BELLINGHAM PLANNING BOARD

P.O. BOX 43

BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

WILLIAM M. WOZNIAK, CHAIRMAN ROLAND R. LAPRADE, VICE CHAIRMAN PAUL CHUPA EDWARD T. MOORE ANNE M. MORSE

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

JUNE 12, 1997

Meeting commenced at 7:05 p.m. All members were present.

81-P SUBMISSION

Mark Staniscia, Centerville Estates, submits an 81-P plan for two lots. He had to get a variance for one lot from the ZBA. The reason for the variance was because when the land was developed he deeded a piece to the town when the road was accepted. This left him short so he needed the variance. He owns the strip of land. He presents copies of the ZBA decision with notification that the 20 day appeal period has passed.

EM asks where the frontage is.

M. Staniscia points out where it was varied. Beacon Holdings foreclosed on the property next door.

WW asks the purpose for deeding the land to the town.

EM believes it was for access to the cemetery and to all the land out back. He notes that lot 1 is the frontage lot and only lot 2 was granted the variance.

M. Staniscia owns the piece all the way up.

EM moves to sign the 81-P plan. There should be a note on the plan saying that a variance was granted and the date of the variance.

M. Staniscia indicates the decision is to be recorded with the plan. He presents a check for the \$20.00 81-P fee for the two lots.

HIXON FARM ESTATES

William Eagan, Fidelity Financial is here for a lot release request for lots 1 - 7 but forgot to bring a completed Form G for release of the lots. He presents a Form E-1 Performance Bond which must be approved as to form by Town Counsel and Town Treasuer. He will be putting up a \$32,725.00 bond for Beaver Pond Road as recommended by the DPW. Clerk presents Mr. Eagan with a copy of the Form G which he completes and presents to the Board for signature.

EM moves to accept the cash deposit passbook savings account for Ben Franklin Savings Bank in the amount of \$32,725 to release lots 1 - 7 on Beaver Pond Road in Hixon Farm Estates. PC seconds. Unanimous vote of 5.

Clerk to hold the lot release until the cash deposit is set up with the Town Treasurer. Upon notification that it has been deposited, Clerk will forward the lot release to Mr. Eagan. Letter to Town Clerk to reference bank account number for passbook savings account.

PINECREST AMENDED DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

Roger Gagnon, developer, was here at the last meeting when the Board said they wanted Milford Federal Savings Bank to sign the covenant. Milford Federal is the bank for one of the houses.

Board members would like to continue since Mr. Gagnon does not have all of his paperwork in order. The Board received a letter from Town Counsel dated today which says that he is awaiting receipt of a properly executed Covenant which has been properly signed by the Petitioner, the property owners and assented to by the Mortgagees. The copies provided to his office do not contain a typed signature of the name of the person or the Notary public or any evidence of the authorization of the person signing for Eastern Mortgage Services. He suggests that the Board hold the decision and release in escrow until he has been satisfied that all of the documents have been properly executed in accordance with our requests. Mr. Gagnon presents an extension request to July 3, 1997.

AM moves to continue to June 26, 1997 at 7:00 p.m. with approval for an extension to July 3, 1997. PC seconds. Unanimous vote of 5.

WW opens the Heritage Pines public hearing and requests a continuance to later this evening. The Board would like a few minutes to discuss the Elm Estates drainage situation while Mr. Gagnon is present. EM moves to continue to 7:45 p.m. to night. PC seconds. Unanimous vote of 5.

BRIEF DISCUSSION RE: ELM ESTATES DRAINAGE CONCERNS

Clerk reads letter from Donald DiMartino, DPW Director, dated May 23, 1997 wherein he states he met with Mr. Kauker and Mr. Choinere and placed a call to Mr. Driscoll who did not return his call to set up an appointment. His office has no signed plans relative to this subdivision. Clerk located some signed plans at the office of Attorney Bruce Lord which was provided to him and copies were made. Mr. Choinere had a few sheets of signed plans that were not included in those received from Attorney Lord. He has a call in to Mr. Choinere to borrow and copy his plans. He reviewed all plans and found a drainage swale and a perforated pipe subdrain proposed behind several properties on Bellstone Drive. His site visit indicated that this swale has not been constructed in accordance with the signed plans. What does exist in some locations is a one bucket width ditch that is not in any way the completed drainage swale and subdrain pipe system shown on the plans. At this point the \$6,100 being held as bond for this road is, in his opinion, substantially beneath what is necessary to complete the construction of the drainage swale and roadway repairs. The proposed drainage swale and underdrain pipe, shown on Mr. Choinere's set of plans, does not include any crushed stone. Typically an underdrain is perforated pipe, 4" in diameter that is installed in an envelope of crushed stone. The crushed stone allows the groundwater to run to the perforated pipe and helps to prevent clogging of the perforations. Mr. Gagnon should be required to perform the work in accordance with the approved and signed subdivision plans. The residents indicated that Mr. Gagnon has promised the Board that he would make the corrections necessary. At this time there is nothing the DPW can do other than inspect the work that Mr. Gagnon constructs.

Mr. Gagnon asks for a copy of D. DiMartino's letter since he did not receive one. Clerk presents him with a copy. He states that he took care of the lower part where Choinere is. He will have to call Phil Vadenais to take care of the rest. The first part is done. The 300' trenching is done but he will bring a dozer in to do the rest. If they want he can go further in back of Joe (Kauker's) mother's house.

B. Lord notes that the plans D. DiMartino had were signed upon approval.

EM doesn't think the Board was given a revised set of plans on what was decided through the lawsuit.

Joe Kauker wants to know when it will get done and wants it done per plan. He asks if the drainage behind his mother's house will be done by the next meeting as per the plan.

R. Gagnon agrees to do whatever the plan calls for including the swale.

AM points out it is not just swale but a perforated pipe with crushed stone. D. DiMartino will inspect it. Roger Gagnon will have to put in swale, pipe and cover it with stone.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

- J. Kauker indicates it needs to be in an envelope of crushed stone with a swale on top.
- R. Gagnon will have it done by the next meeting. He will need authorization to cross the properties.

OLD COLONIAL PLACE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW CONTINUED

Edward Broidy, applicant, is here to conform with the Board's request. He will put in a fence completely on his property 6' which will be raised to 9' where Bruce Lord's property his. He will put a berm. He agrees to put all the fencing in and raise it.

RL asks how he will raise it.

EM understood it would be a taller fence.

RL believes Mr. Broidy would need a variance for a fence at that height.

E. Broidy asks Attorney Lord to stop interrupting his explanation. He further explains the code calls for a 6' fence but because the berm comes up higher he doesn't think he needs a variance. The zoning law says 8'.

Bruce Lord, Esquire, abutter, suggests that he back fill down and around.

E. Broidy doesn't want to be bothered with what B. Lord has to say. He is doing what the Board requested and is doing everything suggested on all sides.

EM reads the notation on the plan relative to the fence.

E. Broidy agrees not to go over 8'.

EM moves to approve the Old Colonial Place Development Plan with a May 12, 1997 revision date with a varying fence from 6' to 9'. AM seconds. Unanimous vote of 5.

EM states that whether the fence is 8' or 9' is the Building Inspector's call.

HERITAGE PINES DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

EM abstains from the discussion and removes himself from the meeting room.

Bruce Lord, Esquire, representing applicant Howard Wilson explains this is a 10 lot subdivision off S. Main St. with a cul de sac. Sewer will be put in through Potter Drive. They will work out the details with the landowners regarding the concrete wall. Sewer will be brought down to the

two lots because there is available sewerage. They are waiting for a final reply from Amory. All issues have been addressed by their engineer but they are waiting for Amory's response.

Don Nielson, engineer, Guerriere & Halnon, explains that the entrance is 40' offset. It is an issue they can't resolve. It is down gradient to the cul de sac. The sewer line is all the way to the pump station. Amory will receive their reply package with all the information tomorrow. He did meet with the Amory engineer for 1.5 hours in his office to go over the reports and comments. There should have been a 6" sump pump provided with that. The stormwater on the main plan is up to the Conservation Commission relative to how the developer will work with the erosion control issues. Everything will be chipped. There will be no burial or burning. They will have a paved emergency spillway as opposed to rip rap. They did include a sedimentation basin. The site distance was talked about in the original proposal. All the wetlands flags have been placed on the plans. The zoning district is noted on the plan. The brush will be chipped. The soil evaluator is enclosed.

- B. Lord notes that some of the issues have already been taken care of deep hole testing has already been provided and it is a safer situation with the walls.
- Lt. Haughey (previous Safety Officer), explains that since his promotion to Lt. he will be working days. Sgt. Tim Buskirk replaces him as Safety Officer. The site distance is more than adequate.

AM asks about the intersection of the centerline offset.

Lt. Haughey has no experience with that so he won't know until it is there. They will have accidents there since there is a greater possibility but is it unsafe, he would have to say no. He can offer his opinion but doesn't have the experience to make a recommendation.

Kenneth Briggs asks if a study was done.

- Lt. Haughey responds that with 10 houses there will be 27 vehicle trips which were not there before. The chances for an accident are higher. People will have to come out and look left and then right and left again.
- K. Briggs would like to see a study done on Harper Blvd. during school hours since it is a very residential area.
- Lt. Haughey indicates that people in the area have asked for signs during traffic at 2:15 when the kids get out. Will that impact this? He doesn't think so.

Virginia Fowler, 1099 S. Main St., has to back up and pull out in order to get out of her driveway. With these cars coming out, there won't be enough space and time for her to get out of her driveway. She is worried about the safety of the kids.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

Lt. Haughey can't say that 27 extra vehicle trips will cause any more delay. There may be a higher chance for an accident or difficulty getting out. There is no way to stop traffic on S. Main Street.

PC explains that if the applicant meets all the requirements the Board is obligated by law.

- V. Fowler asks if they will wait until kids get hurt.
- Lt. Haughey has to live by the rules.

WW notes there is big difference between a cul de sac deadend road and a throughway.

Lt. Haughey states his first priority is the children. We are talking about 27 vehicles out of 27,000 to 30,000. That is less than 1/10th % impact of the road. It is a busy road.

John Fowler is concerned about the road being offset 40' from Harper. With someone taking a left to Harper and someone behind going right to the new road, the third guy behind will have an accident.

- Lt. Haughey lives on a street which is offset from another street. He can't say if it is more safe or hazardous. Yes, there are more accidents at offsets or intersections. This is his opinion. He has no basic knowledge like an engineer.
- B. Lord believes that even though they are not across from each other, there is adequate distance. The whole area is wide open.
- Lt. Haughey indicates there is more than 300' in both directions.
- E. Tiller, 10 S. Main St., states that even though he can see 300' from both sides, what happens if someone puts in a fence or bushes because of all the traffic.
- Lt. Haughey has asked people to trim their trees. He has knocked on doors. He looks at the site distance.

AM notes that the town does own so much of everyone's property.

- Lt. Haughey clarifies it is 25' from the center of the road.
- J. Fowler thought the Rules and Regulations make a safety rule that they can't have an offset road of 40'.

WW explains they can have it with a waiver. The Board tries to maintain that if at all possible.

Waivers are done all the time.

PC refers to the State Board of Appeals. The neighbors could buy the land to preserve it but the owner has the right to develop after paying taxes all those years. Precedent rules are set as a guideline.

D. Nielson states that 150' sets up stacking. The number of cars don't block the other intersection. It depends on traffic volume. The reason is they don't block the intersection. There is a hill going down. They are at 2% which goes down slightly at the entrance. 2' in 100' and 2 ½ for the first 100 feet. It drops 10' over a 400' area. It just looks at the site distance. He can't say about the grade slope.

V. Fowler notes there are still 1-2-3 driveways coming out an angle of the street. They need the distance. The lights will be coming through her front window all night.

WW asks if the sewer line will be brought by the frontage.

B. Lord responds it will be.

WW asks if Mr. Briggs and Mr. Tiller and other people will be able to tie in.

B. Lord responds it is not available.

PC points out that we can't make them put in the sewer.

Mr. Tiller asks what happens next year if they want 10 more.

D. Nielson responds that it can't be done. The Regulations say there can only be 12 homes on a cul de sac. There is no place to extend because they run out of land. The subdivision is surrounded by wetlands and there is no place to go. Wetlands are designated by vegetation and not necessarily water. Their next step is to go to the Conservation Commission.

J. Fowler indicates that the residents got together and wrote some comments which he presents to the Board for review.

Clerk to provide copies of the Amory letter and Guerriere & Halnon response to the neighbors. Clerk reads memo from P. Herr, dated June 12, 1997 wherein he states relative to Submittal Adequacy: 1. The location of stockpiles and spoil areas, temporary drainage systems and sediment basins should be indicated on the Erosion Control Plan. Likewise, some indication of brush and stump removal measures should be given. 2. Gap acceptance analysis and any street hazards. RE: Substantive Concerns: 3. The intersection centerline offset between the proposed Heritage Way and existing Harper Blvd. is approximately 40', far less than the 150' minimum

required. 4. Although, we are aware that the Board has forwarded drainage calculations and designs to Amory Engineers for review, the proposed detention facility is not enclosed by a fence. 5. Lots 1, 5 and 10 need to be marked by at least one bound as required at Section 4553.

RL asks about the gap acceptance analysis.

D. Nielson explains the gap acceptance and how traffic is running and how many are opposite the exit or enter the site. The rate of the intersection at A, B, C, D.

V. Fowler is concerned about firetrucks in the street.

PC explains they live in the highest point in Bellingham where the tank is.

V. Fowler asks why they have no water.

PC explains the pipes are always full but they just don't have the pressure.

Thomas Guerin, Deputy Fire Chief, notes that the Fire Dept. can get down the Silver Lake Streets.

K. Briggs doesn't think this plan coincides with the last plan.

PC states they can't put in duplexes since they are only allowed 12 dwelling units.

AM thinks that is a legal issue which should be asked of Town Counsel. A duplex is one structure which may be considered one dwelling unit.

WW instructs Clerk to forward a letter to Town Counsel to see if the Board has the legal right to require that the developer only build single family homes. RL wants to ask if a duplex is one dwelling unit or two. He thinks it is two. Board to clarify with Town Counsel.

- T. Guerin sent the Board correspondence that he wants a hydrant at the entrance but there is nothing on the plan.
- D. Nielson agrees to provide a hydrant at the entrance.

RL moves to continue Heritage Pines public hearing to June 26, 1997 at 7:30 p.m. AM seconds. Vote of 4 (WW, RL, PC and AM). EM not present and abstained from the public hearing.

EM rejoins the meeting.

CENTRE RUN DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION PUBLIC HEARING

WW opens the public hearing. Clerk reads Notice of Public Hearing.

Neil Roche, Esquire, explains that applicant Tom DiPlacido is held up at a meeting in Franklin and should be here soon. The preliminary plan was approved by the Board on February 15, 1997. This is an 8 lot subdivision with 5 Approval Not Required Plans labeled A - E. When the plan was submitted as a preliminary there were concerns from the Safety Officer so they designed the roadway so all except Parcel C face onto the proposed street which is Pine Warbler Way. There is a provision made for water looping to extend the Pulaski easement. There is the necessity for gravel removal at certain points which Don Nielson will explain. There is a gas transmission line. T. DiPlacido talked with the gas company. All the utilities, drainage pipes will go under the gas transmission line. Someone from the gas company also must be present while the work is being completed.

EM asks if the utilities will be underground for the entire project.

D. Nielson replies affirmatively for the whole thing.

EM explains they have run into problems before in this situation and asks if they will put a street light at the end of the cul de sac.

D. Nielson presents an 81-P plan for the next meeting which is the first step. They had the Conservation Commission out to inspect the site and walked the isolated wetland. The wetlands are under the jurisdiction of the Army Core of Engineers. It qualifies as isolated wetlands subject to flooding and comes under the Conservation Commission's jurisdiction. He had a conversation with the Conservation Commission regarding the drainage. They will start at 217 elevation and will climb up over the gas line. They will be connected to the street drain for the 100 year storm event which will go into the town system. The whole back of 8 - 10 lots will deal with one detention pond. They utilized isolated land subject to flooding. They will create the detention to the rear of lot 3. The road will go down and up and back up again based on the roadway profiles. The terrain is up and down considerably and varies 20' very quickly. They tried to place the septic systems to blend the lots. One side of the street is high and the other side is lower. They do have an earth removal permit request before the Zoning Board of Appeals. They have 2 versions of the same plan with 55,000 yards to be removed from the site and 15,000 to fill. Net disturbed is 70,000. The detention pond sits on the side of the hill. They will create a flat plateau around it and terrace up with a 3 - 1 slope. There will be a 100' buffer around the whole site. The detention zone will be within the buffer. There is a 100' buffer where the earth removal is concerned. It will be better to have the 5 driveways facing the proposed road. They will look like they are part of the subdivision with frontage on Pulaski.

EM asks why they can't put the sewer line under the gas line if they can put the utilities under it.

D. Nielson explains there would be 15 - 20' cuts down Centre Street. They couldn't go under the gas line. The elevation won't work. They would have to pull 1500' elevations so it won't work.

Clerk reads letter from Deputy Chief Thomas Guerin, dated May 28, 1997 wherein he states that the Fire Department finds the development plan acceptable but requests that the hydrant shown approximately 40' inside the entrance to Pine Warbler Way be moved to the corner of Pulaski Blvd. and Pine Warbler Way, with the 4 1/2" opening facing Pulaski Blvd.

Clerk reads letter from DPW Director Donald DiMartino, dated June 9, 1997 wherein he states: Relative to Roadway: 1. It would be preferable to eliminate the cul de sac and loop the street out to Pulaski Blvd. The loop provides greater access and is easier to deal with for snow and ice control. Water: 1. Extend the 8" cement lined ductile iron, shown at the gas crossing. All water main in this area that is over 5' deep should be cement lined ductile iron pipe class 52. 2. Add a main line gate valve at the end of the cul de sac just south of the hydrant branch line. 3. Our plans show the existing pipe in Pulaski Blvd to be 6" in diameter. This should be shown on the plan, along with an increaser after the tapping sleeve and valve. 4. The two main line valves shown on either side of the tapping sleeves, do not exist now and do not need to be installed with the tapping sleeve installation. Drainage: 1. He defers review of the drainage sizing submittals to the Board's consultant. 2. A maintenance plan should be submitted for the sedimentation and detention basins. Sewer: There is no sewer proposed to service this property.

D. Nielson states it calls for ductile pipe horizontal. Everything in the bend area will be ductile but when they get beyond the bend area they will change to PVC. Other towns have a 3 way valve system. They will have an easement to provide a main line valve at the end of the cul de sac.

EM believes the subdivision will gain pressure.

Clerk reads memo from Philip B. Herr, dated June 12, 1997. Submittal Adequacy: 1. Tree cover is indicated on sheets 4 & 5 with 2 12" oak trees shown as benchmarks. Presumably, 12" trees or other outstanding individual trees exist elsewhere on the site and should be located on the plans.

2. The Earth Removal, Site Development, and Erosion Control Plan, sheets 4 & 5, indicate some erosion control measures while omitting others. Specifically, the location of stockpiles and spoil areas, temporary drainage systems and sediment basins should also be indicated. Likewise, a description of brush and stump removal measures should be included in the narrative section of the environmental analysis. 3. The width of adjacent street rights of way and pavement should be shown on the definitive plan. 4. Storm drainage pipe sizes should be indicated on the street plans, in addition to the profiles. Existing and proposed curbs should also be added to the street plans.

5. The street cross section on sheet 6 should indicate 5' minimum cover for water main and cut and fill slope gradients resulting from street construction. Substantive Concerns: 6. The proposed grade of the street continues to exceed the 7' departure allowed from existing grade by Section 4258 of the Subdivision Regulations. It appears that the proposed grade has been set averaging

more than 10' below and in places 20' below existing grade. We understand that the applicant has applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a Special Permit to remove 53,200 cubic yards of soils. That proposed street design appears to violate Section 4111 (A), (B), (C), (F) and (I) of the Subdivision Regulations. At minimum, there remains to be a persuasive explanation of why grade departs so sharply from that which exists. It also appears that slopes resulting from street grading may exceed limits set out in Section 4259. 7. The catch basin which is shown at 7+50 on the street profile should also be shown on the street plan. 8. Wheelchair ramps should be added to the proposed sidewalk. He assumes that the Board will forward drainage calculations and designs to a qualified engineer for review and so have not reviewed them here.

D. Nielson reiterates that the site goes up and down dramatically and that is the reason for the placement of the septic systems which will meet the 100' buffer. They may have to add another detention pond. The in excess issues regarding depth are for purposes of cut and fill. The gas line plays a part since they have to go up and over the gas line. The road has different elevations. The drainage will be 20' in the ground or they will have to add another pond if they shift the profile. They'll have 3 ponds with 3 easements. There is one waiver of 7'.

EM indicates that in order to request the waiver they must present an argument for it in writing.

- D. Nielson states there are no slopes regarding the 3 1 and flatter.
- RL asks about the grades after they cut.
- D. Nielson points out if they don't get the waiver they don't have the earth removal. It has to be addressed before the calculations can be done on the drainage. Before sending this to a consultant, the cuts and drainage have to be worked out first.
- RL realizes that if they don't get the waiver it becomes a different project. The issue of the waiver has to be addressed first.
- EM asks how big of an area they are talking about.
- D. Nielson replies it is 20 25' in certain sections.
- RL believes they will disturb the entire vegetation of the area.
- D. Nielson states the placement of the houses will be in the level areas. The south side is at elevation 230. They kicked the road up 12 13' and the south side is up 6 8'. The road rises up to the pad and rises up again with a terracing effect. Some of the others didn't change the grades since it depends on where you are. Earth removal is confined to 7 to 13.

EM thinks the Board needs to hear from P. Herr about the cuts and fills and explains that P. Herr

only comes to one meeting a month.

Ken LeMarb, 14 Centre Street, asks the reason for removing the 55,000 gravel.

RL replies it prevents additional detention ponds.

K. LeMarb notes the land behind is wet now.

T. DiPlacido explains that originally at the preliminary plan there was a cul de sac but there was a real safety issue so they changed the road around to go over the gas main resulting in loss of a house lot and a longer length of road. He faced the houses towards the road but the result is to elevate and go over the gas main. It is touchy to make the drainage work appropriately. They can put the pipe 20' in the ground but maintenance 20 years from now is a major issue.

RL notes they are removing 55,000 gravel but they are relocating more.

EM believes the removal is necessary to build the project.

- T. DiPlacido replies that is correct. He is a developer and builds houses. He intends to do the Form A lots as the road is being constructed. His foremost business is development and building houses, not gravel removal.
- D. Nielson indicates that 5,000 yards of loam will be left on the site. They will loam and seed everything. If the profile deviates, the drainage changes.
- K. LeMarb asks the reason they are not sewering.
- D. Nielson replies it is the combination of the distance and the elevation down Centre Street. There is a hill at 220' with a valley to cross the gas line two times. It would be impractical to have an elevation 20' up Centre Street. Anything is possible if one wants to spend enough money but it is not practical. The lots are two times the size with septic at 80,000 and 40,000+ square feet.

WW asks if they can go through the piece they don't own.

D. Nielson looked at the other side but that would require deep cuts also. They would have to traverse through by easements.

EM states that if the sewer line could go in, others in the neighborhood could tie in at someone else's expense.

WW asks the distance to Deer Run.

- D. Nielson replies the distance is too great.
- K. LeMarb asks the style homes they are proposing.
- T. DiPlacido responds they are colonials and capes in the \$179,000 to \$200,000 price range with 4 bedrooms. They will all be single family and most likely will have garages too.

WW asks about the gas line crossing.

- D. Nielson explains they can't do anything near it and until they get the utilities under it, someone from the gas company will have to watch and be there.
- T. DiPlacido states if there was any other way, he would have preferred that. He has been forewarned. Before cutting a tree, he has to build a bridge over it.

WW asks about the years to come.

D. Nielson indicates it is a heavy pipe. They have to be conscious and over cautious in the area but once they build the road it will be 6' above the gas line. This line is under Centre and Pulaski.

EM explains that the Town Administrator sends the plan out to an independent engineer for review.

- T. DiPlacido asks for a strong vote from the Board before sending it out.
- RL would like to discuss it further at the next meeting when P. Herr is here.
- D. Nielson will review P. Herr's comments and respond back.
- T. DiPlacido is willing to pay for an independent engineering review with a cap and would like an estimate. He would like to send it out now.

EM can't send it out because this may not be the plan which will be used. P. Herr had issues with excessive tree removal. He suggests they talk with P. Herr since they may be able to solve some of the issues. It is between the engineer and the consultant when this gets sent out to an independent engineer. Why spend the money before they get the earth removal permit. He moves to continue to June 26, 1997 at 9:15 p.m. PC seconds. Unanimous vote of 5 (WW, RL, PC, EM and AM). He can't see the point of sending it out without the gravel removal permit first.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Deputy Fire Chief Thomas Guerin asks about the Planning Board sponsoring a Bylaw regarding

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

June 12, 1997

all the subdivisions since they have problems and need an emergency access to get in to a development as it is being built and kids play near a house which is being built. He is worried about fires and would like to see developers put in the water main first and some kind of base coat on the road in the beginning so the emergency vehicles can get in. It is done all the time in other communities. The closest water to Deer Run is at El Gee Products.

EM explains the developers need to build as they go to generate money.

PC notes that in Hopkinton the roads and utilities are in before the development begins.

AM indicates that the developers will undermine their own road with the heavy equipment.

EM believes the best way would be to propose this to P. Herr and ask him to find a Bylaw from another town that the Board can review.

PC suggests talking with D. DiMartino to find out what he thinks.

T. Guerin notes that the Deer Run developer is putting in the water line at their urging.

AM didn't think they could get a building permit without a road.

WW states it is the occupancy they can't get.

PC moves to accept the May 8, 1997 minutes. RL seconds. Unanimous vote of 5.

Members sign semi-annual stipend for members, Clerk's pay voucher and invoice for P. Herr's 4th quarter retainer and reimbursement to Clerk for telephone expense and Staples supplies.

Meeting adjourned at 10:34 p.m.

William M. Wozniak, Chairman

Roland R. LaPrade, Vice Chairman

Paul Chupa

Edward T. Moore

Anne M. Morse