 805 West Boylston Street. From Todd Brodeur. Dated September 13, 2010; received September 13, 2010.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 (Mr. Truman abstained because he was not present at the July 21, 2010 meeting) to approve the July 21, 2010 minutes.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the August 18, 2010 minutes.

Approval of the August 4, 2010 minutes was held.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Public Hearing

- 4. 348 Salisbury Street – Amendment - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-054):** Attn. Todd Brodeur, representing Vernon Realty Company, LLC, petitioner, stated that he submitted a letter from an arborist from Trees Unlimited (Exhibit C) stating that the 70” butternut tree on site is decayed and needs to be taken down. Ms. Bold reminded that the reason the applicant is before the Board is because the Board conditioned the original decision on: “70” butternut tree referenced in the Tree and Shrub Care proposal from Bartlett Tree Experts be pruned, retained and noted on the plan.” She suggested that the applicant replace some of the trees proposed to be removed and asked if the applicant would be amenable to that. Mr. Brodeur stated that he would be amenable to replacing the 70” butternut tree, which is close to the common driveway, but not replacing all trees to be removed because the site is heavily wooded. He stated that the area to be cleared for the development is clearly delineated and the intent is not to cut down the trees in the rest of the site.

Miguel Salerno, abutter, stated that he had hired an independent arborist who assessed the butternut tree and agreed that it needs to be taken down. He stated that this is a mature tree that provides shade for his property and asked the Board to condition the application on replacing it with a sapling in the general vicinity of the tree to be removed.

John Foley, an abutter, expressed doubt that the tree needed to be taken down and stated that Trees Unlimited is not a certified organizations. He asked the Board to consider a condition of approval that a similar tree is planted and maintained.

Mr. Rolle clarified whether staff’s recommended condition of approval is specific to the 70” butternut tree or all trees proposed to be removed. Ms. Bold stated that the condition is specific to the butternut tree referred to in the original condition of approval. Mr. Rolle asked what the City’s recommended

caliper size for new plantings is. Ms. Bold said three and a half inches. Mr. Mitra asked why the applicant is proposing to increase the number of trees to be removed as compared to the original Site Plan Approval. Mr. Brodeur responded that five trees were asked to be removed by Paul Simonelli, an abutter, as they are not in good condition. Mr. Rolle stated that he believes it would be reasonable to ask to replace a mature 70" butternut tree with two young trees. Mr. Brodeur was amenable to that. Mr. Cashman concurred with Mr. Rolle.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with a condition that the 70" butternut tree is replaced with two (2) three-and-a-half (3.5) inch caliper shade trees in the general vicinity of the tree to be removed.

Exhibit A: Amendment to Definitive Site Plan Application, received July 15, 2010.

Exhibit B: Amendment to Definitive Site Plan; dated July 12, 2010, received July 15, 2010; engineer – Graves Engineering, Inc.

Exhibit C: Letter from Trees Unlimited regarding 354 (a.k.a. 348) Salisbury Street recommending removal of the large Butternut tree; dated September 24, 2009, received August 11, 2010.

Exhibit D: Letter from Attn. Todd Brodeur to the Planning Board requesting continuance of the meeting to September 15, 2010; dated August 11, 2010, received August 11, 2010.

NEW BUSINESS:

Public Hearing

5. 717 Plantation Street – Amendment – Special Permit for Water Resources Protection Overlay District (PB-2010-060): The Amendment to the Special Permit (PB-2010-060) and the Amendment to Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-059) were taken up contemporaneously. Normand Gamache of Guerrire & Halnon, representative for Saint Gobain Performance Plastics, petitioner, stated that the site is currently under construction. He stated that the petitioner is seeking to: convert an existing warehouse space to manufacturing area by expanding the previously approved 10' x 10' pad for mechanical equipment to a 20' x 24' pad; reduce the size of the new loading dock to 23' x 13'; add an access walkway to the mechanical pad (total of 1-3 – 112 SF of impervious area); add a pedestrian walkway from the parking area (828 SF impervious area); install an additional 475 sf paved apron adjacent to the solvent storage shed to accommodate a forklift; relocate existing liquid nitrogen tank and concrete pad (adds 504 SF of impervious surface); add five (5) parking spaces in the area of the proposed liquid nitrogen tank to be relocated; and add sixteen (16) off-street parking spaces (2,250 SF). With respect to the DPW&P Environmental Systems responses (Exhibits E, F, G), Mr. Gamache stated that the petitioner is proposing to install a new infiltration system to infiltrate roof runoff from the existing building. Mr. Adams referred to Exhibit G stating that DPW&P is amenable to the petitioner's proposed changes as long as the final revised plans reflect the proposed changes. Mr. Gamache submitted two copies of the proposed plan to staff.

Ms. Bold stated that the petitioner needed an Amendment to the Special Permit because the site is located in the Water Resource Protection Overlay District. She stated that 717 Plantation Street is located in the Ground Protection-2 area or the "zone of contribution." She stated that 20% of imperviousness is allowed by-right on sites in the GP-2 districts, and that the existing site received an Amendment to a Special Permit on June 3, 2009 to allow 52% of the site to become impervious and on December 18, 2009 to allow 53% of the site to become impervious. The applicant is proposing a total increase in impervious area of 4,169 SF or 55%. She stated that Philip D. Guerin, Director of

Environmental Systems at DPW&P, stated that sandy soils of the site are conducive to recharge of the roof's water runoff which is non-polluted. She stated that the proposed Amendment would accommodate the expanding business and will improve traffic flow. She recommended approval of both the Amendment to the Special Permit and Amendment to Definitive Site Plan with a condition that final revised plans are submitted showing amended drainage plans.

Mr. Rolle asked what the total roof area surface is. Mr. Gamache was not sure, and stated that the proposed roof recharge system will accommodate 11,862 square feet of impervious area which more than compensates for the additional impervious area that is proposed for the Amendment to the Special Permit. Mr. Truman asked if 79 parking spaces proposed are more than minimum required by the zoning ordinance and if they all are needed. Mr. Gamache stated that while not all spaces are needed now, Saint Gobain is seeking to grow its core business and also the expansion gives more room for trucks to turn around at the turning dock.

Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 5-0 to close the Public Hearing.

Mr. Cashman had a question about the Special Permit finding of fact with respect to traffic. Ms. Bold stated that proposed changes will improve the traffic flow along Plantation Street as large trucks will not have to back up on the street, and that the improvements on site help the business expansion and operations on site.

With respect to fiscal impact findings of fact, Mr. Cashman stated that it is debatable whether the project provides an overall financial benefit to the City and stated that he believed the second sentence was not necessary: "The previous approval provided numerous benefits to the City" due to the fact that Saint Gobain has received incentives from the City.

Ms. Bold stated that per City's conversation with the Saint Gobain representatives the expansion would allow for job increases thus creating a positive fiscal impact. Ray Lareau, Saint Gobain representative, stated the company has added 30 jobs and invested millions of dollars into this facility which shows its long-term commitment. He stated that he believed the City's infrastructure was not taxed and that while several City and state incentives were received to locate in Worcester, the company hires from the central Massachusetts economic resource area in order to qualify for those funds.

Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 5-0 to adopt the petitioner's findings of fact with the exception of the last sentence of the fiscal impact findings of fact and to approve the Amendment to the Special Permit conditioned on the Philip D. Guerin's letter, dated September 14, 2010, as modified September 15, 2010 (Exhibits F & G).

Public Meeting

- 6. 717 Plantation Street – Amendment - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-059):** The Amendment to the Special Permit (PB-2010-060) and the Amendment to Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-059) were taken up contemporaneously.

Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mt. Truman, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Amendment to Definitive Site Plan with the condition that all work shall be done in accordance with the final approved Amendment to Definitive Site Plan and final approved Amendment to the Special Permit on file with the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services.

Exhibit A: Amendment to Special Permit and Amendment to Definitive Site Plan Applications, dated August 10, 2010. Received August 11, 2010. Prepared by Michael Y. Weaver, P.E. Guerriere & Halnon on behalf of Saint Gobain Performance Plastics.

Exhibit B: Amendment to Special Permit Plan and Amendment to Definitive Site Plan, dated July 29, 2010. Received August 11, 2010; revised Sept 13, 2010. Prepared by Michael Y. Weaver and Norman Gamache, Guerriere & Halnon Inc.

Exhibit C: Memorandum to the Planning Board from the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services staff, re: 717 Plantation Street – 2nd Amendment to Special Permit (WRPOD) & Amendment to Definitive Site Plan; dated September 8, 2010.

Exhibit D: Memorandum to the Planning Board from the Department of Public Works & Parks staff, re: 717 Plantation Street Special Permit Amendment – PB-2010-060; dated September 8, 2010.

Exhibit E: Memorandum to the Planning Board from the Department of Public Works & Parks staff, re: 717 Plantation Street Definitive Site Plan Amendment – PB-2010-059; dated September 8, 2010.

Exhibit F: Memorandum to Chris Gagne of Department of Public Works & Parks from Philip D. Guerin, Director of Environmental Systems, City of Worcester, re: 717 Plantation Street / Saint Gobain, PB-2010-059; dated and received September 14, 2010.

Exhibit G: Memorandum to Chris Gagne of Department of Public Works & Parks from Philip D. Guerin, Director of Environmental Systems, City of Worcester, re: 717 Plantation Street / Saint Gobain – Response to Comments, PB-2010-059; dated and received September 15, 2010.

- 7. 0-9 Hemans Street - Extension of Time - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-056):** The petitioner was not present. Ms. Bold stated as a note to the Board, that the state legislature, as part of the economic stimulus bill, voted in early August to extend special permits, variances, subdivision approvals, site plan approvals and parking plan approvals for two years from the date such approval would expire, provided the approval was in effect between August 15, 2008 and August 15, 2010. This approval for 0-9 Hemans Street was in effect at that time and would automatically be extended for two years until September 15, 2012. Ms. Bold stated that same applicants may still seek approval from the Board to update records. Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 5-0 to approved the Extension of Time – Definitive Site Plan to September 15, 2012.

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan – Extension of Time – Application and Plan, received July 20, 2010.

Exhibit B: Memorandum to the Planning Board from the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services staff; dated September 11, 2010.

Exhibit C: Memorandum to the Planning Board from the Department of Public Works & Parks staff; dated September 10, 2010.

- 8. 152, 152R, 0 and 166 Moreland Street – Amendment – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-063):** Attn. Don O’Neil representing Michael Hannon, applicant, stated that the purchaser of lot 4A wanted to change the proposed building footprint from 1,500 SF to ~3,000 SF which necessitated an Amendment to Definitive Site Plan. Ms. Bold stated that the amended building and driveway footprints would cause a slight increase in the lot surfaces imperviousness from 21.5% to 22.1%, but would not trigger an Amendment to the Special Permit for Cluster Subdivision as determined by the Division of Inspectional Services. She stated that under the Cluster Subdivision, a maximum 40% site imperviousness is allowed. She stated that staff would like to retract its recommended condition of approval in the staff memo (Exhibit C) with respect to cover page annotation because the revision date is already shown on the plan.

Richard Wolf, an abutter, stated the proposed amendment represents what he called “a continuous creep” toward the Matthews property at 144 Moreland Street. He stated that he is speaking on behalf of the Matthews family who was not able to attend the meeting and have been living there for 40 years. He stated that the family sees the construction activity at the neighboring site as an eyesore. He stated that the Matthews sold the land to be developed with an understanding that the purchaser would plant vegetation to visually screen the abutting property. Chair O’Connor stated that the proposed house is within the required 10-foot side yard setback and that those plantings are already a condition of approval. Ms. Bold stated that there are no specific requirements in the Zoning Ordinance with respect to the timing of the landscaping. Mr. Traynor stated that the landscaping should be tied to the construction, such as an occupancy permit. Ms. Bold stated that the Board could condition the approval of the planting by a date certain, though the construction date has not been set for some of the lots in the subdivision. She then suggested that date of landscaping buffer could be tied to the date of construction of the building on lot 4A and a driveway on lot 4 B. Mr. Fontane stated that plantings could be damaged by construction activities and it is preferable to plant them after the construction is completed. Mr. Truman concurred. Mr. Cashman stated that the Matthews could also plant on their property as well along the property line. He stated that he does not think the Board should condition landscaping from the applicant, especially because such a condition was not required of the applicant for the previous permits and because the Matthews were aware of the proposed activity since they were involved in the land sale. Mr. Wolf stated that the site could be clear-cut and bare for a long time, until properties are eventually built. Mr. O’Neil stated that the applicant’s intention is to put in the landscaping after lot 4B is constructed to plan, but that there is no buyer for lot 4B yet. He stated that it is impracticable to put in a driveway and landscaping prior to construction of the house. Mr. O’Neil stated that 20 arborvitae trees were planted before the construction along the rear (eastern) lot line of the Matthews lot on the lot 4B property, which are not shown on the plan. He stated that the applicant did this even though it was not required of him. He stated that it has not been a year since the site work began in October of last year.

Mr. Wolf stated that Matthews had an understanding that the purchaser will plant planting to visually screen the abutting property prior to construction. Chair O’Connor stated that if this agreement was part of the Purchase and Sale Agreement, then it would be a private matter outside of the Board’s purview. She stated that she does not see requiring plantings earlier to make sense.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Cashman, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Amendment to Definitive Site Plan with the condition that all landscaping shown on the plan between lot 4B and the Matthews property is planted upon completion of construction of the dwelling on lot 4B and prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit for that dwelling unit.

Exhibit A: Amendment to Definitive Site Plan Application; received August 17, 2010.

Exhibit B: Amendment to Definitive Site Plan; dated August 16, 2010, received August 17, 2010; engineer – Quinn Engineering, Inc.

Exhibit C: Memorandum to the Planning Board from the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services staff; dated September 8, 2010, updated September 13, 2010.

Exhibit D: Memorandum to the Planning Board from the Department of Public Works & Parks staff; dated September 10, 2010.

OTHER BUSINESS:

9. ANR Plans:

- **AN-2010-048, Camden Avenue:** Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 5-0 to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-048.
- **AN-2010-049, Goddard Memorial Drive:** Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 5-0 to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-049.
- **AN-2010-050, Benoit Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 5-0 to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-050.
- **AN-2010-051, Norfolk Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Cashman, the Board voted 5-0 to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-051.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Public Hearing

10. Amend the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Worcester relative to sign regulations, create sign overlay districts and amend the Zoning Map of the City of Worcester to establish sign overlay districts. Summarily, the proposed amendment would:

Delete Article IV, Section 6 - Signs in its entirety and insert a new Article IV, Section 6 - Signs.

- Amend Section 2 of Article I - Definitions of the Worcester Zoning Ordinance by deleting all definitions relating to signs and incorporating new and/or revised definitions into Article IV, Section 6. - Signs.
- Amend Section 1 of Article III - Districts by inserting the following designations at the end of the list:

Union Station View Corridor Sign Overlay District
Blackstone River Parkway Sign Overlay District
Blackstone Canal Sign Overlay District

- Amend Section 2 of Article III - Zoning Map by designating the area within the boundaries therein described as the Union Station View Corridor Sign Overlay District in the area of I-290, Grafton, Summer and Shrewsbury Streets.
- Amend Section 2 of Article III - Zoning Map by designating the area within the boundaries therein described as the Blackstone River Parkway Sign Overlay District in the area of Blackstone River Road and I-146.
- Amend Section 2 of Article III - Zoning Map by designating the area within the boundaries therein described as the Blackstone Canal Sign Overlay District in the area of Millbury, Grafton, Water and Washington Streets.

Ms. Bold presented an overview of the proposed modifications and remaining policy issues.

With respect to window signs, Ms. Bold stated the proposed modified definition based on the previous hearing's feedback: "The combined area of temporary and permanent window signs on each of the first and

second stories of a building and along each primary and secondary building length shall not exceed 50% of the available window area per story and per building length.” She stated that the following clarification will also be provided in the ordinance: “This provision shall not be construed to limit sign area to 50% of each individual window pane. Window signs shall not be located above the second floor of a multi-story building nor shall the area of windows on floors above the second story of a multi-story building be included in the calculation of maximum permissible window sign area.” Mr. Truman used CVS on Commercial Street as an example of filled in windows, but not with signs. Ms. Bold stated that the City would only regulate signs.

With respect to signs on vehicles, she proposed the following definition: “Signs attached to or painted on a parked motor vehicle or other parked wheeled conveyance, where such vehicle or wheeled conveyance is not used in the regular transport operations of the business owner and is used merely, mainly or primarily as a support structure for the sign shall be subject to the dimensional requirements for freestanding pole signs. Note: Size of the sign would be based on number of tenants without further limitation.” Mr. Lanava asked for a clarification on whether or not these signs would be grandfathered. Ms. Bold responded yes. Mr. Fontane stated that because it is an exemption, it would be in the notes section to the proposed sign table (below).

With respect to non-accessory signs spacing, Ms. Bold proposed the following in response to the Attn. Finkelstein’s question at the hearing on September 1, 2010: “Spacing between non-accessory signs with digital display facing the same direction of travel along a street shall be a minimum of 1,000 feet.”

With respect to murals, Ms. Bold stated that current regulations require a Special Permit for all murals. The proposed regulations would treat mural that is determined to be an accessory sign as a permanent accessory wall sign (or whatever sign type it is determined to be). She stated that the proposed substitution clause would allow noncommercial speech to have the same area as commercial speech. She stated that a non-accessory commercial “mural” would be required to obtain a Special Permit for the use. She proposed a revised definition for the mural: “A noncommercial picture or decoration, typically painted, which is for artistic, cultural or societal purposes. However, a mural is considered a sign if it is related by language, logo or pictorial depiction to the advertisement of any product or service or the identification of any business.”

Ms. Bold stated that DPRS staff is finalizing tables for permanent accessory signs, non-accessory signs, and temporary signs in order to summarize the information in a more concise and accessible format. Mr. Cashman suggested that Ms. Bold use “Allowed” instead of “Permitted” in table column. Ms. Bold additionally suggested using the same preamble as Table 4.1 (Section 2- Permitted Uses) of the Zoning Ordinance explaining what allowed/not allowed/special permit means. Mr. Lanava stated that he does not see a note in the table stating that digital signs less than 14 SF will be allowed. Ms. Bold stated that the table is in draft form and that she will include the note.

Jo Hart asked for clarification on where the non-accessory signs are currently allowed. Ms. Bold responded that they are permitted on highways, which include local highways such as Chandler Street, Pleasant Street, and more. She read the street definition from the Zoning Ordinance.

With respect to proposed non-accessory sign area, Ms. Bold stated that current regulations permit 1200 SF per side (total 2400 SF) by SP for non-accessory freestanding, roof and wall signs. She stated that staff proposes the non-accessory wall and roof signs to have the same area as accessory wall and roof signs.

She stated that at 9/1/2010 PB hearing, the Board received testimony from Damien Jacob recommending that non-accessory freestanding signs be treated the same as non-accessory wall/roof signs and be permitted the same area as accessory freestanding signs. She stated that staff maintains recommendation that non-accessory wall and roof signs be less than 1200 SF which staff believes would prioritize buildings, architecture, and accessory signs. Staff believes that because non-accessory freestanding sign are a separate use on the property, these signs should be regulated differently. Alternatively, staff proposes to limit

freestanding billboard signs to 672 SF per side (total 1344 SF) along all highways (including local street highways such as Grafton, Lincoln, Chandler, and Pleasant Streets) or along limited access highways only (i.e. 1-290, I-190, and Rt. 146). Mr. Truman asked for a definition of non-limited access highway. Ms. Bold stated that this definition is not in the Zoning Ordinance, but state law delineates tiers of roads such as commercial, arterial, limited access highway, and unlimited access highway. Mr. Fontane stated that a typical industry standard for a free-standing non-accessory sign is about 672 SF per face. Mr. Finkelstein asked for time to consider these alternatives and to discuss them with his clients and acknowledged that current regulations allowing 1,200 SF per face is a somewhat excessive. He stated that Murray Outdoor Communications has a non-accessory freestanding sign that is 17 by 48 feet (i.e. 816 SF).

With respect to the net effect of the proposed ordinance for non-accessory signs, Ms. Bold stated that staff is compiling a list of existing billboards, developing a map showing areas where billboards are currently permitted and prohibited based on local and state ordinances, and developing a map showing impact of the proposed overlays. She stated that the largest affected area appears to be along Route 146 – Blackstone River Parkway Overlay District. Mr. Rolle asked if the area near the bike path along Route 146 would already be excluded by the Outdoor Advertising Board regulations. Ms. Bold stated that it would be considered a public area available for public recreational use and that she will look into how this might affect the proposed overlay delineation.

Upon Mr. Fontane’s request for continuance and upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Cashman, the Board voted 5-0 to continue the hearing to October 6, 2010.

- Exhibit A: Presentation. “Modifications to Proposed Sign Ordinance.” Presented by Joel Fontane, Director and Lara Bold, Chief Planner of the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services. September 15, 2010.
- Exhibit B: Proposed Permanent Accessory Sign Table, draft – September 14, 2010.
- Exhibit C: Proposed Temporary Accessory Sign Table, draft – September 15, 2010.

ADJOURNMENT: Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 5-0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 pm.