

**BOLTON PLANNING BOARD**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**January 10, 2007 at 7:30 P.M.**  
**Bolton Town Hall**

Present: Larry Delaney (Chair), Douglas Storey (Vice-Chair), Stephen Garner, John Karlon, Frank Lazgin, Nat Tipton (Town Planner)

**HEARINGS**

**1. Master Plan Vote**

Present: Martha Remington (Historical Commission); Joe Kovacs; Wayne Wetzel; Brad Reed; Ken Swanton; Ken Troup; Betsy Taylor-Kennedy; David Wylie; Bonnie Chandler

Delaney explained the purpose of the hearing was to solicit additional comments from the public and town boards on the Master Plan draft before the Planning Board issued its vote required under MGL Chapter 41 Section 81D. Remington explained she reviewed the plan and was happy with the changes that were made. She mentioned the Historical Commission did not formally vote on the plan, however she supports the plan and hopes the plan passes muster with the Planning Board. As a town resident of 30 years, Remington stated she is pleased the town has a master plan. Storey asked if there were specific tasks that the Historical Commission supports. Remington responded that the adoption of a local historic district and passage of the Community Preservation Act are supported by the Historical Commission. She was disappointed the plan did not address parking for the Wisell property that is being rehabbed.

Wetzel asked why the Master Plan Committee believed the town residents within a proposed historic district would support it when a similar effort failed at town meeting in the past. Swanton responded the residents that the Committee has spoken with were enthusiastic. Wetzel mentioned his wife worked on the article and residents did not the town dictating what they could or could do on their property. Reed mentioned that a local historic district is not a one-size-fits-all measure and could be tailored to provide proper protection without setting burdensome restrictions on residents.

Discussion shifted to the Community Preservation Act. Wetzel asked whether the Town would consider passing it under the condition that only monies collected under the CPA would be used to fund projects falling under its allowable uses (Affordable Housing, Open Space Preservation, Historical Preservation, or Parks/Recreation). Storey stated the big balancing act is to control spending by ensuring funds go to project that what the town would have spent anyways. Delaney stated he is skeptical of the open space argument made throughout the Master Plan and at the end of the day it does not hold water.

Wetzel felt the Master Plan should have a different title. He cautioned the argument made in the plan would be used to support projects on town meeting floor in the future. Wylie stated this would water down the purpose of the plan and to give the Plan respect. He felt the Plan made its arguments using data to back it up and credence should be given to the plan.

Delaney read a comment submitted by Daniel Senie of the Public Ways Safety Committee on the Plan. Delaney and Storey stated they don't agree with some of the arguments and strategies in the Plan, but by in large it is a good collection of ideas for the town to consider. Garner suggested adding a section in the Implementation Chart that acknowledges the charter of each committee that is proposed to be created. The Board also suggested writing a tag line that acknowledges the plan is not intended to be an edict.

Pursuant to the addition of a cover letter explaining the Board's position on how the plan should be used, and the amendment to the Implementation Chart, the Board voted unanimously to accept the Bolton Master Plan under the provisions of MGL Chapter 41 Section 81D.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **2. Approval Not Required Plan - Walter Graustein/Greystone Electronics 237 Sugar Road**

Present: Bill Cucchiara – David Ross Associates

The Board voted to endorse the Plan showing division of a 9.24 acre lot into two lots (1.84 acres and 7.40 acres). Plan entitled "Plan of Land in Bolton Mass." prepared for Walter Graustein III prepared by David E. Ross Associates, Ayer, MA dated June 2006.

### **3. Development of One Single Family Home In Hudson with Bolton Frontage**

Present: David Brown, Jed Wood

Tipton explained that he received a request from Mr. Brown seeking to clarify what role the Board would play in permitting a driveway off Hudson Board if the building area was in Hudson. In this instance, where the applicant was proposing to divide a lot in such a manner that the building area was in Hudson but the frontage was gained in Bolton, it was not immediately clear. Under normal circumstances, the Board would need to issue a driveway permit before signing a building permit. However, in this instance, the applicant was proposing to divide the lot to meet the frontage requirement for Hudson (150 feet) but not in Bolton (200 feet).

The applicant presented an opinion from the Hudson Building Inspector and a sketch drawn on a plot plan of the proposed division. Delaney questioned the ability of the applicant to seek endorsement of a plan solely from the Hudson Planning Board if the frontage was in Bolton. In addition, because the frontage requirement of Bolton was not met, Delaney questioned whether the applicant could legally divide the lot in the manner he was suggested.

The Board decided to seek advice from Town Counsel on the request. The Board would review Counsel's response at the next meeting.

### **4. Oak Trail – Additional Work**

Present: Rich Burgoyne, IGC

Burgoyne explained that Brian Lynch could not make the meeting tonight. Tipton explained he met with Lynch to review a memo produced by Rob Oliva and the value of the bond estimate. Oliva's memo estimates the remaining work to be valued at \$113,300. Tipton stated some of the items were going to have to be done anyways for the developer to have the road under consideration for acceptance (street bounds and as-built drawings). He suggested these items might not have to be included in the escrow. Storey stated the Town needs to be sure that the additional work is completed to the Board's satisfaction before the town can accept the road. He felt that if IGC disagreed with Oliva's estimate, they were free to submit their own estimate that includes the value of all the work left to do. Storey also stated he needed to be sure that when additional driveways are constructed, the builder knows that a number of culverts are required to be constructed at a certain size. He was concerned that the onus would fall on the Town during the driveway permit phase when it was the responsibility of IGC to ensure this is done. It was decided that IGC would need to submit a revised itemized estimate that shows the value of each item.

Meeting adjourned.