

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**GEORGETOWN PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, February 10, 2010**  
**7:00 p.m.**

**Present:** Mr. Harry LaCortiglia; Mrs. Matilda Evangelista; Mr. Rich; Mr. Howard; Mr. Nicholas Cracknell, Town Planner; Ms. Michele Kottcamp, Asst.

**Absent:** Mr. Hugh Carter (arrives at 8:10PM)

**Board Business: 7:00 p.m.**

Mr. LaCortiglia opens the meeting at 7:12PM

Mr. Carter arrives at 7:18PM.

**Minutes – Sept 9, 2009**

Approval of minutes postponed to a later date

**Vouchers –**

Mr. Cracknell – Regarding the Railroad Ave invoice totaling \$2,466, Bob Grasso, applicant for Railroad Avenue, did a response to Dave Varga and Dave responded back with a detailed explanation of all charges. Dave explained that he needed to be on sight to explain key issues of the project on the site with a PE of the BSC Group.

Mr. Rich- Motion to pay Railroad Avenue invoice totaling \$2,466.

Mr. Howard- Second

Discussion:

Ms. Evangelista- I think Dave Varga is a reasonable person.

Mr. Cracknell- We have a contract with Dave Varga of the BSC Group.

Mr. Grasso– I got charged for his travel time.

Mr. Rich- It is a cost of doing business for Dave to contact a PE to fill in on his behalf.

Mr. Carter- If Dave needs to communicate to another guy, that is on their time, not a charge to the applicant.

Mr. LaCortiglia- There was a scheduling issue due to weather issues.

Mr. Cracknell- [To Mr. Grasso] In fairness to our engineer, put your concerns in writing. I am not comfortable discussing it with Dave not present to comment.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Am I correct, 2.25 hours of Dave's time should have been one hour's worth of time instead? It would be very difficult for a detailed discussion to occur between Dave and the PE over the phone as opposed to on site.

Mr. Rich- The potential for abuse concerns me.

Mr. LaCortiglia- What is the procedure for a handoff?

Mr. Cracknell- We should develop a policy with how to deal with this issue.

Mr. Rich- There were two people from the BSC Group doing the same job.

Mr. LaCortiglia- If we vote to pay the bill, and the Board finds that \$288 should be charged to us and go back to the M-account, is there a mechanism to do that? I would like to move this discussion to another meeting.

All in favor? 4-0-1; Ms. Evangelista opposed  
Motion carries

**Correspondence –**

**Other Business –**

**Little's Hill – Tripartite Agreement reduction request**

Mr. Cracknell- Dave and I met on this. Exhibit 1A and B are included in the meeting draft comments. Mr. Spear is requesting \$59,299. This is our third meeting regarding this bond release. Dave agreed with what was stated in the stone bounds memo that is on file in the Planning office.

Mr. LaCortiglia- The iron spike is located at Hillside Dr. and Baldpate, correct? There were 4 bounds installed very recently.

Mr. Cracknell- Yes. There are 2 spikes. The proper substation mechanism was done. I suggest you accept Dave's email as acceptance to a field change.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Motion to request unanimous consent that the Board consider this to be an insignificant change and declare that replacement of the bounds at the end of Hillside

Dr. at the intersection of Baldpate Road may be substituted with 2 spikes as exists in the field.

Mr. Rich- Second

All in favor? 4-0; Unam (Ms. Evangelista abstains as she is an abutter)

Craig Spear- On Baldpate Road near 36 and 40 there are now 4 stone bounds and 1 iron pipe as shown in the plans. Those are all there. On Little's Hill Lane at the cul-de-sac there are 4 bounds that show the beginning of the cul-de-sac, two on either side.

Londonderry Ln – There are 2 stone bounds and there is one other on Lot 37 that had not been installed but it is now in. A house is under construction. We did not change any numbers on the tripartite agreement. One of the neighbors sent an email to ConCom that the end of Londonderry Lane entrance to open space should have iron pipes. I do have to replace those. We now have \$4,000 in stone bounds included in this \$160,000. I request that the Board allow me to fix those. {See Exhibit 1-B}

Mr. LaCortiglia- I noticed that photos were sent regarding the bounds. My concern is visibility for the open space. Are the bounds sticking up on 36-40?

Mr. Spear- I believe they are all sticking up.

Mr. Cracknell- We need to develop a policy for open space. I agree with Harry to instruct the applicant to have it noted on the plans for surveyors.

Mr. Spear- At the two spots of the open space that go between the two house lots, we have a 10 ft sidewalk that directs people.

Mr. LaCortiglia- I personally like to see the one on the right of the entrance off Londonderry Ln. get raised and show people there is a bound there.

The surety is \$220,168.01. The recommended release from Dave Varga is \$59,299.09.

Mr. LaCortiglia- I move to release \$59,299.09 for the Little's Hill subdivision Form J as of Feb.10, 2010.

Seconded by Mr. Rich

All in favor? 4-0-1; (Ms. Evangelista abstains)

### **Parker River Landing – Update from National Grid- rescheduled**

#### **Railroad Avenue – Surety reduction request (Form J)**

Exhibit 4A is the Form J. Dave Varga submitted a response to the request of Bob Grasso. His notes and photos are included. He recommends a slightly smaller number than that in the request. Mr. Grasso's request as stated in his memo dated January 19, 2010 is \$164,883.00. Dave Varga's recommendation is \$147,223.27 after his review.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Move to sign Form J releasing \$147,223.27 of Railroad Avenue surety money.

Mr. Howard- Second

**Discussion?**

Bob Grasso, applicant – I asked for \$164,883.00 in a surety reduction request. I sent a letter to the Board dated Feb 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and the letter was also emailed to Nick.

Mr. Cracknell- What was the purpose of the letter?

Mr. Grasso- It was my response to Dave Varga's report and what happened on the site. I don't agree with some of the numbers on the spreadsheet from Dave. Dave received the letter and he recommends \$147,223.27 as the reduction amount from the surety and I am disputing his numbers.

Mr. Rich- Was there an engineer there when the paving was put down? Doesn't Mr. Varga have the authority to say it is put down incorrectly? The question is what state it is in.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Questions the pallet amounts on site and storage as shown in Dave Varga's *Opinion of Cost* report dated Feb. 8, 2010. {On file in the Planning office}  
My concern is only when they are in the ground installed.

Mr. Howard- If Dave's number is reflective of the purchase of those, then I think his number is too high. We need to discuss this with Dave. I think Dave's estimate of \$1,125 on Line Item #11 of his report is too high. The Board goes by what our engineer says as we are not experts.

Ms. Evangelista- Questions the total of \$1,125 on Item #11 as materials delivered and not installed.

Mr. Grasso – I don't understand Item #8 on Dave Varga's report totaling \$7,350.

Mr. Cracknell- I can facilitate a meeting to discuss these issues.

Mr. Howard- We have to have a level of confidence in what our engineer tells us.

Mr. Rich- We also have to be consistent on projects.

Mr. Grasso- I will agree for now with the new reduction of surety as \$147,223.27 and I will come back again and request more.

Mr. LaCortiglia- I want to amend my original motion to release \$146,098.27(removing the figure of \$1,125 as listed in Item #11 of the BSC *Opinion of Cost* dated 2/8/10 because those bounds are on site)

Mr. Rich- Second

### **Discussion?**

Mr. Rich- If this is what our engineer has said, should something happen to those bounds? The bounds are there and he's releasing it. He authorized the release of the funds.

Mr. Howard- It is a vote of no confidence in Dave. We can discuss this issue in the future.

Mr. Carter- We want to be supportive and if we see something we feel is wrong, we need to take action on it.

First vote of amendment (\$147,223.27): All in favor? 5-0; Unam

Original motion as amended (\$146,098.27): All in favor? 5-0; Unam

Ms. Evangelista- Makes a motion that she wants to be sure that the Planning Board does not discuss agenda items unless the Board receives the information a week in advance. It's too last minute.

Mr. Cracknell- I don't know that the bounds would have been caught if we had a week to review. Out of respect of the Board, we need to demand from the applicant that if they plan on disputing an invoice, we need a week to review the information.

{Mr. Rich asks Ms. Evangelista to reconsider her original motion and she agrees to do so}

Ms. Evangelista- Makes an amended motion:

When it comes to Form J releases, any request other than that which has been submitted that varies from the inspection engineer's report must be received in the planning office one week prior to the scheduled meeting.

Mr. Rich- Second

All in favor? 5-0; Unam

Mr. Cracknell- As a Board member, you should vote on it or choose to take action at the next meeting. If Mr. Grasso has a problem with Dave Varga's number on the spreadsheet, he needs to address it with Dave directly.

### **Zoning Amendment Discussion – 2010 ATM**

Mr. Cracknell- I am working with all the necessary committees and taskforces for discussion of 40R. I will be going to the Trust to talk about Harris Way. We have a meeting with Claire Golden of the DPU and the Georgetown Board of Health. There will be an informal discussion to understand any potential for the Perley School and waste water management in the town. We are also hoping to hire a technical expert that might be able to help us implement a plan. We have until the end of March to decide whether to sponsor this.

Ms. Evangelista- Let's also do something about the recreational fields.

Mr. Cracknell- I will bring it back for the next meeting and we can decide what to do with it.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Motions to enter into Executive Session to discuss litigation understanding the Board will not be returning to public session

Mr. Howard- Second

Mr. Carter- Aye

Mr. Rich- Aye

Ms. Evangelista- Aye

Mr. Howard- Aye

Mr. LaCortiglia- Aye

{Planning Board enters into Executive Session}