

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
43

MEETING MINUTES
GEORGETOWN PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, March 12th, 2014
Memorial Town Hall – 3rd Floor
7:00 p.m.

Present: Mr. Harry LaCortiglia; Ms. Tillie Evangelista; Mr. Bob Watts; Mr. Tim Howard (arrived at 7:25 PM); Mr. Howard Snyder, Town Planner; Ms. Wendy Beaumont, Administrative Assistant.

Meeting Opens at 7:05 PM.

{Moment of silence held for Mr. Christopher Rich.}

Approval of Minutes:

1. Minutes of February 26, 2014.

Ms. Evangelista – **Motion** to accept the February 26, 2014 meeting minutes with any changes requested at this meeting.

Mr. Watts – **Second.**

Motion Carries: 3-0; Unam.

Member or Public Report:

1. Notice to Board of Selectmen of Vacancy.

Mr. LaCortiglia – With the passing of Mr. Rich, MA General Law requires this board to notify the Board of Selectmen that there is a vacancy on it.

Mr. Watts – **Motion** to inform the Board of Selectmen of the vacancy on this board.

Ms. Evangelista – **Second.**

Motion Carries: 3-0; Unam.

Mr. Snyder – It doesn't need to be a formal letter it can be a simple email.

Mr. LaCortiglia – It is my understanding that the Board of Selectmen and the Planning Board will meet – is there a timeline for that?

Mr. Snyder – Within a week and possible the Planning Board can give them a time to meet.

Mr. LaCortiglia – We only have one week to meet?

Mr. Snyder – To meet jointly.

Mr. Watts – Does there need to be a quorum of the Planning Board or can it be just one person?

44 Mr. LaCortiglia – It has to be a majority of both boards. Let’s figure it out and hopefully that
45 timeline will be extended out of necessity. Mr. Snyder perhaps you can figure this out and send
46 out an email?

47

48 Mr. Snyder – Sure I will that tomorrow.

49

50 Mr. Hoover – My Name is Rob Hoover and I just wanted to... It is rather an odd meeting
51 tonight. I considered Mr. Rich a friend. I have come tonight to introduce myself again to you
52 and to officially let you know that while I am on the school committee I am more than willing to
53 fill the seat in whatever format for my friend Chris and that I pulled papers prior to this for Mr.
54 Howards seat.

55

56 Mr. Snyder – You served on the board before right?

57

58 Mr. Hoover – I served on the board for six or seven years and was chairman for a number of
59 those years.

60

61 Mr. LaCortiglia – We made some good decisions in those years.

62

63 Ms. Evangelista – I am glad you came up and stepped forward.

64

65 Mr. Hoover – I care about the community a lot.

66

67 Mr. LaCortiglia –That’s what it is about. Thank you. We will figure out the mechanics of the
68 whole process and let you know.

69

70 **Correspondence:**

71 **1. Town of Boxford: ZBA – Special Permit and Variance for wireless communication facility.**

72 **2. Town of Boxford: ZBA – Special Permit for demolition and reconstruction.**

73 **3. Town of Boxford: Planning Board – Changes to the Zoning Code.**

74 **4. Town of Rowley: ZBA – Special Permit for In-Law Apartment.**

75 **5. Department of Housing and Community Development: Subsidized Housing Inventory.**

76 Mr. LaCortiglia – The first four are notices from other towns.

77

78 Mr. Snyder – The DHCD letter was sent to the Planning Board for information purposes. The
79 Trust and the Task Force will be taking it up. It is a letter involving confirmation involving an
80 annual update to the subsidized housing.

81

82 Mr. LaCortiglia – Are we responsible as the Planning Board to notify them that the West Street
83 project has not received a building permit? They need to remove those units from the SHI.

84

85 Mr. Snyder – We’ll ask why it hasn’t been removed and the fact that it’s still there and it’s been
86 so long. They may have been counting it for a particular reason but again it’s not fully
87 permitted.

88
89 Mr. LaCortiglia – So it shouldn't be on the list.
90
91 Mr. Snyder – I will confirm with them as to why it is on the list.
92
93 Mr. LaCortiglia – It did get an approval of a 40B.
94
95 Ms. Evangelista – Is that permit still open with the ZBA and the ConCom?
96
97 Mr. Snyder – I don't know. I think they are still monitoring clean up on West Street through
98 ConCom but I don't know about the ZBA.
99
100 Ms. Evangelista – I think they are done with clean up through the DEP at least – it has been
101 going on for 13 years.
102
103 Mr. LaCortiglia – My understanding is that if they don't receive a building permit within a year
104 of the approval, it needs to be removed from the list. At such time they do get a building permit
105 then those units go on the list.
106
107 Ms. Evangelista – That's the way it supposed to work but if it's still on the town's books as
108 being open then it is not a closed case as far as I know. That would be something the ZBA
109 should find out and also the ConCom because they work with the DEP right? Because the DEP
110 was officiating with the clean-up and they were the final say as to whether it was ok to build on
111 it or not.
112
113 Mr. LaCortiglia – At this point those number artificially inflate the percentage.
114
115 Mr. Snyder – When it is removed we will still be over the requirement.
116
117 Mr. LaCortiglia – My understanding is that we are getting closer and closer to the 10 percent.
118
119 **6. H.L. Graham Associates, Inc.: Site Plan Review Report – 6 Norino Way.**
120 Mr. Snyder – This can be brought up during the public hearing later tonight.
121
122 **7. Millennium Engineering, Inc.: Cover Letter and Response Letter – 6 Norino Way.**
123 Mr. Snyder – This can be brought up during the public hearing later tonight.
124
125 **8. H.L. Graham Associates, Inc.: Site Plan Review Report – 105 Rear East Main Street.**
126 Mr. Snyder – This can be brought up during the public hearing later tonight.
127
128 **9. Merrimack Engineering Services: Review Report Response Letter – 105 R East Main St.**
129 Mr. Snyder – This can be brought up during the public hearing later tonight.
130

131 **10. H.L. Graham Associates, Inc.: Definitive Subdivision Plan Review Report – Jefferson**
132 **Court.**

133 Mr. Snyder – This can be brought up during the public hearing later tonight.
134

135 **11. David and Margret Smith: Abutter’s Letter regarding Jefferson Court Development.**

136 Mr. Snyder – This will be for the board to have read it in for the record.
137

138 **12. John Sousa: 161 West Main Street – Update.**

139 Mr. Snyder – John Sousa sent an email regarding his efforts at 161 West Main Street.
140

141 **13. Georgetown Park and Rec: Request for Extension of Time.**

142 Mr. Snyder – This can be brought up during the public hearing later tonight.
143

144 **Vouchers:**

145 **1. Merrimack Valley Planning Commission: Annual Assessment Fiscal Year 2015.**

146 **2. W.B. Mason.**

147 Ms. Evangelista – **Motion** to accept the vouchers as presented with a total of \$2,798.90.

148 Mr. Watts – **Second.**

149 **Motion Carries: 4–0; Unam.**
150

151 Mr. Snyder – Just to summarize about MVPC; this is our annual assessment and for budget
152 purposes it is carried as a line item and is funded by a different budget.
153

154 Mr. LaCortiglia – Maybe we should think about putting it on our budget for next year?
155

156 Mr. Snyder – They seem to be happy with it being a different line item.
157

158 **Public Hearing:**

159 **1. Jefferson Court: Definitive Subdivision Plan and Special Permit.**

160 Mr. Snyder – This is a definitive subdivision with the ability of a special permit to be part of
161 it for the court.
162

163 Mr. Kroner – Can you review where we stand with a four member board?
164

165 Mr. Snyder – It is my understanding that preceding you will need 3 of 4 votes in terms of for
166 the court. For the subdivision you will need 3 of 4 votes and right now Mr. Howard is not in
167 attendance. He can fill out a Mullen’s form. I have also put in a request to town counsel to
168 give a finding about if we get a new member and if they can use a Mullen’s for them to
169 review meetings prior to their election/appointment.
170

171 Mr. LaCortiglia – The gentleman here earlier is running for Mr. Howard’s seat as he has no
172 plans to return to this board.
173

174 Mr. Kroner – When is the election?

175
176 Mr. Snyder – May town meeting.
177
178 Mr. Kroner – We will have this wrapped up before then so Mr. Howard will be on the board.
179 We have a limited discussion tonight so I think we can proceed. I want to submit the
180 assessor’s record showing it was a 2 family house at 78 North Street so we are not increasing
181 the number of families.
182
183 Mr. Snyder – I will enter this as Exhibit #1.
184
185 Ms. Evangelista – Is the house still standing?
186
187 Mr. Kroner – At 78 North Street no, it has been torn down. The Smiths wrote a very nice
188 letter can we take note of it?
189
190 Mr. LaCortiglia – Yes, we will take note that it has been read.
191
192 Mr. Kroner – If we can, Mr. Holt wanted to respond to Mr. Graham’s letter.
193
194 Mr. Holt – I am not going to go over all the items.
195
196 Mr. LaCortiglia – We have received Mr. Graham’s comments dated March 4th and we can
197 go right thru it. He tells us what he did and did not receive. The plan review starts with
198 sheet 1 an easement note. Can you respond to that?
199
200 {Mr. Howard arrives at 7:25 PM.}
201
202 Mr. Holt – Prior to this he said he didn’t receive the documents and I know we submitted
203 them. Maybe they didn’t get forwarded to him, I don’t know. I guess he didn’t get the
204 application permit. We submitted them as one package. We will get him the supportive
205 documents he said he did not get.
206
207 Mr. Kroner – I would like to refresh your memories on a few points. We have agreed this
208 was going to be a private road with a deed restriction with no municipal involvement from
209 the town. I will prepare a maintenance agreement for the owners of the two lots. The other
210 thing is that we kept 76 North Street out of this subdivision. It is a separate lot scheduled to
211 be sold the end of March. Our plan is to sell that lot as a free standing lot not part of the
212 subdivision.
213
214 Mr. Holt – The easements Mr. Graham is talking about are on 76 which are going to sold.
215
216 {The area is shown on the screen.}
217
218 Mr. Holt – First is an easement for owners of the two homes since it will be a private way.

219
220 Mr. LaCortiglia – Will there be a homeowner’s agreement with that?
221
222 Mr. Holt – Yes.
223
224 Ms. Evangelista – I have never seen that, have you?
225
226 Mr. Kroner – It is like for a common driveway. You would have to have a maintenance
227 agreement.
228
229 Mr. LaCortiglia – The maintenance of this new roadway would not be a burden to the town.
230
231 Ms. Evangelista – I am just thinking of when they sell it.
232
233 Mr. Kroner – The bylaw on a common driveway requires a maintenance agreement so we
234 will treat it the same way as that.
235
236 Ms. Evangelista – Do you have an example of that Mr. Snyder?
237
238 Mr. Snyder – No.
239
240 Ms. Evangelista – Are you going to bring it in soon so we can compare it?
241
242 Mr. Kroner – Yes.
243
244 Mr. LaCortiglia – We like to see the wording on them. Mr. Graham goes on about the
245 project is in a water resource area and open space should be provided.
246
247 Mr. Holt – We can provide those and will add it to the table on the plan. We are eliminating
248 access to lot 32.
249
250 Mr. LaCortiglia – Where will they get their frontage from?
251
252 Mr. Holt – Frontage is off of North Street not from the court. There are 128 feet now and
253 138 when we are done.
254
255 Mr. LaCortiglia – Mr. Graham points out that any approval from the board should address
256 this item on a final plan as “note revised.”
257
258 Mr. Holt – We are taking the note off.
259
260 Mr. LaCortiglia – General design note is that he is concerned how the restrictions are
261 documented and enforced.
262

263 Mr. Kroner – Again, I will put that in the deed that it is two single family homes on a private
264 way maintained by the owners of each home. I will put language in each deed and will
265 provide you a more detailed document.

266
267 Mr. LaCortiglia – General design note 2 he suggests that note 33 and 33A be clarified as each
268 lot is going to be independently owned.

269
270 Mr. Holt – Yes, we will take care of that. When Mr. Dehullu sells them it will be referenced
271 that they will be responsible.

272
273 Mr. LaCortiglia – And reference the homeowners agreement as they are tied in together. A
274 note for Mr. Snyder from Mr. Graham is that any approval decision should carry a condition
275 that speaks to these notes. He goes on to waivers and gives his opinion. For pavement
276 thickness he likes 3 ½ inches.

277
278 Mr. Holt – No problem with that.

279
280 Mr. LaCortiglia – Just because it is private doesn't mean it should be substandard.

281
282 Mr. Holt – As far as pavement goes he is suggesting we do 16 foot wide for the first 25 feet
283 so that two cars can pass. We have no objection to it that makes sense. We are trying to
284 keep it as less impact as possible with minimal pavement. Further on he has no objection to
285 the 12 foot wide area. We will widen the entrance so there is enough room for two cars to
286 sit there and there will be no backup on North Street - it makes sense.

287
288 Mr. LaCortiglia – Especially seeing that it is North Street.

289
290 Mr. Holt – Yes, we want to make sure there are no conflicts at the entrance.

291
292 Mr. Kroner – Is the board ok with that waiver?

293
294 Mr. LaCortiglia – We are not making any votes, that is part of the special permit. I'll be
295 honest with you, narrowing it down to 12 feet and the double hammerhead a lot of that
296 depends on the fire department and we need to get some comments from them in regards to
297 that. Have we already received something from them Mr. Snyder?

298
299 Mr. Snyder – Not officially from the fire chief.

300
301 Mr. LaCortiglia – As soon as we see those changes on the plan we will get it to the fire
302 department for comments.

303
304 Mr. Holt – For the property line radius at the intersection we were asking for no radius at the
305 property line of 76 and 78. I spoke with him and he mentioned that a 20 foot radius would fit
306 and it actually will not. I discussed it with him about us wanting to maintain the radius so

307 there is no reason to leave the radius on that side since we don't have a sidewalk. I told him I
308 thought a 12 1/2 foot radius would work on both sides which he said he would support and he
309 told me I could tell you that. He wants the radius the same on both sides. I think we will
310 revise our plan.

311
312 Mr. LaCortiglia – So you will make a revision on the plan to show that.

313
314 Mr. Snyder – That will be a waiver request.

315
316 Mr. LaCortiglia – Yes, amend the waiver request. On sheet 2: show the location of the
317 nearest catch basin. He is concerned about the water and anyone living there should be.
318 Where is that catch basin?

319
320 { Area shown on the screen. }

321
322 Mr. Holt – The water flows from the high spot up near number 70 and there is catch basin.
323 We designed it so that we are catching the water and there is no increase to the water going
324 on to North Street. I think he just wants us to show it.

325
326 Mr. LaCortiglia – He is also looking to see the existing utility lines.

327
328 Mr. Holt – I heard the water department requested a certain size line to the houses and we
329 will add that on as well.

330
331 Mr. LaCortiglia – Looking at sheet 3B - total frontage shown for lot 33A should be revised.

332
333 Mr. Holt – B and C are on the list and it was a typo and needs to be corrected.

334
335 Mr. LaCortiglia – Can you explain D?

336
337 Mr. Holt – Before we tore the house down, we permitted the left lot number 33 with a septic
338 and a building permit to protect our interest for the buildable lot. Lot 78 as it is an existing
339 lot that had a house on it so we prepared a plan showing the house in the back to take down
340 the house that was there so prior to taking the house down we wanted to protect the lot to
341 have a buildable lot so...

342
343 Mr. Kroner – Remember, 78 is nonconforming so once the house comes down the clock
344 starts running to protect it for a one lot dwelling if for some reason this board doesn't
345 approve the court.

346
347 Mr. LaCortiglia – So you will have something to fallback on to build one home. Where is
348 this referenced?

349

350 Mr. Holt – It is written right on the house. We do have a permit to build. We will remove
351 that note.

352
353 Mr. LaCortiglia – Yes, less confusion.

354
355 Ms. Evangelista – What is the size of lot in 78?

356
357 Mr. Kroner – It's the frontage that makes it non-conforming. It was on the building
358 inspector's advice.

359
360 Mr. LaCortiglia – Moving on; no radius we discussed that. On sheet 4 the 12 wide turn
361 around he suggests seeing the comments from the fire department. Plan should specify the
362 pavement return radii at the intersection.

363
364 Mr. Holt – I will add that on.

365
366 Mr. LaCortiglia – On sheet 4; propose alternate drive for 76.

367
368 Mr. Holt – We are eliminating that one.

369
370 Mr. LaCortiglia – He notes the proposed drainage easement - you will take care of that. He
371 is concerned about an increase to ponding. {Shows the area of concern on the map.}

372
373 Mr. Holt – I am going to meet with him and go over all drainage issues and propose a
374 solution for each of these.

375
376 Ms. Evangelista – He will discuss with you LIDS.

377
378 Mr. Holt – Yes, I am hoping next week to sit down with him.

379
380 Mr. LaCortiglia – Where is the weir he mentions?

381
382 {Area is shown on the screen.}

383
384 Mr. Holt – A weir is basically a berm - a hump that will stop the water.

385
386 Mr. LaCortiglia –It is very close to the lot line.

387
388 Mr. Holt – The reason we put that there is we know water will go that way. I will talk that
389 over with Mr. Graham. We can do them long and narrower and make them look like a swale.

390
391 Ms. Evangelista – You need a retention area right?

392
393 Mr. Holt – That is what we are trying to avoid.

394
395 Mr. LaCortiglia – My concern is that I see grading there and my thoughts are that it looks
396 like you are going to remove a lot of vegetation and usually what we do with special permit
397 on sub divisions; we like to see a screen buffer.
398
399 Mr. Holt – When the building is close to the setback you need to have access around the
400 building so clearly we have to trim some vegetation.
401
402 Mr. LaCortiglia – Clearly you need some vegetation and visual screening for the abutters.
403 You’re the engineer you will work it out.
404
405 Mr. Dehullu – I am willing to do any planting needed.
406
407 Mr. LaCortiglia – Can we see that on a plan?
408
409 Mr. Holt – Yes we will. Going back to the berm and the ponding, further in to the review he
410 mentions the roof runoff and we did not take credit for that even though he suggests that we
411 do take credit for it and eliminate the little swale on the side.
412
413 Mr. LaCortiglia – Did you do the test pits for that?
414
415 Mr. Holt – We did test pits throughout the site and it is totally sandy, gravel material - very
416 impervious.
417
418 Mr. LaCortiglia – So there is a good chance that the roof runoffs will be successful.
419
420 Mr. Holt – We have to size them appropriately for the house.
421
422 Mr. LaCortiglia – I would figure for the max roof - make the numbers works. Take the credit
423 for that and come up with a better configuration that’s a little more acceptable to the abutters.
424
425 Ms. Evangelista – Keep the biggest trees standing.
426
427 Mr. Dehullu – We are keeping the sugar maples there.
428
429 Mr. Holt - All the trees that say “RET” next to them means we are keeping that tree.
430
431 Ms. Evangelista – But there is quite a lot of proposed tree line. Are there any rock walls?
432
433 Mr. Holt – Yes, on the north side.
434
435 Mr. Snyder – The property was farm for a while so this is not necessarily mature growth.
436
437 Ms. Evangelista – I am glad you are saving some of the mature trees.

438
439 Mr. LaCortiglia – In G he refers to the technical configuration so some of the detention
440 basins and the slope of the sides. Sounds like you will do some tweaking there and take into
441 account his comments and concerns.
442
443 Mr. Holt – They are actually very shallow but we will grade them as he mentioned. He also
444 wants some stone at the bottom that we will do. We will show stock piles locations as well.
445
446 Mr. LaCortiglia – Is this going to ConCom?
447
448 Mr. Holt – No it is not.
449
450 Mr. LaCortiglia – Moving on; the water service needs to be approved by the water
451 department. Wants you to show there are two meter pits.
452
453 Ms. Evangelista – They shouldn't go in the swale.
454
455 Mr. Holt – Right, we are going to move them.
456
457 Mr. LaCortiglia – Continuing on; contour should be redrawn to show the pavement
458 pitching... You're going to fix that right?
459
460 Mr. Holt – I have it as a regular crown and he wants it to be elevated to push it to one
461 direction. No problem.
462
463 Mr. LaCortiglia – He is uncomfortable with the 4% pitch of the street. He recommends a 2 -
464 2 ½ maximum. We will need to waive whatever it is. Try and get as close as you can.
465
466 Mr. Holt – Yes, I think we can do it no problem.
467
468 Mr. Snyder – Is the pitch going to be affected by the wider width?
469
470 Mr. Holt – No it will not affect that.
471
472 Mr. LaCortiglia – Comment about the profile view; a small detail about the way it looks.
473
474 Mr. Holt – That may change when we do trees and grade. We will correct that.
475
476 Mr. LaCortiglia – He sees a line on North Street.
477
478 Mr. Holt – It is an auto cad typo.
479

480 Mr. LaCortiglia – On sheet 6 there is a disconnect between pavement thickness - we talked
481 about that. Proposed street trees if required; let's talk about it we might as well - Mr.
482 Graham brings it up for a reason. What is the width of the pavement here?

483
484 Mr. Holt – It is 12 feet.

485
486 Mr. LaCortiglia – So 16 feet at the opening and followed by 12. Maybe this is for discussion
487 for when we see the new plan. Because then we will be able to see where trees may fit.

488
489 Mr. Holt – We are showing a bunch of trees that are there that are going to be retained.

490
491 Mr. Snyder – When he referring to street trees, is he referring to North Street? This is not a
492 street it is a court.

493
494 Mr. Holt – We can add trees if he decides we need to add more.

495
496 Mr. LaCortiglia – I think he is talking about the new roadway. Let's see what it looks like
497 with the redraw.

498
499 Ms. Evangelista – When we do discuss the trees do you ever put a well around the trees to
500 protect them better?

501
502 Mr. LaCortiglia – I have seen plan details with the right way to do it.

503
504 Ms. Evangelista – Some are brick or stone around it. Where you have so much water there it
505 may be a help.

506
507 Mr. Dehullu – If they were on the property I think it would be better as some tree roots are
508 pulling up the sidewalk.

509
510 Ms. Evangelista – Did you get the trees inspected to see if they are healthy?

511
512 Mr. Dehullu – If you want a tree is fine, I would probably keep them away from the
513 sidewalk.

514
515 Mr. LaCortiglia – You may not have room for a sidewalk or a grass strip. Let's see what the
516 engineer comes up with. Moving on; vegetated basins to be provided - that is soon to be in
517 your detail. Comments; drainage analysis, exempt from Stormwater management because it
518 is less than 4 lots, existing contours are difficult to read. We did not receive calculations for
519 the sediment storage - you are going to get that to him right? Designer may wish to
520 incorporate proposed drywells into the analysis to get a more accurate representation for the
521 proposed condition. He talks about the way you are referencing the pond. He recommends
522 that the board review and go over these comments and request the plans and documents be
523 revised. I think we did that right?

524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567

Ms. Evangelista – Yes, we did that.

Mr. LaCortiglia – Mr. Snyder, anything else?

Mr. Snyder – I just have a couple of documents to be read into the record. One is a letter from the Smiths. I am entering that as exhibit number 2. And handed to use tonight at this meeting is a letter from the Dunton's on 29 Pond Street. They are a direct abutter. I am entering their letter as exhibit number 3. {Reads the letter, which in part voices their concern about the septic systems.}

Mr. Griffiths – I live at 29 Pond Street but am not the landowner. {Shows on the screen where there used to be a stream and now floods out every year.} That natural spring is still there. When they built Homer's house they had covered it up. You have your sewer tanks and your drywell right there. You have your tanks right next to my tanks at 29 Pond Street. {Shown on the screen is the Tapin property.} Mr. Snyder said the stream does not show on the map but 40 years ago it was there.

Mr. Snyder – It is not shown on the FEMA flood maps either.

Mr. Griffiths – I'm telling you there is a stream there. Next month you can come down there and see it. I am not begrudging them having three properties there but you are causing a natural disaster.

Ms. Evangelista – So that is naturally spring fed and it is not an overflow from North Street?

Mr. Griffiths - Yes. There are a couple thousand trees in that area that has been absorbing all the water. Go down there and even with the trees there you will sink into the mud at least 6 inches.

This person here {shows on the map} is about 4 feet down from the land they are hoping to build on - where is that water going to run off - right in her back yard. We only found out about this two days ago. They are upset over this and the reason they are not here is because they are both handicap and in their 70 and 80's. I really think someone should look at the physical properties down there because the houses in the corner didn't realize that they were putting septic tanks right in their corner.

Mr. LaCortiglia – For my own satisfaction can you show me the test pits location?

Mr. Holt – {Shows them on the screen.} There are two in each area and a perk test in each area. Again, we had good depths.

Mr. LaCortiglia – Please send the soil logs.

Mr. Holt – I will send the soil logs and I will try to address it at the next meeting.

568
569 Ms. Evangelista – Could you get a map and show the abutter’s septic locations and work
570 with Mr. Graham on that?
571
572 Mr. Holt – If they have records, yes we could do that. We did design the drainage to have no
573 impact on the abutting properties. Water runs off the property today and will continue to run
574 off but we don’t want to have any increase.
575
576 Mr. LaCortiglia – Has the Board of Health reviewed this?
577
578 Mr. Holt – They reviewed the one down here but we have not submitted the other one.
579
580 Mr. LaCortiglia – Have they approved that one?
581
582 Mr. Holt – Yes. We meet all the setback requirements.
583
584 Mr. LaCortiglia – Are these raised systems?
585
586 Mr. Holt – They are slightly raised. It is about a foot higher than it was.
587
588 Mr. LaCortiglia – You had to raise it from the existing groundwater?
589
590 Mr. Holt – We had to have 5 foot separation because we had such a good perk rate.
591
592 Ms. Evangelista – Before you were saying the water was flowing this way which now makes
593 sense to me because you are higher than everyone else around there.
594
595 Mr. Holt – It flows a little in two directions actually which is why we are trying to maintain
596 two drains on it.
597
598 Ms. DeGiovanni – As stated before, indeed our land at 27 Pond Street is about 4 feet below
599 the level of lot 33 and 33A. Also, my land slopes downward and in the back gets worse. It is
600 interesting to know what goes on the other side because I was not aware of the water way and
601 the stream. It would be interesting for the board to know exactly what the elevations are and
602 where is the water really going to go. The trees are going to be cut down and the water will
603 go somewhere. We want to know where the water will end up. I also wanted to know if
604 there were any thoughts about the thoughts I proposed at the last meeting. My ideas of the
605 ways people deal with this type of situation such as porous material. Some of this water
606 could be dealt with easily with the water going into the ground and I wonder if any research
607 was done. And if you need an example of this work just look at the school that is being built
608 - they have a long driveway that is all porous surfaced. Learn from them and you can do the
609 same thing here.
610

611 Mr. Holt – We did address the water running off the roadway. All along the road is a trench
612 and the water will go into the trench and then into the ground. We will recharge the water so
613 it will not stay on the ground it will go on the trench.

614
615 Mr. LaCortiglia – You are showing a 12 foot wide pavement there and you will lose that
616 because you are going to 16 feet wide.

617
618 Mr. Holt – We will have to increase the size of the trench - make it work.

619
620 Mr. LaCortiglia – How would this all function if the roadway was porous pavement and
621 maintained as part of the homeowner agreement?

622
623 Mr. Holt – The primary problem with porous pavement is that it has to be maintained. It has
624 to be vacuumed. I think in the long run the trenches we are proposing are much easier to
625 maintain and is more cost effective than the porous pavement.

626
627 Mr. Kroner – From a legal point of view I see a couple of issues. One is that it may be a
628 deterrent for someone buying the house. Second is an enforcement issue if they want to put
629 in regular pavement rather than the porous. It creates an unnecessary enforcement issue for
630 the town I think.

631
632 Mr. LaCortiglia – It is private - if the neighbors saw it being covered with another layer of
633 asphalt then it would be matter of litigation. This is something for the board to think of - we
634 are running a little bit behind schedule, we have four other hearings. Is there anyone in the
635 audience who would like to be heard in regards to Jefferson Court?

636
637 Mr. Paganelli – I am not an immediate abutter but I am concerned about my septic system as
638 it right along the line. And it is not too far from the property line. A lot of trees have been
639 taken down. I am concerned about my septic system and maybe in the next few years I may
640 sell. The visibility will be affected. It was a nice quiet neighborhood. Mainly is the water
641 issue. I didn't understand about the approval of the first septic - has it been approved by the
642 Board of Health?

643
644 Mr. Holt – It has.

645
646 Mr. LaCortiglia – We have heard testimony that it is a slightly raised system.

647
648 Mr. Holt – We have a two minute perk set on the whole site.

649
650 Mr. Paganelli – I am concerned about all the water from roofs etc... that water has to go
651 someplace.

652
653 Mr. LaCortiglia – I think I speak for everyone. We have water concerns that need to be
654 addressed by the engineer and possibly by Mr. Graham.

655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698

Mr. Holt – We intend to sit down with Mr. Graham and go over all these concerns.

Mr. Snyder – It will be a big topic for when you come back.

Mr. LaCortiglia – Is everyone comfortable with asking Mr. Snyder to research porous pavement? That may alleviate some of the concerns of the neighbors.

Ms. Evangelista – I think the date on the Board of Health approval is important to see how old this permit is and if it's still valid.

Mr. Holt – We just did it last October or November.

Ms. Evangelista – Then I misunderstood.

Mr. Dehullu – This all happened this past summer.

Mr. Cannon (16 Pond Street) – It doesn't actually affect me as I am across the street. I am just suggesting that the Mr. Graham makes a physical visit and looks it over. That is what I am suggesting.

Mr. LaCortiglia – Thank you sir. I will accept a motion to continue this hearing.

Mr. Howard – **Motion** to continue this hearing to the April 9th, 2014 meeting.

Mr. Watts – **Second.**

Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.

2. **Turning Leaf: Definitive Subdivision Plan.**

Mr. LaCortiglia – We are now reopening this hearing.

Ms. Mann – We are here this evening to go over the plans and response we submitted to Mr. Graham a couple of weeks ago. And also to present to you our traffic report. We also presented a letter with some concerns that the conservation commission had raised which were the same raised by this board. One is the right-of-way and whether or not it should be on the parcel of land that is going to be gifted to the town as open space. They raised concerns as well as this board so we are looking for direction as to what you would like us to do from this board in regards to the easement as it exists presently. When we originally appeared before the board, we had discussed lengths of dead ends and the ConCom made a representation that it had talked to Mr. Snyder and that they would be willing to grant and entertain an extension of length of road. I said to them that we have had conversations with Mr. Snyder - and this board and had never been given any indication either way.

Mr. LaCortiglia – This was a meeting you had with the conservation commission?

699 Ms. Mann – Yes, last Thursday. I think that they audio it and Mr. Przyjemski said we could
700 do a cul-de-sac so I told him we would come to this board and let them know that that was
701 even discussed and ask them to respond to the ConCom so we wanted to address that as well.
702

703 Mr. LaCortiglia – I don't know how to respond to that. Have we received anything form the
704 ConCom formally?
705

706 Mr. Snyder – No.
707

708 Ms. Mann – They're not going to. They asked me to ask you.
709

710 Mr. Snyder – Mr. Przyjemski sent me an email just outlining what Ms. Mann is explaining.
711

712 Mr. LaCortiglia – Do you have a copy of the email?
713

714 Mr. Snyder – Not here, no.
715

716 Mr. LaCortiglia – We can maybe discuss it at the next meeting.
717

718 Ms. Mann – They are looking for you to give some sort of an indication to them at their next
719 meeting on April 17th. Basically their position is that they need to know that the Planning
720 Board has looked at extending and granting a waiver for their dead end restriction. That's
721 what they want. They said when we look at this plan, if you are going to be anywhere near
722 the wetlands and we have to give you some sort of relief under the wetlands act and we want
723 to know that the Planning Board will give some sort of waivers as well so we want to know if
724 you presented and requested a plan for a waiver which would require the board to waive its
725 length of dead end restriction to permit this particular development to proceed without
726 connecting to Searle Street.
727

728 Mr. Howard – Why would ConCom like that?
729

730 Ms. Mann – Because then we don't have to go by an area of wetland.
731

732 Mr. Snyder – Some aspect of a design would have a similar type of dead-end and they would
733 be removing the conflict with the wetlands here. {Shows the area on the screen.}
734

735 Mr. Howard – They would be losing lots to do that?
736

737 Mr. Snyder – Right.
738

739 Ms. Evangelista – You would lose three house lots.
740

741 Mr. LaCortiglia – I am not as concerned about losing lots as I am about if you don't have this
742 connection to Searle Street... Aren't we at 11 hundred feet to start with?
743

744 Ms. Mann – 16 hundred.
745

746 Ms. Evangelista – It should be 800.

747
748 Ms. Mann – We understand and we did discuss this with the board informally and the board
749 said to us that no we are not in favor and we basically recounted that to the ConCom and they
750 said basically ok but we want Mr. Snyder to tell us that the board said that and not you. You
751 can't really vote but basically what is your position in regard to extending an already over
752 long dead-end way.

753
754 Ms. Evangelista – I haven't changed my mind.

755
756 Mr. LaCortiglia – I haven't changed my mind either and I know we haven't formally voted
757 on it. Can I get a sense of the board for the benefit of the conservation commission so that
758 Mr. Snyder can relate to Mr. Przyjemski a sense of the board? Then we are not held to in or
759 in any way shape for form formally granting any waivers or denying any waivers. I see a
760 hand in the audience and I am wondering why.

761
762 Mr. Grosslein – I was at the ConCom meeting. To clarify, the reason the ConCom was
763 asking for this is it kept coming back to saying that you have this plan that needs a series of
764 waivers. And we'd like to see a plan that has no waivers. And in their minds that would
765 include potentially putting something that didn't connect Searle Street but came off Lisa
766 Lane.

767
768 Mr. LaCortiglia – A No Waivers Plan on ConCom is a No Waivers Plan under the wetlands
769 protection law. That has nothing to do with what we do.

770
771 Ms. Mann – No it doesn't you're just mixing two issues that's all.

772
773 Mr. Grosslein – The reason I mentioned it is - the reason Ms. Man is asking is to get your
774 feeling as to whether you would consider extending off of Lisa Lane. That was one of the
775 potential ways that they would be able to present a plan that would have fewer houses.

776
777 Ms. Mann – No matter what, I have to present to them a no waiver plan no matter what.

778
779 Mr. LaCortiglia – But I think under Chapter 161 - it is under wetlands protection.

780
781 Ms. Evangelista – I know you are trying to move it along so why did you not bring a plan
782 with no waivers to them?

783
784 Ms. Mann – We are presenting it, we are. Don't forget, we only appeared before them once
785 because we've had some issues.

786
787 Mr. Williams – In order to show a plan with no waivers it would mean that we didn't have a
788 connection out to Searle which means we would have a cul-de-sac off of an extension of Lisa
789 Lane which would be an extension of an already 1600 foot dead-end street so our point and
790 we relayed that to them that a no waiver plan is no lots. Without getting a waiver for the
791 length of a dead-end...

792
793 Mr. LaCortiglia – There would be one lot.

794

795 Mr. Williams – There is no frontage for one lot. You’d have to create the frontage.
796
797 Mr. Snyder – Have to get an easement to get to the property.
798
799 Mr. LaCortiglia – Getting back to the sense of the board so we can dispense this
800 communication to the ConCom and get back to Planning Board issues. I can’t in good
801 conscience grant a waiver for an over 1600 foot dead end in this town. I don’t even want to
802 think about emergency vehicles etc... trekking their way in and if a tree ever falls...
803
804 Ms. Evangelista – I feel that way also. That is asking quite a lot I think. That is my feeling
805 on it.
806
807 Mr. Watts – I concur.
808
809 Mr. Howard – Have we granted other waivers on other projects? What was Stone Row?
810
811 Mr. Snyder – Stone Row was a shared driveway.
812
813 Mr. Howard – If we didn’t let them do it - well I guess they had nowhere to go.
814
815 Ms. Evangelista – You’re talking 3 houses rather than 24.
816
817 Mr. Howard – I guess I would not be keen on not having them reconnect.
818
819 Mr. LaCortiglia – I hope that you got that Mr. Snyder and you can express that to ConCom.
820
821 Mr. Snyder – I will say that I gather from the Planning Board meeting that the board would
822 not be in favor of creating or extending Lisa Lane instead of going to Searle Street.
823
824 Ms. Mann – Thank you. Would it be ok for us to present our traffic plan?
825
826 Mr. Mills (MDM Transportation Consultants) – We conducted a traffic study of several
827 intersections including off of Searle Street, Fieldstone Lane, Marlboro Road and Tenney
828 Street. We gathered traffic volume data, sit distance information and intersection crash
829 history. We have compiled this information into the study. One of the more important parts
830 of the study is the trip generation tripped by the development of 24 single family homes.
831 This is a very compatible size for the area. When we look at the entrance to Searle Street, a
832 one way roadway, while it is narrow and has a curved nature because of the one-way traffic
833 flow eliminates about 50 percent of the conflicts you would typically have. The proposed
834 access is on Searle Street. We did traffic counts so we were able to project what this
835 development would generate. Same size and the same characteristics we expect to generate
836 the same traffic. We did verify that with the IT Trip Generator methodology, this document
837 has a host of data points. Looking at that rush hour condition during an hour time period it
838 shows about 27 vehicle trips during the morning peak hour and about 29 during the evening
839 peak hour. When we looked at the information we obtained from the Lisa Lane bussing
840 company that actually generated about 22 vehicles in the morning and 31 in the evening so
841 they are very consistent.
842

843 Mr. Snyder – I just want to make sure the audience understands. What you are doing is
844 making a comparison between what theoretically would occur which is the ITE and with
845 what you observed.

846
847 Mr. Mills – Correct we are looking at the traffic volume generated during peak times. The
848 other part is how people will get to and from the subdivision. We looked at existing travel
849 patterns specifically leaving Lisa Lane and found that most people head towards route 133
850 generally thru White Pine to Marlboro.

851
852 {Discussion held in regards to where most of the residents head on the roads.}
853

854 Mr. Mills – This development will have a second access down Searle Street about 70 percent
855 of the folks will use Lisa Lane and 30 percent will use the new roadway.

856
857 Mr. LaCortiglia – Does that play into the feasibility of making this a one way which would
858 prevent... I don't know, how would that affect it?

859
860 Mr. Mills – We haven't looked at that particular configuration. It would force more people
861 to go out Fieldstone Lane.

862
863 Mr. LaCortiglia – One way or another Marlboro is getting it.

864
865 Mr. Mills – The traffic volumes are very light in this area. There is no substantial queuing or
866 delays at the intersections. The traffic is free flow with or without the development. We did
867 analysis with and without the development with a grading system.

868
869 Mr. LaCortiglia – Is it delay time - how long you are sitting there?

870
871 Mr. Mills – Yes and generally this is all very comfortable wait times with no backups.

872
873 Ms. Evangelista – How long would it take to get to route 133?

874
875 Mr. Mills – We didn't do a specific travel time. The shortest route would be to White Pine to
876 Marlboro and then to Tenney. One other important aspect is that this is a new roadway so we
877 conducted an evaluation of the intersection for site distance up and down Searle Street.
878 Because of the travel speed and site distance is related to travel speed the more time they
879 need to react in stopping for somebody. This is a straight section with great site distance
880 and again it is a one way roadway. We did note that there are some existing trees that need
881 to be removed and a stone wall will need to be lowered.

882
883 Mr. LaCortiglia – Is that number 4 on the plan?

884
885 Mr. Mills – Yes. This property is under the control of the applicant.

886
887 Ms. Mann – This will be shown on the plan.

888
889 Mr. Mills – So the visibility coming either way is acceptable.

890

891 Mr. LaCortiglia – When we talk about site distances - is it only computed from exiting onto
892 Searle Street onto Lisa Lane?
893

894 Mr. Mills – There are 2 aspects to site distance. One is going down Searle Street, they need
895 to be able to stop.
896

897 Mr. LaCortiglia – That’s why you want the wall to be lowered so they don’t have to pull
898 halfway into the street. I am more concerned about folks driving down on Searle Street and
899 someone puts their brakes turning into that roadway - how do you compute that?
900

901 Mr. Mills – Traveling Searle Street to the east you are able to measure to the distant to the
902 intersection to the proposed site driveway.
903

904 Mr. LaCortiglia – Is that in here?
905

906 Mr. Mills – Yes, page 11.
907

908 Mr. LaCortiglia – I am concerned about people not putting their blinkers on.
909

910 Mr. Mills – It is on Page 11 and table 4. You need about 155 feet from the proposed site
911 driveway. On Searle Street you can see over 350 feet, well over the criteria.
912

913 Mr. LaCortiglia – It says the posted speed limit is not applicable.
914

915 Mr. Mills – It is not available. There are no posted speed limits on Searle Street.
916

917 Mr. LaCortiglia – So all of this data is done upon presuming the speed limit is 25 mph?
918

919 Mr. Mills – We didn’t select 25 mph we sampled...
920

921 Mr. LaCortiglia – I understand you got it as the 80th percentile. That is what you determined
922 to be the mean speed. My concern is that no one knows how fast the speed limit is there. No
923 one seems to be able to tell me if this board can suggest that to the police and that they
924 adhere to it and no one seems to be able to give me an answer.
925

926 Mr. Snyder – This is thickly settled and I believe the states mandates a speed limit is 30 mph.
927

928 Mr. Mills – We would probably not recommend you put a 30 mph speed limit there.
929

930 Mr. LaCortiglia – From your study you saw that most people traveled at 25 mph.
931

932 Ms. Evangelista – But you can’t enforce it if it is 25 so what good would it do?
933

934 Mr. Mills – That is what they are traveling. For the past 5 years we did not see any accidents
935 on Searle Street.
936

937 Ms. Evangelista – How far back did you go?
938

939 Mr. Mills – We went back 5 years. There is a sidewalk on one side of Lisa Lane and we
940 will review with the bus company about locating a bus stop at the proposed site driveway.
941 This would be en route.
942

943 Mr. LaCortiglia – Why would there be no going thru the neighborhood - you are adding 26
944 houses? That is a whole other bus.
945

946 Mr. Mills – I believe that is between the school and the bus company. They may opt to go
947 through the neighborhood.
948

949 Mr. LaCortiglia – Perhaps we can reach out to Carol Jacobs with a letter and ask her to chime
950 in on that to see if she would prefer to have a bus top on Searle Street or within the
951 subdivision itself.
952

953 Mr. Mills – In the course of our study we found that the Marlboro Road, Tenney Street site
954 distance is very restrictive and looking at the accident history there were 2 accidents in the
955 last 5 years. It is a very low number of accidents. I will note that there is a dangerous
956 intersection sign there. I don't know when it was put up or why.
957

958 Ms. Evangelista – Before we had National Way trucks were going up there.
959

960 Mr. LaCortiglia – It's not a site distant issue there?
961

962 Ms. Evangelista – Before we had the access road the only way they could get there was thru
963 Tenney Street.
964

965 Mr. LaCortiglia – I seem to remember someone mentioning something that that area has a
966 difficult site distance. Do you have the site distances for that?
967

968 Mr. Mills – That location is independent from the project. We don't have control over it.
969

970 Mr. LaCortiglia – I wonder if you could advise in any way as a help to the town.
971

972 Mr. Mills – I guess it is private property. The only suggestion would be to make Marlboro
973 Road an entrance only if the town perceives it as a safety issue. The accident history does
974 not support that.
975

976 Mr. LaCortiglia – Going back 5 years is not a long time.
977

978 Mr. Mills – It could be improved. It is not an ideal situation.
979

980 Mr. LaCortiglia – What is your projected traffic increase at that intersection?
981

982 Mr. Mills – I believe it is about 37 vehicles turning right and we will be adding about 19.
983

984 Mr. Mills – People are going right because that is where they are headed not because of a site
985 distance issue. One solution is to make Marlboro Road an entrance only if the town feels
986 there is a safety issue.

987
988 Ms. Evangelista – I thought maybe one side was more difficult to see and that was why
989 everyone is turning right.
990
991 Mr. Mills – We also noticed that at Fieldstone Lane and Marlboro there are no stop signs -
992 who has the right of way is not clear.
993
994 Mr. LaCortiglia – Any questions from the board?
995
996 Mr. Snyder – From my experience, if a development puts in something that impacts change
997 of level of service they might in the traffic study mitigate that level change of service. In
998 your report was there any level of service change in any of the intersections?
999
1000 Mr. Mills – They are all operating at a good level both existing and post development. Very
1001 low volume roadways with no queuing. While it is not an ideal situation you can take your
1002 time and creep out a little at the intersection.
1003
1004 Ms. Evangelista – Now you are adding cars so it may be different.
1005
1006 Mr. Mills – We are not adding a significant number of cars.
1007
1008 Mr. Watts – What would you consider a volume increase that would trigger concern?
1009
1010 Mr. Mills – There would have to be a tremendous amount of volume on Tenney Street. We
1011 would explore what would trip it if it were a higher level of service - it is not needed for us to
1012 do that.
1013
1014 Mr. Watts – What would trigger it – double or tripled? I am trying to get a sense because we
1015 are doubling the number of homes.
1016
1017 Mr. Mills – On Tenney Street for example in the evening we have 200 cars - we generally
1018 look at 500. We have to sustain that over 4 hours not just in the morning and some criteria is
1019 over 8 hours in order to justify a traffic signal.
1020
1021 Mr. LaCortiglia –I’d like to point out one thing Mr. Graham points out that the plan does not
1022 show calculated site distances the traffic study does and that data needs to get to Mr. Graham.
1023
1024 Mr. Williams – He has a copy of the study and I can add the distances to the plans as well.
1025
1026 Mr. LaCortiglia – It is 9 o’clock I would like to focus on the traffic issue with the permission
1027 of the board. We do have 3 other hearings tonight.
1028
1029 Mr. McLaughlin – A couple questions one about the site line between Wilkins Way to the
1030 proposed street. Although it is straight it is downhill and to me the site line is the tree
1031 canopy.
1032
1033 Mr. Mills – If you walk back you can see over the crest. We put a cone in the site driveway
1034 and walk back until we can’t see the cone anymore.

1035
1036 Mr. LaCortiglia – Bear in mind I think Mr. Graham takes it 3.5 feet off the ground.
1037
1038 Mr. McLaughlin – Did you take into effect the backup of cars from Tenney to 133? The
1039 backup now is 3 or 4 cars.
1040
1041 Mr. Mills – We did not expand the study area.
1042
1043 Mr. McLaughlin – Most of the neighbor think they could use a blinking light there.
1044
1045 Mr. Mills - I believe the state came in recently and made improvements to that location.
1046 They generally don't build something for today they take into consideration future growth.
1047
1048 Mr. McLaughlin – Now there is an island there.
1049
1050 Mr. LaCortiglia – Also a place to pull over to take the turn.
1051
1052 Mr. Mills – One, we did not evaluate this section. Two, there were improvements made by
1053 the town.
1054
1055 Ms. Evangelista – When Mirra developed the apartment complex.
1056
1057 Mr. Howard – They were obligated.
1058
1059 Ms. Evangelista – Our road surveyor was involved with it.
1060
1061 Mr. Mills – I can't speak much as I did not evaluate that location but I guess they based their
1062 engineering judgment on what the design should be.
1063
1064 Mr. McLaughlin – Whoever did the analysis haven't been stopped in traffic there.
1065
1066 Mr. Mills – They probably observed traffic in peak periods and looked at the accident
1067 history. When a design is done they make projections. My guess is that they didn't it think a
1068 traffic signal was warranted in this location.
1069
1070 Mr. LaCortiglia – If there was increased queuing, what would you do about it?
1071
1072 Mr. McLaughlin – The point is that adding traffic will make it worse.
1073
1074 Mr. LaCortiglia – You are probably not going to want to hear this but personally I don't see
1075 the impact. The delays are about 3 seconds. From the study area the traffic issue does not
1076 seem that great.
1077
1078 Mr. Grosslein – It is not so much the delay there it is the danger. You take your life in your
1079 hands. It is a nasty intersection.
1080
1081 Mr. Mills – There were 2 accidents for Marlboro and one for Searle Street.
1082

1083 Mr. Grosslein – There was one I noticed a few weeks ago. A pickup slide down Marlboro in
1084 an ice storm and someone hit him. I was coming to a meeting and there was an accident at
1085 that same spot. Not all accidents get reported. I think there are more accidents in a five year
1086 period just at that intersection alone. Any significant increase in development is going to
1087 lead to more accidents. I hope none of you have to teach a son or daughter to drive in this
1088 development.

1089
1090 Mr. LaCortiglia – What would you have the board or the applicant do to mitigate this? It
1091 sounds to be that Marlboro and Tenney Street intersection and the danger is caused by an
1092 embankment of privately owned land. Unless you get a citizens petition to take that land by
1093 emanate domain to cut it down. Given this report I think you have the data to support that.

1094
1095 Mr. Grosslein – Maybe a mirror or a temp blinking light? I am sure there are a number of
1096 things that can be done.

1097
1098 Mr. LaCortiglia – Is there a stop sign?

1099
1100 Mr. Mills – Yes.

1101
1102 Mr. Duncan – When I taught my daughter to drive I made her go down Searle Street. It is
1103 dangerous there. When you go right your have to be ready to hit the gas.

1104
1105 Mr. LaCortiglia – I hope that this report can be sent to the traffic committee.

1106
1107 Ms. Evangelista – I don't think we have one.

1108
1109 Mr. LaCortiglia – Maybe the highway department?

1110
1111 Ms. Evangelista – Did the police have any more records back further than 5 years?

1112
1113 Mr. Mills – We usually do 3 years and in this case we went back 5 years.

1114
1115 Ms. Evangelista – I think why it is safe in 5 years is that most have been living there for a
1116 while. New people coming in will not know those roads and the danger points. There has to
1117 be more accidents than that on the Tenney Street hill.

1118
1119 Mr. Mills – We got a letter from the police department and that is the information we got.

1120
1121 Mr. LaCortiglia – As good as it is going to get for data.

1122
1123 Mr. Snyder – We have 3 more public hearings tonight.

1124
1125 Mr. Howard – **Motion** to continue this hearing to the April 23rd, 2014 meeting.

1126 Ms. Evangelista – **Second.**

1127 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.**

1128
1129 Mr. Snyder – Provided in the packet is correspondence from the engineer dated March 6th
1130 and you have the drawings.

1131
1132 **3. East Main Street Recreation: Special Permit for Athletic Facilities.**
1133 Mr. LaCortiglia – We will now open this continuation.
1134
1135 Mr. Snyder – I received a letter from Ms. Wade requesting a continuation to the March 26th
1136 meeting but that meeting is full.
1137
1138 Mr. LaCortiglia – How about we do it when we do Jefferson? This is a special permit right?
1139
1140 Mr. Snyder – Yes.
1141
1142 Ms. Evangelista – You hired a new engineer right?
1143
1144 Mr. DiMento – Yes. They are meeting with Mr. Snyder tomorrow. I think you’ve given
1145 approval for him to meet with Mr. Graham.
1146
1147 Mr. Snyder – I encouraged him to meet with the board first. The new engineer he has
1148 requested past meeting minutes and correspondence to get himself up to date.
1149
1150 Mr. Howard – **Motion** to extend the time for approval (Form H) to June 30th, 2014.
1151 Mr. Watts – **Second.**
1152 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.**
1153
1154 Mr. Watts – **Motion** to continue the hearing to the April 9, 2014 meeting.
1155 Mr. Howard – **Second.**
1156 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.**
1157
1158 Mr. Howard – Is he going to try and deal with the water runoff situation?
1159
1160 Mr. DiMento – Yes, he is. He’s got simulation programs he is doing. He may want to talk
1161 to Mr. Snyder about the possibilities. He will present them to Mr. Graham.
1162
1163 Mr. Howard – Mr. Graham came up with like a 35% increase of water. Mr. Mammolette
1164 had said it was going to be a 5%.
1165
1166 Mr. LaCortiglia – This may be porous pavement all the way to the street.
1167
1168 Mr. DiMento – We talked about a number of different solutions. There are 120 engineers at
1169 this company so they will talk about it and come up with a solution.
1170
1171 Ms. Evangelista – Any discussion about testing the soils?
1172
1173 Mr. DiMento – No.
1174

1175 **4. 105 Rear East Main Street: Site Plan Approval.**
1176 Mr. LaCortiglia – We will now open this continuation for site plan approval. We have a
1177 bunch of comments from Mr. Graham. {Plan shown on the screen.} Does everybody see the
1178 letter from Mr. Graham dated February 25th?
1179
1180 Mr. LaCortiglia – Looks to me that everything has been addressed.
1181
1182 Ms. Evangelista – The first one, was that addressed? Or the second?
1183
1184 Mr. LaCortiglia – Let’s take them one by one. Mr. Snyder do you have a response letter?
1185
1186 Mr. Snyder – The response letter is an email.
1187
1188 Mr. LaCortiglia – {Reading of the letter received form Mr. Graham.}
1189
1190 Mr. Snyder – I thought the board derived from the last meeting the only outstanding item left
1191 over from Honey Dew was the landscape islands in the parking area.
1192
1193 Mr. LaCortiglia – I did notice there are missing signs. One was a no idling sign.
1194
1195 Mr. Ricci – I will buy any signs needed.
1196
1197 Mr. LaCortiglia – With permission of the board just about everything here has been
1198 addressed until the end. I think that was misunderstood or misinterpreted - especially
1199 number 7. Mr. Graham recommends 2 additional signs at the rear access point. One should
1200 be for deliveries and the other access to Hydraulics Plus. It seems your engineer
1201 misinterpreted it.
1202
1203 Mr. Ricci – Let me write that down. We will move the sign up.
1204
1205 Mr. Snyder – Note for the board that I put a draft condition of approval in there and I can
1206 amend it to reflect these two items and take the word draft off if you are fine with everything
1207 else.
1208
1209 Mr. LaCortiglia – I didn’t get a chance to really pour over it.
1210
1211 Mr. Snyder – What I would like to suggest opt the board is that you can give a condition of
1212 approval and then at the next meeting these two items will be addressed on the mylar.
1213
1214 Mr. LaCortiglia – I am good with approving it at this point. The only issue I have is that the
1215 islands are not in.
1216
1217 Mr. Ricci – She gave me a copy of a letter from the landscaper and I guess he will start in the
1218 second week in April.
1219
1220 Mr. Snyder – So it might start between now and the time of the next meeting. If you can
1221 provide that she’s gotten a recent quote, maybe that will show for the board the intention of
1222 moving forward.

1223
1224 Mr. Ricci – I will email it to you.
1225
1226 Mr. LaCortiglia – No, I didn't say I was voting for it. I am not hearing anybody making a
1227 motion either.
1228
1229 Ms. Evangelista – We get caught when we do conditionals.
1230
1231 Mr. Snyder – Ms. Evangelista, this is not a conditional. This is giving a conditional approval
1232 that in two weeks you will be signing all the documents. Or you can wait for the meeting in
1233 two weeks and vote with the documents there.
1234
1235 Mr. Howard – It wouldn't make any difference from his standpoint.
1236
1237 Mr. LaCortiglia – You can't move forward until it is recorded anyway. You need signed
1238 mylars to move forward. One trip to the registry of deeds rather than two. It doesn't matter
1239 either way. Any other concerns or comments from anyone?
1240
1241 Mr. Snyder – Do you want to close the public hearing or keep it open till the next meeting?
1242
1243 Mr. LaCortiglia – I am never in favor of closing a public hearing - if you get hit by a bus we
1244 get thrown out the door. I've seen a lot of comprehensive approvals go thru for closing a
1245 hearing before everything was signed. I am not in favor of closing the hearing.
1246
1247 Mr. Ricci – Really, I can't open because of two islands? I think that is preposterous.
1248
1249 Mr. LaCortiglia – I think it is too. This board signed off on that before it happened. Does
1250 anyone want to make a motion to close the public hearing?
1251
1252 Mr. Howard – What are the consequences of closing the public hearing?
1253
1254 Mr. LaCortiglia – The consequences of closing the public hearing is that this board needs to
1255 have a decision within 21 days. If a snowstorm happens and we don't have a meeting or a
1256 quorum then we can't act and sign and then all of a sudden it is a wide open approval.
1257
1258 Mr. Howard – But we are not going to prevent him from opening his shop because of the
1259 landscape and the islands right?
1260
1261 Mr. Ricci – But that's what's going to happen right?
1262
1263 Mr. LaCortiglia – I don't know how the other board members feel - I only know how I am
1264 going to vote.
1265
1266 Mr. Snyder – At the next meeting you'll have the mylars and the decision to sign.
1267
1268 Mr. Howard – **Motion** to continue the hearing to the March 26, 2014 meeting.
1269 Mr. Watts – **Second.**
1270 **Motion Carries: 3-0; 1 abstention.**

1271
1272 Mr. Ricci – But she won't have the islands in by then.
1273
1274 Mr. Snyder – At the next meeting they will sign the decision and sign the mylar.
1275
1276 Mr. Howard – He needs to make plans to open his shop. I think it's only fair.
1277
1278 Mr. LaCortiglia – This hearing was just continued we cannot have this discussion right now.
1279 It will work out.
1280
1281 Mr. Howard – The question is when.
1282
1283 **5. 6 Norino Way: Site Plan Approval.**
1284 Mr. LaCortiglia – I am now opening this hearing. It's getting later kids. We are running
1285 really late tonight.
1286
1287 Mr. Snyder – We have comments from Mr. Graham and Millennium Engineering.
1288
1289 Mr. Murray – We responded and we are in agreement with his comments. The one change
1290 was the labeling of the building. In the proposed changes the storage area was originally in
1291 the back of the building and that has been switched to the front. So he asked us to label that
1292 area which we have done on the plans. Other comments were describing the changes to the
1293 new building. One comment was the distance from the new building to the pavement area.
1294 It will be essentially it will be a one way pattern so we feel it is sufficient. I know the board
1295 had a concern about showing the addition on all the site plans which we have submitted to
1296 Mr. Snyder. Previously you signed the one cover sheet so I believe we covered that with the
1297 one mylar provided.
1298
1299 Ms. Evangelista – Did you mark the storage areas on the plan?
1300
1301 Mr. Murray – Yes, that and the vehicle maintenance area.
1302
1303 Mr. LaCortiglia – I did seem to notice that the older plan doesn't seem to show the proposed
1304 addition. Not a problem with Mr. Graham so it doesn't change any Stormwater calculations.
1305 The only concern I have is that I am not seeing the plan that shows the fence.
1306
1307 Mr. Snyder – It is on the utility plan.
1308
1309 Mr. LaCortiglia – Ok. Does anyone have any concerns? I don't think Mr. Graham has any
1310 other recommendations.
1311
1312 Mr. Murray – I think he made reference to the 25 foot that you may want to note.
1313
1314 Mr. LaCortiglia – {Reading of the letter from Mr. Graham.}

1315
1316 Mr. Murray – We are comfortable with the plan.
1317
1318 Mr. LaCortiglia – Let’s go to the decision. On page 4 of 6 the applicant will record a
1319 certified decision. If I am not mistaken the old set of plans had sheets one two...
1320
1321 Mr. Murray – They were architectural plans.
1322
1323 Mr. LaCortiglia – I think the board should decide tonight and include a list and the titles of
1324 these because they are not numbered. Can we name them and there are two that have the
1325 same name - maybe put an A on one? Are we all good with this?
1326
1327 Mr. Howard – Yes.
1328
1329 Ms. Evangelista – Yes.
1330
1331 Mr. LaCortiglia – I would like to call out each page.
1332
1333 Mr. Snyder – The first application was just a cover sheet.
1334
1335 Mr. LaCortiglia – If you just record the cover sheet there is no reference to the stormwater
1336 system, fencing etc.
1337
1338 Mr. Howard – Typically we only sign the front that is how we have always done it. As long
1339 as there is a reference on each sheet.
1340
1341 Mr. Watts – As long as there is something that connects each page to the cover sheet.
1342
1343 Mr. LaCortiglia – On the front page it shows the cover index. That’s why I think it’s easier
1344 to call them out.
1345
1346 Mr. Watts – Is there a facility to associate the cover sheet with these specific documents?
1347 Would we need to sign each one?
1348
1349 Mr. LaCortiglia – We need to sign the ones that are being recorded.
1350
1351 Mr. Murray – If you put the list in the decision then that records all the plans,
1352
1353 Mr. LaCortiglia –Does the board want to call out some of the pages or not?
1354
1355 Mr. Howard – I’m good with the cover sheet.
1356
1357 Mr. Watts – Me too.
1358

1359 Mr. Howard – Anybody that is curious can go see Mr. Snyder.
1360
1361 Mr. LaCortiglia – How are we going to deal with sheet 8 - plant material and fencing?
1362
1363 Mr. Snyder – Those are conditioned from the last meeting.
1364
1365 Mr. Snyder – Does you're your cover sheet reference the book and page of the original?
1366
1367 Mr. Murray – Yes, we reference this is the original approval on it. Your concern was to
1368 make sure that the building got shown because this is a site plan modification.
1369
1370 Ms. Evangelista – **Motion** to approve the site plan modification and to sign the decision.
1371 Mr. Howard – **Second.**
1372 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.**
1373
1374 Mr. Howard – **Motion** to close the hearing.
1375 Mr. Watts – **Second.**
1376 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.**
1377
1378 **Member or Public Report:**
1379 **2. Any other concern of a Planning Board Member and/or member of the Public.**
1380 Mr. Snyder – The Open Space committee working with the planning office and ConCom
1381 needs to engage MVPC to complete the mapping for the open space and recreation plan. Mr.
1382 Whitten has stated it will take 35 hours to complete the rest of them. I need the planning
1383 board to authorize me to fill out the letter of technical assistance and I will send it on to them
1384 so they can get engaged.
1385
1386 Mr. Howard – **Motion** to have Mr. Snyder sign the LTA request.
1387 Mr. Watts – **Second.**
1388 **Motion Carries; 4-0; Unam.**
1389
1390 Mr. Howard – I have a question. Was it MIMAP that departments share? Are we going to
1391 allow the residents to use MIMAP as I think people will use it?
1392
1393 Mr. Snyder – MIMAP is being used by most Town Departments. For public access is
1394 planned for in the start of the next fiscal year.
1395
1396 Mr. Howard – I really think it is worth is.
1397
1398 Mr. Howard – **Motion** to adjourn.
1399 Mr. Watts – **Second.**
1400 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam.**
1401
1402 **Meeting adjourned at 10:00 PM.**