

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

**MEETING MINUTES
GEORGETOWN PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, January 22, 2014
Memorial Town Hall – 3rd Floor
7:00 p.m.**

Present: Mr. Harry LaCortiglia; Mr. Christopher Rich; Ms. Tillie Evangelista; Mr. Tim Howard (arrived at 7:40 PM); Mr. Bob Watts; Mr. Howard Snyder, Town Planner; Ms. Wendy Beaumont, Administrative Assistant.

Meeting Opens at 7:10 PM.

Approval of Minutes:

1. Minutes of January 8, 2014.

Mr. Rich - **Motion** to accept the minutes of January 8, 2014 subject to any changes made by colleagues at this meeting.

Mr. Watts - **Second.**

Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.

Correspondence:

1. Town of Newbury: Zoning Board of Appeals - Legal Notice.

2. Town of Boxford: Zoning Board of Appeals - Notice #926.

3. Town of Boxford: Zoning Board of Appeals - Notice #927.

4. Town of Georgetown: ZBA – Finding for 6 Norino Way.

Mr. Snyder - The recent finding on a special permit for a water resource transport terminal will be relevant later in the meeting as they are coming back for a minor modification to the site plan.

Mr. LaCortiglia - What did they find?

Mr. Snyder - Their proposed changes were not substantially different from the previously approved decision.

5. H.L. Graham and Associates: Technical Review Report – Turning Leaf Definitive Subdivision.

Mr. Snyder - This will be relevant to a public hearing being held later tonight.

6. John Sousa: 161 West Main Street.

Mr. Snyder - I received a letter from Mr. Sousa and he will be back under Old Business at tonight's meeting.

New Business:

1. Sign Application: 103 East Main Street: Honey Dew Donuts.

43 Mr. Snyder - Received a sign application for Honey Dew and for Georgetown Liquor. The
44 property owners want to update and make consistent all signs. In my opinion the sign
45 applications meet the article of the sign bylaw.
46
47 Mr. Rich - Did the building inspector review it?
48
49 Mr. Snyder - {Shows the proposed signs on the screen.} Yes and he forwarded them to us for
50 review. By my calculations both are under the percentage.
51
52 Mr. Rich - Is that the only signage for them?
53
54 Mr. Snyder - This is the only sign for Honey Dew. No application for a window sign.
55
56 Mr. LaCortiglia - But they have a window sign.
57
58 Mr. Rich - Just a banner.
59
60 Mr. Watts - Is there a sign inside the building?
61
62 Mr. Rich - The only thing I saw were the beautiful pictures of historic Georgetown in there. I
63 guess corporate doesn't like them. I think people should go in and look at the pictures. I
64 think they are trying to become part of the community and I think we may want to think
65 about writing a letter in support of the pictures from the planning board.
66
67 Ms. Evangelista - That would be a nice gesture.
68
69 Mr. Snyder - My calculations have signs under code requirement of no more than 15 percent.
70
71 Mr. Rich - Fifteen percent of the building area they are using?
72
73 Mr. Snyder - Right. The bylaw allows for a free standing sign or a window sign. Neither
74 application considers these. This permit is just for the sign hanging off the roof edge.
75
76 Mr. LaCortiglia - I didn't see any signage that directs people in the parking lot for entering
77 one way and exiting one way.
78
79 Mr. Rich - There is an entrance only sign and an exit only sign but it does not tell you that
80 you can't make a left turn.
81
82 Ms. Evangelista - Wasn't there a condition that Mr. Durkee was taking care of that sign?
83
84 Mr. Snyder - That was a conditions for 161 West Main Street and not for this application.
85

86 Mr. Rich - Maybe we can ask them to get in touch with Mr. Durkee to get the signs for one
87 way in and a one way going out at the exit?

88

89 Mr. LaCortiglia - That's not what was in the site plan. I think it was supposed to be free
90 standing signs at the end.

91

92 Ms. Evangelista - That is critical as in the morning it is very busy and it can be confusing.

93

94 Mr. LaCortiglia - I was concerned about people going in the exit and out the entrance
95 because there is no signage there.

96

97 Mr. Rich - **Motion** for Mr. Snyder to sign off on the Honey Dew sign.

98 Mr. Watts - **Second.**

99 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.**

100

101 **2. Sign Application: 103 East Main Street: Georgetown Liquors.**

102 Mr. Snyder - I calculated this to be under the 15 percent as well.

103

104 Ms. Evangelista - That's nice that each section will have the same signage.

105

106 Mr. Watts - Isn't this sign larger than the other?

107

108 Mr. Snyder - It is but they have more square foot of store front than Honey Dew.

109

110 Mr. LaCortiglia - Do they have more face or overhang?

111

112 Mr. Snyder - They have more building face.

113

114 Mr. LaCortiglia - Can I see the bylaw one more time?

115

116 {Reading of the sign bylaw and discussion regarding it.}

117

118 Mr. Rich - So the space that the liquor store front wall exceeds the pillar.

119

120 Mr. LaCortiglia - Why is the measurement taken from the pillar?

121

122 Mr. Snyder - This is the shop sign provided by the sign company. My calculations did not
123 follow that layout. I looked into the width of the sign and amount of store frontage.

124

125 Ms. Evangelista - But they occupy the rest of it with the hardware store.

126

127 Mr. Snyder - I went out there and paced it off to the end of their space.

128

129 Ms. Evangelista - I don't think you should have used that. I am thinking he is going to put
130 another sign over the hardware section.

131
132 Mr. LaCortiglia - I am good with the Honey Dew sign but this one I think we need more
133 information. Mr. Snyder can look into this further and maybe look into the site plan approval
134 for the signs on the pillars and see if we did it right or dropped the ball.

135
136 **Old Business:**

137 **1. 161 West Main Street: Pentucket Workshop Pre-School: Conformance of Approval of**
138 **Decision.**

139 Mr. Snyder - The decision of approval was in a previous packet.

140
141 Mr. LaCortiglia - I remember that there were three things that needed to be dealt with. Do we
142 have it electronically?

143
144 Mr. Sousa - First I want to apologize for not communicating with Mr. Snyder in order to
145 make you aware of what is going on there. I know there are three issues. The first is line
146 stripping and curb stops. This was done over the summer. The second are the no parking
147 signs. As I understood it the town was going to put them in and I would pay. I also miss
148 understood as I assumed the town would get the ball rolling. I didn't know I had to call Mr.
149 Durkee. I have now called Peter and asked him to do that. He said he would be calling Mr.
150 Snyder.

151
152 Mr. LaCortiglia - When did you contact him?

153
154 Mr. Sousa - Last week.

155
156 Mr. LaCortiglia - Mr. Snyder have you heard from him yet?

157
158 Mr. Snyder - I received an email from him. {Reads email from Peter Durkee.} In part he
159 states he cannot just put up signs because the Planning Board says so. It has to be in the
160 Town bylaw. If it is in the town bylaw about where signs are to be located, he can put those
161 up and repair them. Given this two sentence explanation, the Planning Board can put it in the
162 conditions but he can't put it up as it needs to be in the bylaw and to state where signs are.

163
164 Mr. LaCortiglia - We need a bylaw to do this or a town warrant at town meeting to do it?

165
166 Mr. Rich - But it says where they can be. We just went through that with the traffic
167 committee. They revamped all the parking in Georgetown and relocated HP spaces and that
168 went to the selectmen, they Ok'd it and the signs were put up.

169
170 Mr. Snyder - If you want me to go to the selectmen I will do so.

171

172 Mr. Rich - **Motion** to refer our order of conditions to the Board of Selectmen with a request
173 that they issue an order for the installation of the no parking signs and the applicant will pay
174 for those signs.

175 Mr. Watts - **Second.**

176 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.**

177

178 Mr. Rich - There is a bylaw that states the selectmen are the only people that can decide where
179 the signs go.

180

181 Mr. Sousa - The third is about the HP lift. In a previous meeting we agreed to install access and
182 you graciously gave me a year to complete. It was discussed that the cost would be about
183 \$10,000. When I started to do it I found that there are significant differences between lifts.
184 What I found was just a lift alone is \$20,000 installed with \$1,100 per year for inspections. It is
185 considerably more expensive. A reason is that a lift needs to have a battery backup. The other
186 thing is that the lift needs to be put in a shaft way. These are things I did not expect. The reason
187 they are in a shaft way is to protect it from the elements.

188

189 Mr. LaCortiglia - Who is the engineer?

190

191 Mr. Sousa - It was Atlantic.

192

193 Mr. LaCortiglia - So they did not get it right?

194

195 Mr. Sousa - We showed two locations on the plan where it could go. It wasn't that they didn't
196 get it right. At the time we didn't know that we needed a shaft way around it. So the cost for a
197 lift has ballooned. In addition to the \$20,000 I also have a shaft cost of \$23,000 dollars.
198 Including the retaining wall, we are in at \$45,000 to provide universal access. This is
199 considerably more than what was expected. Had I gone forward with it, it would not have
200 conformed to what the site plan currently shows.

201

202 Mr. LaCortiglia - So you would have had to come back with the modifications?

203

204 Mr. Sousa - That is what I could have or should have done.

205

206 Mr. LaCortiglia - How quickly could it be installed? I don't believe I have to remind you that
207 this was a special permit. You asked when you rented the upstairs and you moved downstairs
208 with another use that this board grant a special permit under three conditions. One of which you
209 have not met. You should have net it prior to getting your occupancy permit. But because you
210 asked, we gave you a year and it is now 15 months into the process and we had to contact you
211 about it. I can honestly tell you that if anybody now asks for delayed condition that this member
212 would never vote for it again. I feel I was scammed.

213

214 Mr. Sousa - I am sorry to hear that. I wish you wouldn't think the worst of everyone. If you
215 remember, we had a debate on that and whether I needed to provide this access or not. We had
216 asked to not have to provide this.

217
218 Mr. LaCortiglia - I have to disagree with you. There is no question that you had to provide that
219 access. It is the law.

220
221 Mr. Sousa - It is a law except that when it is a private business and not open to the public. We
222 had gone through this before. It is just me and my employees the public is not going down there.
223

224 Mr. Rich - Don't say it. I told you the last time and you said you don't employ handicap people.
225

226 Mr. Sousa - That is different. Then I would have to make the accommodations.
227

228 Mr. Rich - Federal law states that you have to make that accommodation to meet code private
229 business or not.

230
231 Mr. LaCortiglia - So in another words, I approved under a special permit process a business that
232 can never hire someone with a disability? That's what I approved as of today. Four months ago
233 that wouldn't have been true if you met that condition that we gave you a year to do.
234

235 Mr. Sousa - MA law does not make it a requirement for me to make it accessible.
236

237 Mr. LaCortiglia - Our conditions did.
238

239 Mr. Rich - The ADA which is federal law preamps and supersedes any MA law says you do
240 have to. I just happen to be disabled and I just happen to be the ADA coordinator for the town
241 and I know the ADA pretty well.
242

243 Mr. Sousa - In investigating this, I spoke to the town building inspector and that is basically what
244 he told me. That as a private business I am not required to make it universally assessable.
245

246 Mr. LaCortiglia - It really isn't the point whether or not you can or cannot under a law. The
247 bottom line is that you got a special permit and the only reason you have your business in that
248 building today is because we voted to approve that special permit. If someone wants to make a
249 motion to rescind that permit tonight, I will hear it and will even second it. What is your time
250 line?

251
252 Mr. Sousa - I don't know. I don't have enough information. What I would like is to be relieved
253 of that year condition until I can deal with it. It is not possible for me to come up with \$45,000 to
254 put this lift in today and I am still not sure what lift is required.
255

256 Mr. LaCortiglia - Fourteen months later you are telling us this? Maybe we should not have given
257 you a year and you would have worked on it more quickly when you didn't have your occupancy
258 permit. The mistake was made by this board; we gave you the year.

259

260 {Mr. Howard arrives at 7:40 PM}

261

262 Mr. Rich - I think this board bent over backwards for your project because there was a school
263 involved and parents worrying about their children, and you were pretty much promising us that
264 it was not a problem. And when I asked you how much time you need, is a year long enough
265 you said that that's plenty. I agree with the chairman, I don't think I will ever give anyone... I
266 believe I was patted on the head and told ya, ya, ya. I am familiar with the costs of lifts as I
267 have one in my house.

268

269 Mr. Sousa - This is a pretty complex project. It has turned into something different than what any
270 of us thought it would be. Had you said to me a year ago and had I known the information I
271 know now, I would have asked for more than a year as this is a considerable investment.

272

273 Mr. Rich - Do you understand that we didn't have to give you five minutes to get it?

274

275 Mr. Sousa - I understand. You did a great thing for the Town. The school is cherished and has
276 been here for 27 -30 years now.

277

278 Mr. LaCortiglia - Let's point something out. Where that school goes has nothing to do with this
279 board. Where your business goes - that has to do with this board. Stay on point we are talking
280 about the special permit for your business. Who wants to rescind it or give me a timeline?

281

282 Mr. Sousa - I will have to investigate that and get back to you.

283

284 Mr. LaCortiglia - Then goodnight, we have other business tonight. Thank you. Does anyone
285 want to make a motion?

286

287 Mr. Sousa - The reason I want to investigate this is that it needs to make sense. If it's going to be
288 this complicated, basically putting on an addition and having to go to the zoning board for
289 approval for an addition.

290

291 Mr. Rich - There is an exemption in zoning for HP access.

292

293 Mr. LaCortiglia - You have a special permit to do it. I think there are a lot of things you don't
294 understand until probably next week - maybe Monday.

295

296 Ms. Evangelista - Do some research and get it in writing.

297

298 Mr. Rich - Convince me why I shouldn't make a motion to rescind the special permit because I
299 am on fire about it. I know three colleagues of mine are on fire about it. I think we feel that we
300 have been had.

301
302 Mr. Sousa - You haven't been had.

303
304 Mr. Rich- Yes I have because 12 months ago you promised that this will be done within 12
305 months. If we didn't bring it to your attention you certainly were not going to bring it to ours.

306
307 Mr. Sousa - That's not true. One thing that has to happen is that this lift has to go in not just
308 because you ask for it but because in the long term it is a benefit to that property.

309
310 Mr. Rich - It's the law!

311
312 Ms. Evangelista - Do you realize that all you had to do was make a call to the state and they will
313 have somebody look at your property and tell you what you have to do and when and if you
314 don't do it they will close you down?

315
316 Mr. Sousa - I ask for more time to go through the process. It may make more sense to put it
317 indoors instead of outdoors. I want to explore those options.

318
319 Mr. LaCortiglia - Fool me once, shame on me. With all due respect, if you came in two months
320 ago and said you wanted more time... But the reverse is true. Fifteen months later we reviewed
321 your property. You got bagged - you tried. Most boards would forget - we didn't.

322
323 Ms. Evangelista - I would like to see more communication for follow-ups.

324
325 Mr. LaCortiglia - Thank you we have other conditions to write tonight. Take this up under
326 business after? Maybe in executive session.

327
328 **Public Hearing:**

329 **1. Turning Leaf: Definitive Subdivision Plan – Public Hearing continued from December**
330 **11th, 2013.**

331 Mr. LaCortiglia - This is a continuation for the Turning Leaf definitive subdivision hearing.

332
333 Ms. Mann - The last time we were here we discussed securing information from Mr. Graham.
334 We did get his report and have begun the process of responding to him but have not finalized
335 it yet but we have been working on it. We also discussed defining the scope of the traffic
336 report. The board thought it would be best to wait for Mr. Graham's comments for that. As
337 you see he basically said we should get one. We almost had a meeting with the ConCom but
338 did not as it was a failed posting. We now have on scheduled for February 6th. Would you
339 like to go through Mr. Graham's comments point by point?

340
341 Mr. LaCortiglia - I would like to go point by point.

342
343 Mr. Williams - In regards to Item B2. We had a meeting with the zoning enforcement officer.
344 We altered the lot line at the entrance to the subdivision.
345
346 Mr. LaCortiglia - He points out that 44 Searle Street is being redefined and it did not have the
347 minimum required depth of lot.
348
349 Mr. Williams - We are going to confirm lot depth requirement and redraw this. Comment C1.
350 This is relative to the new section of Lisa Lane coming off of the old section of Lisa Lane.
351 He said that the intersection needs rounding. However, after discussing it with him, we will
352 show on the revised set of plans that this is a continuation of Lisa Lane and it meets the
353 minimum radius requirement. It is really just an extension of the road. We will show that on
354 the plans and he agreed.
355
356 Ms. Mann - We did meet with Mr. Graham yesterday and went over the comments.
357
358 Mr. Williams - There are still a couple of things that we are working out.
359
360 Mr. LaCortiglia - What was item C2?
361
362 Mr. Williams - The regulation §365-36(F) is really not clear in the way it is written. It
363 doesn't talk about tangents between curves. His opinion is different than from what I read so
364 we agreed to request another waiver. If you had a curve to the right and on to the left you
365 would have a hundred feet of straight section between it. One of his comments was that the
366 whole road be posted at 25 mph. At that speed and with the curves we have, the tangents are
367 not required from a safety standpoint. He said he would support a waiver.
368
369 {Mr. Snyder reading of the section §365-36(F) that is being referred to.}
370
371 Mr. LaCortiglia - There should be 100 foot between curves?
372
373 Mr. Williams - My response is that we will ask for a waiver.
374
375 Mr. LaCortiglia - Where is he talking about where they don't meet it?
376
377 Mr. Williams - Between the exit onto Searle and Lot 20.
378
379 Mr. LaCortiglia - So he is saying that there should be a hundred foot straight section. So you
380 are going to ask for a waiver?
381
382 Mr. Williams - Yes and we will add all of the waivers to the front page. In regards to the
383 land swap between the applicant's property and a couple of properties, he states that we are
384 proposing a temporary 20 foot wide slope with an easement within it. We are going to be in
385 control of those so there is no concern.

386
387 Mr. LaCortiglia - Can I see where the temporary slopes are?
388
389 Mr. Williams - We have them adjacent to the entire road.
390
391 Ms. Evangelista - Don't we usually have Mr. Graham with us to go over this?
392
393 Mr. LaCortiglia - At the end of it all we do.
394
395 Ms. Evangelista - That is a heck of a lot of waivers for number two.
396
397 Mr. Williams - Let me explain this easement. We put this on the plan as a temporary
398 easement. If a property is conveyed out and all the final grading or utilities have not been put
399 in yet, the easement allows for work in the area. So we give ourselves some room on the
400 outside of the right-of-way to work and finish the road.
401
402 Mr. LaCortiglia - This not a permanent easement?
403
404 Mr. Williams - No, it is a temporary easement just for roadway construction.
405
406 Ms. Mann - We have the rights to show it in the plan as we got consent from those people.
407
408 Mr. Williams - It will also be outlined in the response.
409
410 Mr. LaCortiglia - He is saying we should have a condition that a deed is provided.
411
412 Ms. Mann - That is not really accurate as it is a temporary easement.
413
414 Mr. Williams - He is making all these comments and we are either going to agree or disagree
415 with our responses.
416
417 Ms. Mann - You wouldn't burden a deed with a temporary easement because it will go away.
418
419 Mr. LaCortiglia - You will have a written response to that anyway.
420
421 Ms. Evangelista - Aren't we getting a copy of this temporary easement?
422
423 Mr. Williams - When the lot is conveyed out it is subject to a temporary easement and once
424 the road is accepted it goes away.
425
426 Ms. Evangelista - I think that everything we do on someone's parcel, we need an OK from
427 the owner. By getting a copy of the temporary easement covers us.
428
429 Mr. Rich - The person who buys a lot gives the easement. It is just for construction purposes.

430
431 Ms. Evangelista - Alright if you are comfortable with it. I was thinking to just have it on file.
432
433 Mr. Snyder - When will the temporary easement be extinguished?
434
435 Mr. Williams - When the road is accepted it will be terminated.
436
437 Mr. Rich - Could you give the board a copy of the deeds as they are given out?
438
439 Ms. Mann - Yes I could that doesn't bother me. All deeds get sent to your assessors but I
440 could send one to Mr. Snyder each time we convey.
441
442 Ms. Evangelista - I would feel better with that because it may be two years down the line that
443 the road is accepted.
444
445 Mr. LaCortiglia - Let's go to number 5 regarding Parcel D.
446
447 Mr. Williams - {Area is shown on the screen.} Parcel D is as you are leaving the road onto
448 Searle on the right. That is being combined with this other land.
449
450 Mr. LaCortiglia - Mr. Graham is asking you to provide proof that the abutter wishes to accept
451 the property.
452
453 Mr. Rich - Can you draft a letter for him to sign Ms. Mann?
454
455 Ms. Mann - They are not going to be there any longer.
456
457 Mr. LaCortiglia - Have they sold the house to you?
458
459 Mr. Rich - Do you have a P and S on it?
460
461 Ms. Mann - Yes. I can give you something in writing showing that they will be combined.
462
463 Mr. Williams - Number 6 refers to clarity on all sheets. We have agreed to do that.
464
465 Mr. LaCortiglia - You will be providing all of the site distances. All of these bulleted points?
466
467 Mr. Williams - Yes. Item C is for calculated site distances. I am going to defer to the traffic
468 engineer to provide these along with the traffic report. We are hiring a professional traffic
469 consultant to do a report. It will include site distances and other scope discussed tonight.
470
471 Mr. LaCortiglia - Are site distances standard in a traffic report?
472
473 Ms. Mann - Yes.

474
475 Mr. Williams - They are calculated based on traveling and posted speed.
476
477 Mr. LaCortiglia - I have never seen calculations for site distance from a certain radius.
478
479 Ms. Evangelista - You have to be detailed in asking what you want them to do.
480
481 Mr. Williams - They are going to do it. I have met with them and asked specifically about it.
482
483 Mr. LaCortiglia - How did you know who we would choose? Interesting.
484
485 Mr. Williams - We are providing a traffic report.
486
487 Mr. LaCortiglia - Interesting.
488
489 Ms. Evangelista - Who is going to verify it, Mr. Varga?
490
491 Mr. LaCortiglia - Let's keep moving. He mentions the site distances in both directions. Do
492 not forget to put that on the plans. He does mention something in item H. He recommends
493 ending the proposed sidewalk at station 25.
494
495 Mr. Williams - The way we show it now, the sidewalk goes out to Searle Street, to the end of
496 the curb and he would rather have it, because there is no sidewalk on Searle, he would rather
497 have it end in the site and we have agreed to do that. It is a good idea.
498
499 Mr. Rich - That will be in the redraw?
500
501 Mr. Williams - Yes.
502
503 Mr. LaCortiglia - Item I is about width condition. I look forward to seeing your written
504 rational on that. About the location of the nearest fire hydrant; any idea where that is?
505 Going to have to extend a little?
506
507 Mr. Williams - It is further out. We are going to locate that tomorrow or the next day and do
508 a little more topo off the street.
509
510 Mr. LaCortiglia - Is it more than 500 feet?
511
512 Mr. Williams - No.
513
514 Ms. Stead - Excuse me. I know you said they would respond to item I. Do they have any
515 comment on item I this evening? That is the one thing I brought up at the very first meeting
516 because it is in your rules and regulations. I would like to hear what they have to say about
517 it.

518
519 Mr. Williams - {Reading from Mr. Grahams comments.} Searle Street is an accepted public
520 way. It has variable width which has one-way traffic. The existing pavement width at the
521 proposed intersection varies from approximately 18 to 18.4 feet and is in suitable condition
522 both easterly and westerly of this location. We will also have our traffic consultant give an
523 opinion.
524
525 Mr. Rich - Suitable for what?
526
527 Ms. Mann - Travel.
528
529 Ms. Stead - So even though it is one way and has no sidewalks and is undersized, it is still
530 suitable for traveling?
531
532 Mr. LaCortiglia - That is something for the board to decide after we see what the traffic
533 consultant and Mr. Graham have to say. Mr. Williams will write the response letter and then
534 there will be another round with Mr. Graham. There will be multiple re-draws and we will
535 just keep honing it down. That is the process.
536
537 Ms. Stead - Do I understand correctly that it is the planning board that decides whether it is
538 suitable or not?
539
540 Mr. LaCortiglia - That's what I says. Yes, we have to vote that.
541
542 Ms. Stead - Are you saying it is suitable in both directions?
543
544 Mr. LaCortiglia - We are not saying anything at this time. We are waiting for his response.
545
546 Audience Member - Or is it just suitable in one direction?
547
548 Mr. Williams - The road is suitable in both directions. It doesn't say it is a two way street.
549
550 Ms. Evangelista - Isn't that the same thing?
551
552 Ms. Mann - No it is not.
553
554 Mr. Snyder - Could you say that to be unsuitable a paved road ends and becomes an unpaved
555 wood lot road?
556
557 Ms. Mann - Unsuitable if access was impeded or not safe. Or it wasn't a public way.
558 Typically public ways are deemed suitable and accessible by law.
559
560 Mr. LaCortiglia - I think a lot of that boils down to how the individual planning board
561 members may interpret it.

562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605

Mr. Watts - It doesn't seem to me that it would be referring to the suitability of the existing street as to the proposed street due to the existing street is an approved street.

Ms. Evangelista - It is referring to the subdivision regulations and bylaws §365-36A. It has to be in both directions. I don't see how you can twist it any other way. There is two way traffic; one going up and one going down.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Maybe the best thing to do is for us all to re-read it, give it serious thought and see Mr. Williams and Mr. Graham's responses when it is done.

Ms. Mann - The perfect example is Wilkins Way which is one-way and still has to meet the same guidelines. It is most certainly an item to be reviewed but it must be done rationally related to the law.

Ms. Evangelista - It also has to be what our bylaws say unless you request a waiver.

Ms. Mann - We are not requesting a waiver.

Mr. Rich - I think people may have the wrong idea of what suitability we are talking about.

Ms. Mann - It is not subjective.

{Mr. Rich reads regulation §365-36A.}

Mr. Rich - I am reading this as the new streets should be orientated to meet the existing streets. Not that the existing streets are suitable but that the meeting of the two is suitable in the opinion of the planning board. We are not deciding whether or not the existing street is a suitable way. We are going to decide whether the meeting of the two is suitable.

Ms. Mann - I agree with you especially of what you read; all streets that are public are considered suitable by the law.

Mr. Rich - The reason I brought this up is that the audience thought we were going to be ruling on whether Searle Street is a suitable way. We are not deciding that.

Ms. Evangelista - I think it would behoove the Planning Board not to make a bad situation worse.

Mr. Rich - I am raising the issue that the suitability is the meeting of the two roads.

Ms. Evangelista - No question about that. The question is that the Planning Board can decide on the width and condition running in both directions. The Planning Board has that say.

606 Ms. Mann - In regards to the new road yes, but not the existing road.

607

608 Ms. Evangelista - I am not going to support adding to a bad situation. Why should the new
609 home owners move in with the idea that the town will fix this road up. Why should we make
610 it more difficult in their subdivision and not make sure that road is fixed properly, right and
611 safe? Searle Street without a doubt needs a lot of work. That is how I am feeling. We
612 shouldn't be infringing on the new owners of these houses.

613

614 Mr. Howard - No one has to buy those houses. If they buy one, they will see the condition.

615

616 Ms. Evangelista - I am not under the impression of buyer beware. To me, I want to move
617 into something that is right now; not later down the line and that it is as safe as possible.

618

619 Mr. Rich - That is not the feeling I am getting from people in the audience. The feeling I am
620 getting from the people in the audience is that their thoughts are that because you are putting
621 a subdivision in, you are going to over tax the already taxed and dilapidated Searle Street.
622 That's the Town of Georgetown's headache. Shame on this town for allowing that street to
623 exist the way it's existing and doing what it is doing to other streets.

624

625 Ms. Evangelista - But when a developer comes in and asks us for waivers... For myself, I
626 am going to look into correcting that by the developer. That is what I am looking for with
627 these waivers.

628

629 Mr. Rich - If it means taking property by emanate domain to widen the street - developers do
630 not have that authority. One of the issues raised by the neighbors is that the street is not wide
631 enough.

632

633 Mr. LaCortiglia - I have a question for the Town Planner. What is the layout of Searle Street
634 and is there existing right-of-way to expand the street?

635

636 Mr. Snyder - Searle Street is an accepted town road and I believe the existing right-of-way of
637 Searle Street is of variable width not wide enough in all places necessary for widening.

638

639 Mr. Williams - I can shed some light on that. It is variable width so it is not a consistent
640 width throughout. It is not 50 feet.

641

642 Mr. LaCortiglia - When was it laid out or was it a historic road does anyone know?

643

644 Mr. Williams - I think it was a historic road.

645

646 Ms. Stead - It was a county road.

647

648 Mr. LaCortiglia - Interesting, then there should be some drawings. It would be interesting to
649 see what it shows; maybe there is room to expand that. Also what I see is that the board may
650 require the developer to pay for a stop or similar traffic signs.

651
652 Ms. Evangelista - We will take care of that with the traffic consultant.

653
654 Mr. LaCortiglia - Moving along in the report to minimum grades. He says you meet it
655 already but suggests a two percent grade be considered.

656
657 Mr. Williams - We are going to look at it. We will shorten the length of the vertical curves.
658 If we reduce the length it will reduce puddle-ing. We agreed to look at it.

659
660 Mr. LaCortiglia - Does that change the amount of cutting you have to do in the back?

661
662 Mr. Williams - It shouldn't. It changes the profile but shouldn't change the limits of work.

663
664 Mr. LaCortiglia - I remember from the site walk saying you either had a lot of cutting or
665 filling - am not sure.

666
667 Mr. Williams - We meet the regulations.

668
669 Mr. LaCortiglia - Larry says it can be slightly better. If you can make it better then go for it.

670
671 Ms. Evangelista - What is the grade on the plan?

672
673 Mr. Williams - It is 1.2 as a minimum in one location. Others locations are 1.5 which is
674 commonly done.

675
676 Mr. LaCortiglia - As long as it's installed correctly. Suggestion of hydrant locations.
677 Standard practice is to have hydrants no further than 500 feet apart. He recommends
678 relocating and replacing some hydrants.

679
680 Mr. Williams - We agreed to all of them except one location. He wanted to pull the hydrant
681 out of the cul-de-sac and we wanted to leave it out there and have the hydrant be the flushing
682 point. That would be hydrant labeled as Hydrant E.

683
684 Mr. LaCortiglia - You and Larry can talk about that and about the benefits.

685
686 Mr. Williams - We did and he agreed. Item number 5 is about light design. They will not do
687 a design until the plan is approved. This is typical. They don't want to do them until they are
688 approved as they would have to do multiple designs and they are not cheap. It is an outside
689 consultant that does the design. Once a subdivision plan is approved we will get it done.

690
691 Ms. Evangelista - We've never done it like that before, have we?

692
693 Mr. Snyder - You can condition the approval.
694
695 Mr. Rich - If they give us a plan saying that this plan is acceptable for the streets, curbs and
696 all that but we are not going to approve it in its totality but you can go get your lighting
697 pending your lighting plan being approved which will overlay this plan then the whole thing
698 would be approved.
699
700 Mr. Williams - The light department does the design.
701
702 Ms. Evangelista - And you are going to pay for it.
703
704 Mr. LaCortiglia - Are we talking about the same thing?
705
706 Mr. Williams - Yes, they do the design and include transformers locations and so forth.
707
708 Mr. LaCortiglia - I remember the issues of light trespass.
709
710 Ms. Mann - That's for a commercial site plan.
711
712 Ms. Evangelista - We have a subdivision regulation for that.
713
714 Mr. Rich - I learned a lot from Rob Hoover being on the board. It was in residential
715 subdivisions.
716
717 Mr. LaCortiglia - Reading from Mr. Grahams response: the length of two of the proposed
718 streets exceed the 800 foot maximum length. A lane length is over 1000 feet. These lengths
719 have allowed the designed to lay out 3-4 lots more than what might be realized. The 800 foot
720 limit should be upheld. Mr. Snyder, the 800 foot limitation in this district, is that in our
721 subdivision regulations?
722
723 Mr. Snyder - Yes, in the subdivision regulations.
724
725 Mr. LaCortiglia - So this is something that needs a waiver.
726
727 Mr. Williams - Yes, we requested a waiver. Lisa Lane currently is 1600 feet and the
728 proposed lane would be a thousand. We are reducing the amount of dead-end street that is
729 there substantially. We did have a long loop originally and we actually had more lots.
730
731 Ms. Evangelista - You mean the preliminary plan?
732
733 Ms. Mann - Yes, on the preliminary plan we had four more lots.
734

735 Ms. Evangelista - I am not in favor of anymore than what the bylaw says. What is your
736 explanation for doing it longer?
737

738 Mr. Williams - It provides a water main loop for Lisa Lane so it won't be an issue with water
739 flow and it lays out better.
740

741 Ms. Grosslein - I just have a question. I believe after Lisa Lane was built that they came up
742 with the 800 foot length or when did they come up with that?
743

744 Mr. Snyder - It was an amendment in March of 2011.
745

746 Ms. Mann - There was a waiver for Lisa Lane, it has been done several times.
747

748 Ms. Grosslein - I know when the water department was looking at. Mr. Mammolette made a
749 suggestion that loops were good for water and he mentions it for these also. If they could do
750 a loop instead of a dead end it would be better.
751

752 Mr. Williams - We are providing a loop. What he was talking about is that he wanted to bring
753 the water main out at North Street.
754

755 Mr. LaCortiglia - I think it is a great idea. This is something that the board will have to
756 decide when we discuss waivers. I don't know how I feel about not providing the applicants
757 guidance tonight. If they do lose four lots now might be the time to do the redraw as opposed
758 to going to the very end and this comes up and fails to be waived and then back to the
759 drawing board again.
760

761 Mr. Rich - The total number of houses is?
762

763 Ms. Mann - Twenty four new homes and two existing homes.
764

765 Mr. Rich - So we are talking eight percent if you lose four.
766

767 Ms. Mann - This is just a better configuration and we reduce the amount of pavement.
768

769 Mr. Rich - If you had to reduce the amount of pavement would the project loose a number of
770 house lots?
771

772 Mr. Williams - I'd have to rework it but as I have said we had more lots before. We would
773 probably have change lots 16-21 to get to a number we need to make the project viable.
774

775 Mr. Rich - Is it how we feel about granting a waiver?
776

777 Mr. LaCortiglia - It's about the length of the road on Searle Street coming up to the new
778 proposed Lisa Lane it is over the 800 foot minimum.

779
780 Mr. Snyder - The formal rationale for the waiver request will be in the applicant's response.
781
782 Mr. Rich - I think the intent of that is to originally keep from having lengthy dead ends. So
783 that water can keep moving.
784
785 Mr. LaCortiglia - I think it is the public safety issue for emergency vehicles.
786
787 Mr. Rich - If the road is wide enough and it has the right drainage what is the difference
788 between public safety issues to get on a good new road or can I use the driveway to the new
789 school as an example?
790
791 Mr. LaCortiglia - The point is this is in the regulations. We will think of it for when it comes
792 time to do the waivers. You will respond and we will have Mr. Graham's comments.
793
794 Ms. Evangelista - It is a regulation not a bylaw.
795
796 Mr. LaCortiglia - We can waive it.
797
798 Mr. Rich - One of the biggest problems in this town is that there are so many dead ends that
799 the water is not moving. What the applicants are saying is that they have a built in loop.
800
801 Ms. Mann - We are changing a 1600 foot dead-end and providing access. As it exists today,
802 it is a 1600 foot dead-end.
803
804 Mr. LaCortiglia - Reading from Mr. Graham's response: proposed plans do not suggest
805 landscaped islands. How do the board and the Mr. Durkee feel about the landscaped islands?
806
807 Ms. Evangelista - I like them.
808
809 Mr. Snyder - It is my understanding the Highway Department has difficulty plowing and also
810 maintenance is an issue. I know with Abbey Road a landscape island became an eyesore due
811 to lack of maintenance.
812
813 Mr. LaCortiglia - How do you feel about it Mr. Williams?
814
815 Mr. Williams - We don't really want to do it. I have seen them done both ways. Where I
816 live, we have an island and it is source of issues when it comes to maintaining the island as
817 the town doesn't maintain them and nor do they want to and I don't blame them.
818
819 Mr. Rich - There is a lot to say for non-island cul-de-sacs for emergency vehicles to have
820 room for turning around.
821

822 Ms. Evangelista - I know developments that do maintain it and it really nice. They have had
823 neighborhood parties and cook-outs on it. It is a nice community effort to entice people to
824 get together. It provides a common area.

825
826 Ms. Evangelista - I will look at Pillsbury's to see what you are talking about.

827
828 Mr. Williams - Bernay Way does not have a landscaped island but Eileen and Pillsbury do
829 have landscaped islands.

830
831 Ms. Evangelista - I think I know why Bernay was done.

832
833 Mr. Williams - Landscape islands are not a requirement.

834
835 Mr. LaCortiglia - No it is not. Mr. Graham is just asking how we feel about it.

836
837 Mr. Howard - I have seen more that are not maintained than maintained. I think they are an
838 eyesore when they are not maintained.

839
840 Ms. Evangelista - Where are they?

841
842 Mr. Howard - Go up Jewett Street and there is a subdivision off to the right. Look at Warren
843 Street too. Some are done - someone mows them anyways. A lot of times they end up as part
844 of the drainage. No one ever maintains them and trees grow up in them. The town doesn't
845 want to do it the DPW has enough to do.

846
847 Mr. LaCortiglia - A lot of subdivisions use them as rain gardens.

848
849 Mr. Watts - It does require community commitment. Your point is well taken. It can
850 become a mess if it is not well designed. I am pretty ambivalent about them.

851
852 Mr. LaCortiglia - If this was a private subdivision and never accepted by the town, I would
853 be in favor of a landscaped island. Where the intent is to have this an accepted road I think it
854 should just be pavement.

855
856 Ms. Evangelista - I would think a tree would not need much maintenance. Let's ask Peter
857 about it and see what he comes up with. I think it's nice to have a tree there.

858
859 Mr. Howard - I think pavement is nice for the kids to play in it.

860
861 Mr. Rich - I like the paved idea for emergency vehicles in any weather condition.

862
863 Mr. LaCortiglia - Continuing on the proposed plan has two storm water management ponds.

864
865 {Storm water management ponds are shown on the screen.}

866
867 Mr. Williams - We are exploring pulling some away from the property line and reducing
868 some of the flow that goes to it. We agreed to look at that and provide a natural buffer strip
869 between those two ponds and that will be in our response and in the revised plans.
870
871 Mr. LaCortiglia - That is what Mr. Graham is asking.
872
873 Ms. Evangelista - That would have to be approved by ConCom, won't it?
874
875 Mr. Williams - No it is within the 100 foot buffer zone.
876
877 Mr. LaCortiglia - If pulled back from property lines aren't you moving closer to the
878 wetlands?
879
880 Mr. Williams - We are not getting any closer to the wetlands. We are pulling it towards the
881 houses on number 5 and 6.
882
883 {The area is shown on the screen.}
884
885 Ms. Evangelista - So where are you putting the septic?
886
887 Ms. Mann - It's in the front.
888
889 Mr. Williams - The septic's in the front of the house.
890
891 Mr. LaCortiglia - Mr. Graham is talking about a tree buffer in that. Can you tell us about
892 that?
893
894 Mr. Williams - That's what I just said we are going to do. We are going to pull the ponds
895 away from the property line to provide a natural buffer there.
896
897 Mr. LaCortiglia - Reading on...Consideration of additional no-cut, no-disturb buffer along
898 lot 22. Is Nally aware of the fact that all those trees are going to come out of there? So he is
899 suggesting you pull that back and provide a buffer on that?
900
901 Mr. Williams - Yes. I don't know if I can provide a 20 foot buffer but we have agreed that
902 we would provide a buffer if possible. We are working through those details.
903
904 Mr. LaCortiglia - So you have responded to him on that one?
905
906 Mr. Williams - Yes.
907
908 Ms. Nally - What kind of a buffer are you thinking?
909

910 Mr. LaCortiglia - Oh, you haven't discussed this yet. I thought you had.
911
912 Mr. Williams - We talked about it but there were not any final details.
913
914 Mr. LaCortiglia - We will see that on the next drawing.
915
916 Ms. Nally - May I ask about the tree easement you are proposing?
917
918 Mr. Williams - The tree easement as I discussed before is an easement we provide ourselves
919 when we sell a lot. It was inadvertently drawn over the property lines.
920
921 Ms. Nally - There is nothing that says a road cannot abut the property?
922
923 Mr. LaCortiglia - There is no offset to a road.
924
925 Mr. Williams - By nature all roads have to touch a property.
926
927 Ms. Nally - Granted but the property will now have a road in the front and a road in the back.
928 My other question is that the cul-de-sac still has not been remedied. We still have not
929 discussed in detail what that cul-de-sac will look like after the road is put in.
930
931 Mr. Snyder - I thought it was discussed at the last meeting that this was a matter for the
932 Selectmen because it is a public road.
933
934 Ms. Nally - But you are changing the configuration of the road. You are changing it from a
935 cul-de-sac to a three-way and you've got one house that will become a corner lot and two
936 houses that will be left in the remnant of the current cul-de-sac.
937
938 Mr. LaCortiglia - That will be redrawn to reflect Mr. Graham's suggestion right? He was
939 looking at it as an intersection and you are designing it more of a curve.
940
941 Mr. Williams - These are two different issues. He makes a comment about the construction
942 in the circle later in his comments.
943
944 Ms. Nally - I know we discussed the lighting and you mentioned that it would not be
945 submitted until the plan is accepted. However as this road is abutting my back property, I
946 am wondering what the plan is for the lighting along that section which abuts there.
947
948 Mr. LaCortiglia - I wouldn't worry about it because I don't think any member of this board is
949 going to approve a plan that doesn't show where the lights are going to go.
950
951 Mr. Rich - I know they will show where the lights are and how bright they will be etc...
952

953 Ms. Evangelista - Are these any different from your comments on the letter you submitted
954 before? Did you put this in your letter - about the cul-de-sac?
955
956 Ms. Nally - Yes, I did.
957
958 Mr. LaCortiglia - Nothing is final yet. Moving on we are now talking about drainage.
959
960 Ms. Grosslein - We just had a comment about the 25 foot buffer area. Mr. Williams was
961 talking about where those drainage areas are. On the plan it says a 25 foot buffer area along
962 the whole 2-8 lots. What would happen as that would concern us as we are at 16 Lisa Lane.
963 If there was a 25 foot buffer along that whole way, that would help us out.
964
965 Mr. LaCortiglia - I'd like to see how you design that. You are talking about a no-cut, no-
966 disturb and there is grading.
967
968 Mr. Williams - On the plan we are right up to the lot line with the grading.
969
970 Mr. LaCortiglia - Number 8 is definitely something we want to see the response to and Mr.
971 Graham's response as well.
972
973 Mr. Snyder - Number 8 is a recommendation for a no-cut along the southern property line.
974 He is not asking for it, he is making a recommendation.
975
976 Ms. Mann - To the extent feasible that we could provide.
977
978 Mr. LaCortiglia - Moving on to drainage. They get technical and numerical. You will have
979 to respond to Mr. Graham on every one of them. You need your pre and post.
980
981 Mr. Williams - We have prepared a response to all the drainage questions.
982
983 Mr. LaCortiglia - The only one that I am focusing in on is on page seven.
984
985 Ms. Stead - Can you clarify what Stormwater management number 3 is? How many are
986 there all together?
987
988 Mr. Williams - There are seven and they are all numbered on the plan.
989
990 { All seven areas are shown on the screen. }
991
992 Mr. LaCortiglia - You might want to make some changes per Mr. Graham's suggestions.
993
994 Mr. Williams - Yes. We are responding to all the comments. Everything will be addressed.
995
996 Ms. Evangelista - You haven't sent the responses yet?

997
998 Mr. Williams - No we haven't. We got it, went through it and had a meeting with him to
999 clarify some things. Based on that meeting we will make revisions to the plan so we can
1000 provide a comprehensive reply.
1001
1002 Mr. LaCortiglia - In Number 2 you have a statement about low impact techniques. I am
1003 curious to see that. Number 3A: concerns about the construction and topography of proposed
1004 lots 10, 12 and 13 and how they will require a significant amount of land disturbance. He
1005 talks about giving consideration about modifying and reducing the footprint. Also that the
1006 plans don't show where the stock pile for materials, disposal of stone etc...
1007
1008 Mr. Snyder - There are thresholds for import and export.
1009
1010 Mr. LaCortiglia - You will have to show that you are just moving it around on the site.
1011 Those are the calculations he will need to send to the building inspector. I will take your
1012 word for it that you are not taking anything on or off.
1013
1014 Ms. Evangelista - Just the road they have to bring in the right soil.
1015
1016 Mr. Williams - Yes, there will be pavement materials and sub-base materials.
1017
1018 Mr. LaCortiglia - You might have a couple of crushers going.
1019
1020 Ms. Evangelista - You have to bring in clay there for the road, don't you?
1021
1022 Mr. Williams - It is more of a gravel material.
1023
1024 Mr. LaCortiglia - Next comment is about stormwater calculations. There is no increased
1025 peak rate or volume peak in the pre and post. Regarding the water shed plan. He doesn't like
1026 how you broke up the catchments. You have nine of them and not all of them go to an
1027 intermittent stream.
1028
1029 Mr. Williams - I think he wants additional information which we will provide him.
1030
1031 Ms. LaPlaca - Can I ask which intermittent stream that is?
1032
1033 Mr. Williams - There is one that surrounds the site. I think that is what he is talking about.
1034
1035 Mr. LaCortiglia - There is additional water going in your direction but again these are
1036 probably going to get redesigned a bit.
1037
1038 Ms. Evangelista - Could show you show MA 4 on the plan?
1039
1040 {Mr. Snyder shows storm water management area number 4 on the screen.}

1041
1042 Ms. Stead - Can you please clarify if stormwater is under your jurisdiction or ConCom?
1043
1044 Mr. LaCortiglia - It is under the Conservation Commission if they are within 100 feet of what
1045 they call wetland resources. As far as the overall review of this, that will be done thru this
1046 board. If we were bypassed for some reason, then it would fall to the ConCom to do it. But
1047 it will get done one way or another.
1048
1049 Mr. Williams - They are also doing engineering and a stormwater review as well. They did
1050 not want to use Mr. Graham, they are using BSC.
1051
1052 Ms. Evangelista -That makes good sense to get a different one.
1053
1054 Ms. Mann - They conflict a lot.
1055
1056 Mr. LaCortiglia - It will be interesting. I'd love to see the contrast of the two of them.
1057
1058 Ms. Evangelista - So you will have two engineers looking at it.
1059
1060 Mr. LaCortiglia - Next is traffic and the proposed 24 lots will obviously create increases.
1061 The build out increase is estimated to be in the vicinity of 200- 250 trips daily. He states of
1062 course this warrants a traffic study and peer review. He has given us the benefit of laying out
1063 what we should do in list form.
1064
1065 Mr. Snyder - {Shows the proposed property on the screen.} He writes it in as
1066 recommendations as method to control and mitigate traffic. He has gone out to Marlboro
1067 Road and Tenney. Is the board in agreement with that? I see that it starting to reach a little
1068 too far over if Woodland Road and Tenney Street are considered.
1069
1070 Ms. Evangelista - Well, we don't know until they do it right?
1071
1072 {Discussion held about Searle Street and where it is one-way and how anyone getting out is
1073 forced to go to White Pine and what direction they are forced to go.}
1074
1075 Mr. LaCortiglia - My point is that folks will go on Lisa Lane in the new development and I
1076 think what Mr. Graham is talking about was that we may want to consider making the new
1077 addition road a one-way. Mr. Graham said we may want to consider making a third of it one-
1078 way. My biggest concern is traffic and where it is going to dump out.
1079
1080 Mr. Snyder - I am sure the traffic study will consider assess to Route 95 but when they do the
1081 traffic calculations they will be laying out instruments to measure traffic patterns.
1082
1083 Ms. Evangelista - I would like to see it mentioned about school buses as well.
1084

1085 Mr. LaCortiglia - Mr. Snyder can you write up the scope? You are hearing our concerns and
1086 also Mr. Grahams.

1087
1088 Mr. LaCortiglia - I don't see anything I would pull out. There are good bullet points.

1089
1090 Ms. Stead - When they do the traffic study will they also study the increase of traffic because
1091 this is a main concern for all of us that live in the neighborhood?

1092
1093 Mr. Snyder - The traffic studies that I have seen look at accident data to help establish a
1094 qualified level of service to the roads and within the studied neighborhood.

1095
1096 Ms. Stead - There is also another intersection that is an issue. Will this area be included as
1097 well in the study?

1098
1099 Ms. Mann - We access the level of service on these independent roads and know that there
1100 are issues. The purpose of a study is to ensure that we don't aggravate a situation that exists.
1101 People keep saying these roads are horrible and it sounds like there is a site distance issue but
1102 that doesn't matter because it does not change the level of service to that road. If there is a
1103 site distance issue the town should have addressed it previously as they have an obligation to
1104 ensure public safety. We are not trying to avoid our job and the public needs to understand
1105 that. What do you want us to do? Assess that these intersections are poor? Well we all
1106 know they are poor.

1107
1108 Ms. Stead - But you are making a dangerous situation worse.

1109
1110 Mr. LaCortiglia - Please one at a time. The public desires to have information. This board
1111 needs information because if we see problems that are pointed out by the traffic study there
1112 are sometimes opportunities to make things a little bit better. Sometimes in the give and take
1113 of waivers there are considerations for certain things.

1114
1115 Ms. Mann - That's why I said we are not trying to avoid any mitigation for some of the
1116 waivers. Everybody keeps saying that this development will make it worse and in fact they
1117 will find out that we are not going to make it worse. It will confirm the present issues.
1118 Another point is that we need to understand what the purpose of the investigation is. Going
1119 out a quarter of mile or a half of mile away is not a typical traffic study. Typically there is no
1120 impact for a 24 lot subdivision.

1121
1122 Ms. Stead - There is a site issue coming down White Pine and to take a right at Tenney it
1123 slopes down and it is a blind corner. Will those be part of it well?

1124
1125 Ms. Evangelista - The burden of proof would be on you. Furthermore I understand what you
1126 are saying but at the same time without completing this report will we know what you are
1127 saying is so.

1128

1129 Ms. Mann - That's why I need to understand what you are looking for. Are you are just
1130 looking for us to assess level of service?
1131
1132 Mr. Watts - Bear in mind that there is only one or two ways out of there so we need to make
1133 sure about the flow.
1134
1135 Mr. LaCortiglia - From my perspective, whether or not your new subdivision should be a
1136 one-way weighs heavy on my mind
1137
1138 Ms. Evangelista - What we are really talking about is an environmental impact statement. It
1139 shows the effect on schools, police and fire, traffic patterns and other municipal services.
1140 That's what we could ask for by state law.
1141
1142 Mr. LaCortiglia - Maybe what we need is to define parameters of the traffic study?
1143
1144 Ms. Mann - That's all I want.
1145
1146 Mr. Rich - The concern I am hearing from the developer is that at what point are you going to
1147 stop saying - what's next is it going to Rock Pond? In the scope we need definite parameters
1148 as to how far we are going to go out. That is the absurd of the argument.
1149
1150 Ms. Evangelista - I don't see anything absurd about it.
1151
1152 Mr. Rich - I am saying that that is the absurd of the argument. You have to have a definite
1153 parameter.
1154
1155 Mr. Grosslein - You've got a balloon and there is only one decent way to get to route 95 and
1156 Georgetown center and it goes thru a series of intersections that we know are not adequate
1157 currently. The East Main Street and Tenney intersection is a bear. Ms. Mann raises a good
1158 point that maybe the Town should have taken care of this originally and if this is something
1159 the developer or the town will be responsible for. The onus is on the board to determine
1160 what you approve for the development without adequately providing for safe streets for
1161 existing and future residents.
1162
1163 Mr. Watts - That is what we are talking about. I would suggest in the terms of scope that we
1164 include that section of the access road and Tenney Street. I think that is another valued
1165 approach to get onto route 95 and route 133.
1166
1167 Mr. Snyder - What Mr. Watts is doing is being precise in terms of location. I can't have
1168 someone saying to do everything seen on the screen. Are we doing a request for findings and
1169 recommendations for site line improvements? These are all aspects of a traffic study. The
1170 level of service is going to be a start and if you find the level of service is dropping then you
1171 can recommend that the next tier up will be to make improvements. The scope should be

1172 structured as a tier evaluation. Why go ahead and do a full study of Tenney Street and
1173 Woodland until you know it needs to be done?

1174
1175 Ms. Mann - Again my point is that there needs to be a defined scope and we need to
1176 understand what the board's intention is. There is a possibility that the traffic person may
1177 raise something and we might have to come back. It is possible that there may be an impact
1178 at certain intersections and you may look at that report and say that we really do need to look
1179 at this intersection. Sometimes it is best to focus on the real issues and allow for a tiered
1180 approach. We can come back and give you more information.

1181
1182 Mr. Watts - I don't want to circumscribe too much of what a professional is going to do.

1183
1184 Mr. Rich - Lets make a recommendation that it is "including, but not limited to" so we get
1185 what we want.

1186
1187 Ms. Evangelista - About the easements on Searle Street. That should be in this traffic study.
1188 It is an impact statement. To me the definition of an impact study includes a traffic study.

1189
1190 Mr. Snyder - Just because you are asking for a traffic study doesn't mean it becomes an
1191 impact study.

1192
1193 Ms. Evangelista - Why don't you write it up and then we will decide if it is complete
1194 enough?

1195
1196 Mr. Snyder - I am trying to get board members to describe their recommendations so I can
1197 scope the traffic study and you are saying that the traffic study needs to be an impact study.

1198
1199 Mr. LaCortiglia - We need to focus on the roads.

1200
1201 Ms. Evangelista - But you will have to know if the fire truck can go by there safely and if
1202 there is going to be a police issue. You've got to know more than just how many cars go
1203 through. That is nothing to me, how many cars go through. I want to know the safety issues.

1204
1205 Mr. LaCortiglia - That is all part of the design.

1206
1207 Mr. Watts - I think we will get a picture of risk. If there are some that are not addressed in
1208 the traffic study, I think we will probably go and say for them to expand the traffic study.

1209
1210 Mr. Snyder - That's the tiered approach.

1211
1212 Mr. Watts - Let the professionals do it.

1213
1214 Mr. LaCortiglia - You can always ask for more information.

1215

1216 Ms. Mann - We can work together and broaden our scope if you want. The traffic engineer
1217 we use is well respected and does many peer reviews.
1218
1219 Ms. Evangelista - For you to ask us right now the purpose...
1220
1221 Ms. Mann - I was asking what are trying to achieve overall. You are trying to get
1222 information collection into the scope of which the subdivision will not contribute to or
1223 burden the roadways.
1224
1225 Mr. Rich - And there is adequate access and egress.
1226
1227 Mr. LaCortiglia - Does the board feel comfortable to have Mr. Snyder design the scope using
1228 what we've discussed tonight?
1229
1230 Ms. Evangelista - I wonder if you notify a traffic consultant to give you samples of what you
1231 can ask for before we write it up.
1232
1233 Mr. LaCortiglia - I am not in favor of that because we have a professional planner here, we
1234 have an engineer and we have our own brains.
1235
1236 Ms. Evangelista - Mr. Snyder have you done a traffic study before?
1237
1238 Mr. Snyder - I have reviewed them and written scope but I have not written a traffic study as
1239 I am not a traffic engineer or qualified to do so.
1240
1241 Mr. Rich - We are paying an engineer that has a lot of experience to give us his best advice
1242 and he has given us his recommendations and the traffic study will go to him for review.
1243
1244 Mr. Watts - We can develop our own questions as well.
1245
1246 Ms. Evangelista - I have never heard of him reviewing a traffic study.
1247
1248 Mr. Williams - He just reviewed one in Rowley.
1249
1250 Mr. Rich - He'll review anything right down to your last dollar.
1251
1252 Mr. LaCortiglia - Are we all in consensus to have Mr. Snyder write the scope up?
1253
1254 {**Unanimous consent** for Mr. Snyder to write and issue a scope for the traffic study.}
1255
1256 Mr. Snyder - Does the public here understand how the traffic study is going to be
1257 accomplished and reviewed?
1258

1259 Mr. Rizza - I don't see anything about bus stops during construction on Mr. Graham's
1260 recommendations. There are three bus stops in the area and kids are out in the street while
1261 waiting for the bus. I am requesting to put restrictions on construction vehicles coming in
1262 and out a half hour before and a half hour after on all three streets that the bus stops on.
1263
1264 Ms. Evangelista - That sounds reasonable.
1265
1266 {Discussion of where the bus stops are.}
1267
1268 Mr. Rich - What are the hours the buses run?
1269
1270 Mr. Rizza - Between 7:10 and 8:30 AM and 2:15 and 3:30 PM.
1271
1272 Mr. LaCortiglia - If all construction vehicles were required to go up Searle Street and not
1273 Marlboro Road that may help.
1274
1275 Mr. Rizza - They can't as there are no trucks allowed on Searle Street. I am asking for the
1276 board to put a restriction on the construction vehicles during the bus hours.
1277
1278 Mr. LaCortiglia - An access restriction and a time restriction?
1279
1280 Mr. Rizza - Yes and forward something to the police so they may be able to enforce.
1281
1282 Mr. LaCortiglia - We will take that in consideration, keep reminding us. Moving on. Mr.
1283 Graham has some technical things, misspellings, and elevation data on page 10.
1284
1285 Mr. Williams - Number 4 is for 44 Searle Street. We will have to redo the utilities there.
1286 New electric service, gas service and new septic.
1287
1288 Mr. LaCortiglia - You will put it on the redraw right? Help me out with Number 5 the SGC?
1289
1290 Mr. Williams - There was a typo there in regards to the curb type. We talked a about it with
1291 Mr. Graham.
1292
1293 Mr. LaCortiglia - What are you asking for?
1294
1295 Mr. Williams - Cape Cod style.
1296
1297 Mr. LaCortiglia - That is a lot of curbing.
1298
1299 Ms. Evangelista - How has the Cape Cod cut held up?
1300
1301 Mr. Williams - It holds up well because the plows ride up over it.
1302

1303 Mr. LaCortiglia - It is a rounded part of tar versus the vertical granite.
1304
1305 Mr. Williams - Number 6 is Mr. Graham saying that when you come down Lisa Lane and
1306 take a left into the new subdivision, that he wants to align the left hand curb to go along with
1307 the center line so it would be a consistent radius. He would like to see that curbing replaced
1308 so that it is parallel to the center line.
1309
1310 Mr. LaCortiglia - So it is more obvious when you are driving. You are redrawing anyway?
1311
1312 Mr. Williams - We would agree to do it if the Planning Board wants us to do it we will do it.
1313 There has been discussion about the circle. Mr. Graham has his suggestions and I want to
1314 make sure that what we draw is what everyone wants.
1315
1316 Mr. LaCortiglia - Where is the proposed transition point?
1317
1318 Mr. Williams - We are on the next comment and there is not transition point. The past
1319 comment was a typo as we are asking for a waiver from Cape Cod curbing.
1320
1321 Mr. LaCortiglia - Where would the transition point be if you weren't granted that waiver?
1322
1323 Mr. Williams - We haven't gotten that far yet. The next comment is that he would like to
1324 extend the sidewalk up Lisa Lane further into the existing section.
1325
1326 {Mr. Snyder shows the area on the screen.}
1327
1328 Mr. LaCortiglia - So there would be a crosswalk?
1329
1330 Ms. Evangelista - That's not too clean. You would have to come all the way around. I think
1331 it should go all around.
1332
1333 Mr. Watts - Nobody would do that.
1334
1335 Mr. LaCortiglia - When you drive down Lisa lane now the sidewalk is on your right. Why
1336 are you proposing to extend it on the left?
1337
1338 Mr. Williams - We thought it was a good idea to make the connection there and when we get
1339 to the other side we want it to be on the left side as you are driving in. For purpose of
1340 construction and not impacting the abutters.
1341
1342 Mr. Rich - I can't see anybody staying on a sidewalk. They will cut right through.
1343
1344 Mr. Watts - I don't think the site lines are bad.
1345
1346 Mr. Rich - I can't think of a better way to do it. No matter what it will be Lisa Lane crossing.

1347
1348 Mr. Williams - It keeps the work away from the abutters on that side.
1349
1350 Ms. Evangelista - I'd like to see a clean page - there is too much on there.
1351
1352 Mr. LaCortiglia - Yes, it is tough to see. Number 7; is there any agreement to provide
1353 driveway access?
1354
1355 Mr. Williams - There is not. They have a driveway off of Wilkins now. I think he is asking
1356 if there is one proposed.
1357
1358 Mr. LaCortiglia - Does he lose frontage? Is there a dimensional issue?
1359
1360 Mr. Williams - No, they gain frontage on the road. By law they would have access to either.
1361
1362 Mr. Snyder - The grade is a little steep there too.
1363
1364 Mr. Williams - They are intending to landscape the yard.
1365
1366 Mr. LaCortiglia - On sheet 18 he is talking about catch basins. He goes on to talk about the
1367 no-cutting areas. You are grading everywhere aren't you?
1368
1369 Mr. Williams - Not everywhere as we don't know where we are grading until we design each
1370 house. From a marketing standpoint, the more trees we save the better off because the
1371 market value is better.
1372
1373 Mr. LaCortiglia - Aren't you going to be showing a limit of work for all the wetlands
1374 anyway?
1375
1376 Mr. Williams - Yes, we have that on there. I think he is talking about between lots.
1377
1378 Ms. Evangelista - Who designates the trees to save? If you cut down a tree you will need to
1379 replace it with another of the same size. How does that fix you?
1380
1381 Ms. Mann - So would you burden the homeowner when there is a buffer between lots. Isn't
1382 it really an individual's choice between properties as to whether they want a tree or not?
1383
1384 Ms. Evangelista - It doesn't say between properties, am I missing it?
1385
1386 Mr. LaCortiglia - I think he is talking about a limit of work.
1387
1388 Mr. Williams - We have grading limits we have shown on there.
1389
1390 Mr. LaCortiglia - Maybe it was not clearly identified as a no-cut or a limit of work line?

1391
1392 Ms. Evangelista - Already because of the septic you have to be careful of where you put it. I
1393 would say that the Board of Health has limits for distances.
1394
1395 Mr. Williams - I did meet with him and he was talking about between lots and I told him we
1396 really don't know where these houses go specifically. He was ok with it but I will respond to
1397 it. I will also add that we have added a no-cut line for the overall plan.
1398
1399 Ms. Evangelista - Especially where it abuts neighbors that have been complaining about it.
1400 What is the closest between houses?
1401
1402 Mr. Williams - We do not know. These are not specifically designed. The location will be
1403 on a case by case basis.
1404
1405 Ms. Mann - They will meet the zoning requirements.
1406
1407 Ms. Evangelista - We are talking about trees and cutting them down. We don't have a bylaw
1408 in zoning on trees. We have a subdivision regulation that if you cut down trees that you will
1409 have to replace them.
1410
1411 Mr. LaCortiglia - No. Am I missing something? You will have to point that out to me.
1412
1413 Mr. Snyder - Mr. Williams, all the sites are going to remain uncut until purchased and the
1414 house constructed?
1415
1416 Mr. Williams - There are areas that need to be worked on for stormwater management, stock
1417 pile areas and some houses will be built before they are sold.
1418
1419 Mr. Snyder - So there are too many unknowns to it?
1420
1421 Mr. Williams - Yes.
1422
1423 Mr. Watts - You are not going to have a mountain on one end and a valley on the other.
1424
1425 Mr. Williams - The road is going to be built and there are cuts and fills for that.
1426
1427 Mr. LaCortiglia - You have to take care of your water and infiltration.
1428
1429 Ms. Evangelista - I will look into it but I say that if you don't know where the trees are going
1430 to be left alone and you're waiting for a case by case basis, then I would do three houses at a
1431 time so we can keep track of what you are slaughtering down. This will make sure there is
1432 some protection there.
1433

1434 Mr. LaCortiglia - Moving on to Number 12. I think he is pointing out that your documents
1435 don't match your wording.
1436
1437 Ms. Grosslein - When I looked at the plan at the beginning part of the plan is in a water
1438 resource district. I know there is a bylaw that states that a certain percentage has to stay
1439 natural so that the water can permeate through for a natural water district.
1440
1441 Mr. LaCortiglia - This is residential.
1442
1443 Ms. Grosslein - Isn't this residential?
1444
1445 Mr. Williams - We are going to conform to that bylaw.
1446
1447 Mr. LaCortiglia - So you are going to the ZBA? I thought residential was exempt.
1448
1449 Ms. Evangelista - It's not exempt to Title 5. I thought the Board of Health would be looking
1450 into what the dimensions are and the volume of water. Am I wrong on that?
1451
1452 Mr. Williams - They have specific requirements that we will meet and if you meet them you
1453 don't have to go to the ZBA.
1454
1455 Mr. LaCortiglia - In regards to the construction sequence on sheet 19 he states that a more
1456 specific construction sequence may be required. Is there a phasing plan?
1457
1458 Mr. Williams - We will address that in the traffic study. There isn't a phasing plan. They are
1459 planning on building the road.
1460
1461 Mr. LaCortiglia - It is not that much of a street. Moving onto installation of signage, he
1462 states it should be 25 mph.
1463
1464 Mr. Snyder - Speed limits are dictated by the state.
1465
1466 Mr. Rich - State law is that it is 25 mph in a thickly settled area.
1467
1468 Mr. Williams - I think it is 30 mph.
1469
1470 Mr. Snyder - I don't think the Planning Board can dictate speed limits. If it is determined to
1471 be thickly settled then it needs to be 30 mph. The Board cannot say it is to be 15 mph.
1472
1473 Mr. LaCortiglia - We can't? We can't put that as a condition?
1474
1475 Mr. Rich - We are the planning board, we can do whatever we want. Whether we win in
1476 court is another subject.
1477

1478 Ms. Beaumont - The police chief came over and I spoke with him about this subject once. He
1479 stated that it is 30 mph in a thickly settled area. He has removed signs in town that other
1480 people had put up because you cannot legally give a speeding ticket for that.

1481
1482 Mr. LaCortiglia - What if it is really thickly settled? Next comment is that he is looking for
1483 lot by lot review. He normally recommends that he does it as he is familiar with the design.

1484
1485 Ms. Evangelista - Can we go back to number 24? You mentioned phase one but what about
1486 the homes? That's it? Phase one?

1487
1488 Mr. Williams - This is for the subdivision to build the road and the drainage infrastructure in
1489 one phase. The homes as the market allows will be built. They will not put 24 foundations
1490 in at once as it does not make sense. As lots are purchased, they will be built.

1491
1492 Ms. Evangelista - So are you going to sell lots and not homes?

1493
1494 Ms. Mann - We don't know.

1495
1496 Ms. Evangelista - So if put in a phase for 3 houses to protect the trees, you don't have any
1497 objections to that?

1498
1499 Mr. Williams - Yes, we definitely do. If we did 3 at a time it just means we are cutting the
1500 trees down slower. We are talking about an overall development.

1501
1502 Mr. Snyder - So the whole road will be in and someone may say they like lot 12 so that house
1503 lot will be developed. They may not have neighbors for a year because no one else likes the
1504 other lots surrounding lot 12.

1505
1506 Mr. LaCortiglia - Can I just say that the whole road has to be built because you have to be at
1507 binder before we are going to release any of those lots.

1508
1509 Mr. Williams - That is right. The applicant could say they are going to phase the loop at
1510 once and then my do the second cul-de-sac.

1511
1512 Mr. Rich - So phase one is the whole road.

1513
1514 Mr. Williams - There is a lot of common construction for the drainage. The drainage goes
1515 from the loop to the end of the cul-de-sac.

1516
1517 Ms. Evangelista - I want to come back to it later on. Can you think of a way for the board to
1518 identify which trees to save? That is what I am trying to think of.

1519
1520 Mr. Rich - Is it not the charge of this board to make sure that the roads and drainage is done?
1521 We don't micro lots.

1522
1523 Ms. Evangelista - Yes we do for the character that is there. They are going to cut a lot of
1524 trees. And you've got water surrounding that area and I think it would behoove them for
1525 problems in the future to leave some trees.
1526
1527 Mr. Snyder - The developer will not take down trees that he doesn't have to.
1528
1529 Ms. Mann - We are subject to the jurisdiction of the conservation commission with regards to
1530 many areas. We will not cut down trees we don't have to.
1531
1532 Mr. Rich - I don't think the Planning Board is going to walk with you and put a red flag on
1533 trees to stay and blue flags on others.
1534
1535 Ms. Evangelista - Doesn't it bother you as a Planning Board member when a landowner
1536 comes in after buying a home and is complaining about the water and she is afraid her house
1537 is going to float away? That concerns me. That subdivision was approved by the Planning
1538 Board and it should not have happened!
1539
1540 Mr. Rich - We have a project right now that they say they will cut as few trees down they
1541 absolutely have to. And then drive down some of our subdivisions where they are clear cut.
1542 It works to their benefits as stormwater is absorbed faster. It works to their benefit to keep
1543 that water in the subdivision. I don't think we should be micromanaging.
1544
1545 Mr. LaCortiglia - Engineers have to design a project to stormwater numbers. If this board
1546 approves it, it is because those numbers work. We have done nothing to adopt the Cornell
1547 numbers so if you are really concerned about it, you can look at the Cornell numbers. We
1548 cannot enforce that now.
1549
1550 Ms. Evangelista - But we can say what trees can be cut down and what sizes - we can. I
1551 don't call that micromanaging; I call that protecting the homeowner.
1552
1553 Mr. Rich - Ms. Evangelista, when you make a statement saying if you cut a tree down you
1554 need to replace it with a like size...
1555
1556 Ms. Evangelista - I don't think that is true - I will check it.
1557
1558 Mr. Rizza - What is the time frame for the whole development if they are going to be doing
1559 three or four houses at a time?
1560
1561 Mr. LaCortiglia - They are not going to be doing 3 or 4 houses at a time. They will have a
1562 permit for certain amount of time and then at that point the market will take over. They
1563 either sell or don't sell.
1564

1565 Mr. Snyder - How long ago was the Little Hill's development started? There is still a lot left
1566 to be developed.
1567
1568 Mr. Williams - It is market driven.
1569
1570 Mr. Rich - From start to finish how long do you see to put the road and the drainage in?
1571
1572 Mr. Williams - About a year.
1573
1574 Mr. Rizza - Basically I was asking how long I will hear the construction vehicles going in
1575 and out of the site things that will disturb my quality of life.
1576
1577 Mr. Rich - It will be about a year because when they start with the houses it will be much less
1578 noisy. It will be nothing near the noise of putting in the roadway.
1579
1580 Mr. LaCortiglia - Why are you concerned with that? Aren't you going to remind us to the
1581 limit the hours of operation?
1582
1583 Mr. Rizza - It is a safety concern.
1584
1585 Mr. LaCortiglia - I am talking about no work on Sunday and things like that.
1586
1587 Ms. Evangelista - Baldpate from Little's Hills to Andover Street was a mess and further
1588 down all the drainage grates are coming up.
1589
1590 Mr. Howard - That's what happens when you build a road on clay.
1591
1592 Mr. LaCortiglia - Let's focus back here guys. Wordage in regards to wetland basin and 12
1593 inch pipes versus 18 inch pipes.
1594
1595 Mr. Williams - I think we are going to add grates to the 18 inch pipes.
1596
1597 Mr. LaCortiglia - Redraw.
1598
1599 Mr. Williams - Number 18 is a redraw to revise the basin.
1600
1601 Mr. LaCortiglia - The list of waivers and what Mr. Graham says about them we will deal
1602 with later
1603
1604 Mr. Snyder - The current list of waivers will be added to as well.
1605
1606 Mr. Williams - At the last meeting we showed the open space parcel and talked about an
1607 access to it and where that would be.
1608

1609 Mr. Snyder - The board has received letters from two abutters regarding access onto their
1610 property believing that there are citations in the bylaws that require it to be done.
1611
1612 Ms. Mann - There is no legal requirement to do so but we have considered it.
1613
1614 Mr. Williams - In order to provide an access in we think the best solution is what we are
1615 presenting here. I would guess the town will give access to the public. We are proposing a
1616 right of way to end at the towns property and then an easement for Tolman and Aulson to get
1617 to their property should they endeavor to get permits to do that.
1618
1619 Ms. Mann - They have the right to develop access should they choose to do that.
1620
1621 Ms. Evangelista - What is the distance from that loop - Lisa Lane to the property.
1622
1623 Mr. Williams - About 600 feet before you get to their property.
1624
1625 Mr. Snyder - Is the last 100 feet of that in wetlands?
1626
1627 {Mr. Williams shows the area on the plan.}
1628
1629 Ms. Mann - The majority of it is upland.
1630
1631 Mr. Williams - This parcel is surrounded by wetlands. There is no access that doesn't cross
1632 wetlands. The town has a wetlands bylaw that does not allow wetland filling. There is
1633 currently foot access. Our intention is to construct a driveway sized access, paved with a
1634 parking lot at the end to give access to the public.
1635
1636 Ms. Mann - It gives the town access parking for that open space. I think there are nine acres
1637 of uplands there.
1638
1639 Mr. Howard - So if the other landowner wanted to access it they would have to get
1640 permission from the town?
1641
1642 Mr. Williams - They would have to go through a permitting process to do it.
1643
1644 Ms. Mann - If you grant this, we would convey to them the easement right. That is
1645 something the board would have to make a determination about. They would have to come
1646 to the Planning Board to construct.
1647
1648 Mr. Williams - They would have to turn this area into a right-of-way.
1649
1650 Ms. Mann - This is the only way they could connect their property to ours.
1651

1652 Ms. Evangelista - The town would have to be involved to accept that easement because you
1653 are giving it to us.
1654
1655 Ms. Mann - Or you would allow us to convey subject to the easement. It is easier for the
1656 town to accept land with an easement than to grant an easement after acceptance of land.
1657
1658 Ms. Evangelista - Does the board have to accept these easements?
1659
1660 Ms. Mann - If this board says you don't want us to give them the easement that is up to you.
1661
1662 Mr. LaCortiglia - Where is the power line easement?
1663
1664 {Mr. Williams shows it on the plan as well as the town owned land.}
1665
1666 Mr. Ferrazza - Can you show on the subdivision where that easement is coming out?
1667
1668 {Mr. Williams shows the Tolman, Aulson and town properties on the plan.}
1669
1670 Mr. Duncan - I would like to ask the developer how many homes do you actually need to
1671 build to make it a worthwhile project. If there were 16 homes instead of 24 there would be a
1672 third less traffic and impact on the environment and the existing neighbors would have a
1673 third more privacy.
1674
1675 Ms. Mann - We are developing the property in compliance with zoning.
1676
1677 Mr. LaCortiglia - That is what everybody does.
1678
1679 Mr. Williams - I don't know the answer to his question.
1680
1681 Ms. Grosslein - I am concerned with the easement that all of a sudden it doesn't become a
1682 new road.
1683
1684 Mr. Howard - Oh, it could if they could find a way over the stream.
1685
1686 Mr. LaCortiglia - Without getting into a serious detail my default would be no easement; just
1687 the land and we could talk about adding an easement after. It just shows a road projection.
1688
1689 Mr. Williams - It would be providing a projection to your land.
1690
1691 Ms. LaPlaca - I am still concerned about the water. {She shows a picture of the swampland
1692 and gives a petition of 37 neighbors that have signed i.}
1693
1694 Mr. LaCortiglia - We cannot hold them to anything greater than the 100 year storm using the
1695 numbers that are currently in the regulations.

1696
1697 Ms. LaPlaca - I want to go on record that every subdivision that gets developed changes the
1698 water. Pillsbury changed the water and it wasn't just the beavers. People on North Street
1699 have been flooded. They meet the requirements but the area shows otherwise.
1700
1701 Mr. LaCortiglia - Are you noticing the pattern here that the numbers they are using are wrong
1702 in my opinion. The standard that engineers are using today is a bad set of numbers from the
1703 60's and we can't do anything about that.
1704
1705 Mr. Watts - The water has changed in my back yard every year.
1706
1707 Ms. LaPlaca - There are people on Silvermine where their fences are half under water! Did
1708 you know that? If you look at the woods and all the development you want to out there, it is
1709 going to change the water. If you can't do something about it then who can?
1710
1711 Ms. Evangelista - We are striving to make sure that the engineer sees that no water leaves
1712 this parcel.
1713
1714 Ms. LaPlaca - It's not reality.
1715
1716 Ms. Evangelista - We are trying our best and they are too. Thank you for coming. If these
1717 people really have water issues - that is what I am looking for. We can't, as a town, deprive
1718 people from developing. We can make sure they keep the water on their property.
1719
1720 Ms. LaPlaca - I don't care if they develop I just don't want more water.
1721
1722 Ms. Evangelista - You are not alone.
1723
1724 Mr. Rizza - With all due respect, you guys argued about the Honey Dew sign for a half hour
1725 and nobody in this room really cares about that. So if we have comments please listen to all
1726 of them. I am requesting a list of all the waivers prior to the next meeting. Would they be
1727 able to provide that list to me?
1728
1729 Mr. LaCortiglia - You can make a copy of the front page of the document. It's all there.
1730
1731 Mr. Snyder - What they provided the planning office has the information you are asking for.
1732 Come by and you can see what the waivers are but when they redraw there may be more
1733 waivers added to that.
1734
1735 Mr. Rich - For the record, the petition that was presented and the photo - can we have them
1736 marked as exhibits and put in the file please.
1737
1738 Mr. LaCortiglia - This is the final comment for the night.
1739

1740 Mr. Parisi - I am an abutter to the development. I read some of the documentation. I wasn't
1741 sure where the development was but now I get to see that my house is on the back corner of
1742 this development. I think it is wonderful that we develop the town. I have been here 20 years
1743 and my builder said he did not want to take down trees because he wanted to hold the water.
1744 There are too many developers in town that cut and chop and it is unfortunate. They cut and
1745 chopped Little's Hill. I am up on a knoll so I don't get the water. I know that down below in
1746 the spring, you can't walk across that. When I moved here 20 years ago we used to walk to
1747 Pillsbury it was all woods and the kids would go fishing there. Now it is a beautiful
1748 development but it changes the topography and run offs on the land. I know their intention is
1749 good but you as the Planning Board need to protect the town and what we have. We talked
1750 about traffic impact studies. How does this development impact the existing area? You are
1751 adding additional cars; you need to look at that. I applaud them for coming to Georgetown.
1752 We need more development that is controlled. We need more revenues for better roads and
1753 better schools. Twenty years ago we had 45 hundred and now we have 83 hundred people.
1754 Now you are seeing all the woods are being developed again we the town have to stand up
1755 and make sure the developers have a keen interest in the town. Lisa Lane was mostly
1756 leveled. You as the planning board, it is your job and we applaud you for sitting here and
1757 going through everything. You need to see what they are doing and what they intend to do
1758 and how it will affect us down the road so when they close up shop and sell the development
1759 and move on there is no recourse. It was 15 years before they accepted my street but it took
1760 them 10 years to develop the whole thing. I am glad we have an engineer that lives here in
1761 town but let's look outside the box and make sure we are protected.

1762
1763 Mr. Watts - I think those are excellent comments. I think one of our largest responsibilities is
1764 risk management. My house was built by Gary Stead and he did a great job. We know there
1765 was water moving on it though. It takes experts. It is certainly something we focus on.

1766
1767 Mr. Parisi - When you look at the bare minimums a developer may say oh this is the law but
1768 if you're a good neighbor you're going to work with the towns people so that it will not
1769 impact it. My developer was Cormier and his brother owns Andover country club and they
1770 made sure that their name and reputation stood fast so they took care of it. If they can work
1771 within the parameters and increase it and help us out so we don't get the water and if the
1772 numbers are archaic then bring it up to par so hopefully they will do that.

1773
1774 Ms. Evangelista - Have you been down to Silvermine?

1775
1776 Mr. Williams - When I was in college I did survey there because I worked for the company
1777 that did the design. I am familiar with it. When that was done the requirements were much
1778 less in terms of drainage and storm water management. Things are much more stringent
1779 now.

1780
1781 Mr. Rich - Mr. Parisi, just so you know - these people and Artisan development are not
1782 strangers to this town.

1783

1784 Mr. LaCortiglia - We have worked with them before and they have gotten us out of a couple
1785 of messes.
1786
1787 Mr. Parisi - Then we are fortunate they have a good reputation. They will stand behind what
1788 the town would like and we could work together and it will benefit them. One is that if they
1789 work with us they will sell their properties and get a good reputation and be a good neighbor.
1790
1791 Mr. Rich - Artisan was the only developer that came back to us when some neighbors had an
1792 issue with the plan. They are the only ones that came back and on their nickel said we want
1793 to make them happy.
1794
1795 Mr. Snyder - The applicant has given a Form H to continue the hearing.
1796
1797 Mr. Rich - **Motion** to extend the time for decision to March 31, 2014 and accept Form H.
1798 Mr. Watts - **Second.**
1799 **Motion Carries: 5-0; Unam.**
1800
1801 Mr. Williams - We are going to respond to Mr. Graham within the next couple of days. We
1802 are redrawing based on his comments and we will get this done soon.
1803
1804 {Discussion held as to the time frame of the next available meeting for this continuation.}
1805
1806 Ms. Mann - Wow, March 12th is a long way out.
1807
1808 Ms. Evangelista - You have to go to ConCom don't you?
1809
1810 Ms. Mann - My concern is that I will have my traffic report back ad my response form Mr.
1811 Graham and it will be almost eight weeks old by the time I come back to you. Pushing out
1812 this far in the future is a difficulty for us.
1813
1814 Mr. Snyder - What about February 12th?
1815
1816 Ms. Mann - That would be easy.
1817
1818 Mr. LaCortiglia - Would you like to close tonight because we could deny it right now. We
1819 are going to continue to March 12th.
1820
1821 Ms. Evangelista - Do you have the traffic study done?
1822
1823 Ms. Mann - No, of course not.
1824
1825 Ms. Evangelista - How long does it take?
1826
1827 Mr. LaCortiglia - I am not going to jam 15 things into one meeting.

1828
1829 Mr. Rich - Why, you do it all the other times.
1830
1831 Mr. Snyder - February 12th we have a site plan and a minor modification both of which are
1832 opening of public hearings but they are minor ones.
1833
1834 Mr. Howard - Ms. Mann you realize that we have to have Mr. Graham's comments a week
1835 before the next meeting?
1836
1837 Ms. Mann - We will send these in to Mr. Graham and get his comments back.
1838
1839 Mr. Rich - **Motion** to continue this hearing to February 12th at 7:30 PM.
1840 Mr. Howard - **Second.**
1841 **Motion Carries: 4-1; Unam.**
1842
1843 **2. Solar Energy Bylaw: Continuation of Public Hearing.**
1844
1845 Mr. Rich - **Motion** to open the continuation of the Solar Energy Bylaw public hearing.
1846 Mr. Watts - **Second.**
1847 **Motion Carries: 5-0; Unam.**
1848
1849 Mr. Rich - **Motion** to continue this hearing to February 26th at 7:30 PM.
1850 Mr. Watts - **Second.**
1851 **Motion Carries: 5-0; Unam.**
1852
1853 Mr. Watts - **Motion** to adjourn.
1854 Ms. Evangelista - **Second.**
1855 **Motion Carries: 5-0; Unam.**
1856
1857 **Meeting adjourned at 10:45 PM.**