

**MEETING MINUTES
GEORGETOWN PLANNING BOARD
Memorial Town Hall – 3rd Floor
Wednesday, December 8, 2010
7:30 p.m.**

Present: Mr. Harry LaCortiglia (acting Chair); Mr. Tim Howard (arrives late);
Mrs. Matilda Evangelista; Mr. Chris Rich; Mr. Nicholas Cracknell, Town Planner;
Ms. Michele Kottcamp – Asst.

Absent: Mr. Hugh Carter

Board Business 7:30 p.m.

Minutes –

Mr. Rich- Motions to accept minutes of 6-09-10.

Ms. Evangelista- Second

All in favor? 2-0; Unam (Mr. Howard and Mr. Carter absent; Ms. Evangelista abstains)

Vouchers –

Ms. Evangelista motions to accept the payment of the vouchers totaling \$5,910.79

Mr. Rich- Second

Ms. Evangelista- Withdraws her motion.

Mr. Rich - Asks for account by account approval of the vouchers and motions to approve the general expenses only totaling \$918.79.

Ms. Evangelista - Second

All in favor? 3-0; Unam

Mr. Rich motions to pay the Harmony Lane invoice for the BSC group totaling \$4,992.00.

Ms. Evangelista- Second

Discussion?

(Mr. Varga, Construction Review Engineer, is present for discussion)

Mr. Rich- On the week of Sept 17th can you show me how many hours were spent on

Harmony Lane? Mr. Rich explains he is concerned about the ~~S~~storm-septor construction and piping on the 17th. Am I now being told there was someone inspecting the construction of it and the associated piping when it didn't actually happen?

{Mr. Howard arrives at 7:55pm}

Mr. Dave Varga- It was Mr. Chapman's understanding that the basic manhole barrel that was being installed was for the Sstorm-septor. The smaller septors come in pieces and the working parts and smaller pieces are installed on site. He was waiting for the Sstorm septor fittings as told by Mr. Gatchell. When I saw it after vacation during the week of September 24th, Frank informed me that the company had delivered an equivalent storm septor unit. That is when I found out it was not a Sstorm-septor but they were still waiting for Sstorm-septor parts. I then asked for information to be submitted that proved the unit delivered was equal to the Sstorm-septor. Frank got calculations from Shay Concrete and submitted them to me. They state the unit has an 81% TSS removal rating which is good. I did some additional checking and found that DEP has contracted to the University of Mass., Amherst where they maintained they are not doing testing of units but rating the documentation on these types of units but have not rated this particular unit since they were not sent to the University for testing. I called the manufacturer and asked for documentation. I was sent a 200 page document and called Frank to say I didn't receive satisfactory information but would accept something in writing from the design engineer giving me written documentation that this unit was comparable to the storm septor.

Mr. Rich- The plans submitted to us specifically state Sstorm-septor. Isn't it standard operating procedure that the variation from a plan has to come before the Board for approval?

Mr. Varga-That was my understanding. When I received this information from Frank and then submitted the estimate for the construction surety, I didn't include a line item for it. I don't have the design information so based on the letter from the engineer of Professional Land Services (PLS), is why I sent the recommendation for approval. We originally thought it was a Sstorm-septor. The external structure looks the same but the inside guts are different. It is an enclosed tank with observation covers. When I looked inside and saw the guts, it looked unfamiliar to me and raised questions.

Mr. Rich- Now it makes sense that this tank could have been a Sstorm-septor. When did you find out it wasn't a Sstorm-septor?

Mr. Varga- When I got back from vacation the week of September 24th, I told Frank he might have to remove it. Frank was concerned that damage would occur so I felt it was a valid concern. I did some research to compare the difference between the two units. It took a month before I got the letter from PLS. The binder was already down and the drainage system already in when I started realizing this was not used for this purpose. Time progressed on the project and I indicated that surety would have to be increased by \$20,000 if the unit was not recommended.

Ms. Evangelista- I'm a little concerned regarding the note on Aug. 26th from Frank Gatchell. {Note on file in Planning office}

Mr. Varga- That note was talking about the re-charge system.

Mr. LaCortiglia- From my perspective, it sounds to me that this an improvement to the design. This occurred 3 months ago. When things like this come up, an email or something in writing should **have** come in to the Planning Board. The review engineer could have been brought in on this for comment and **that** would have been helpful to us.

Mr. Varga- I was trying to be helpful to the applicant as well as the Planning Board.

Mr. Cracknell- There was no surprise to the applicant. He was involved throughout the entire process.

Mr. Varga- I wanted something other than a verbal statement that this unit was adequate so I did my own research.

Mr. Cracknell- The next step for the Planning Board is to either add to the surety and include the \$20,000 contingency, or we stay with the number as it is because we believe the unit is equivalent to what was specified on the plan.

Mr.Varga- To be conservative, the existing casting manhole could be potentially damaged. The external size of the unit has a slight difference in diameter. \$20,000 is being conservative (\$5,000 for the removal of the existing one and \$15,000 for the new unit)

Mr. Rich- The unit there now, is it price equivalent to the **Sstorm-septor**?

Mr. Frank Gatchell-The units are similar in cost to one another. The shipping charge is the only difference.

Mr. LaCortiglia- If it were brought up two months ago, I would have liked to have received Larry Graham's opinion. It sounds like what is there will ~~do the~~ function better than ~~what the Sstorm-septor is supposed to do~~.

Mr. Varga passes information from Shay Concrete and the design engineer of the installed unit. Mr. Varga states he is a big believer if they are responsible for approving the installed unit.

Mr. LaCortiglia- The information from Shay states the unit has an 81% TSS removal whereas the **Sstorm-septor** would only remove 78%. Mr. LaCortiglia states that the applicant may have to go before the ConCom if it is deemed a substantial change **by that board**.

Mr. Cracknell- I spoke with the ConCom agent about this.

Mr. Rich- This is a substantial change as far as I am concerned. Chris reads the letter and asks Mr. Varga how he would know if the unit was installed properly? That information should be sent to you before it is installed in the ground.

Mr.Varga- I agree.

Mr. LaCortiglia- What is the Board ~~needing-like~~ to do to act on this?

Mr. Rich- The issues I have concerning the inspection of the unit have been satisfactorily answered.

Mr. LaCortiglia-To repeat- The motion was made by Mr. Rich to pay the BSC voucher for \$4,992.

Ms. Evangelista- Second

All in favor? 4-0, Unam (Mr. Howard is now present)

Correspondence –Caribou Ct. Notice of Intent

Mr. Cracknell- This project has been approved by the Planning Board and amended once.

The ~~driveway~~~~driveway~~ has been shortened, ~~and the driveway removed~~. They are required to use -pavers. This project will show up in January as a Minor Modification.

Comment [H1]:

Comment [H2]: ??????

Sign ANR Endorsement – 13 Moulton & 6 Monroe

- Signed by the Board

Other Business – Harmony Lane – Tripartite Agreement & Punch List, Surety

Punchlist Discussion –

Mr. LaCortiglia- We seem to now have a question on whether or not the ~~S~~-storm-septor needs to be added to the punch list. [To Mr.Varga] It is my understanding that this is not added to the punch list because you feel it is functionally equivalent, correct?

Mr. Varga- Correct

Mr. Rich- Don't we need the input of the ConCom agent?

Mr. Cracknell- I spoke to the ConCom agent today. He felt if they were equivalent, than it would be acceptable to the ConCom. The TSS requirements have not been reduced.

Mr. LaCortiglia- The removal rate of the ~~U~~unitorm unit is 81% TSS removed. The ConCom deals with what comes out at the end of the pipe. From what I'm hearing is that the installed unit does a better job of cleaning the storm water before it even gets into the underground storage facility.

{Mr.Varga agrees with on the calculations presented. }

Mr.Varga- One of my concerns is that it has not gone through the review process in Amherst. I would recommend going through a similar certification process every time this unit is proposed in the future. Most of these units do not reference that review process. You have to obtain the information on your own.

Mr. Gatchell- I ordered the unit on the phone and thought I was getting a Sstorm-septor. Bob Grasso [Applicant's Engineer] said what was delivered was equivalent to the Sstorm septor and had the same calculations. However, it didn't look like anything on the plans.

Mr. Rich- Are you sure that this will do the job it is supposed to do?

Mr.Varga- Based on the information I received, I believe it will.

Mr. LaCortiglia- I am concerned at how often it is getting cleaned in the years to come. What's the maintenance plan? Is Harmony Lane to be a public street?

Mr. Cracknell- Yes

Mr. LaCortiglia- Do you have any input from Peter Durkee, Highway Inspector?

Mr.Varga- No, I have not spoken to Peter.

Mr. Gatchel- This unit is to have easier maintenance.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Does anyone think we should add anything?

Punch list details – We have a lump sum for landscaping. Punch list totals \$83,820.

Mr.Varga- I have a contract for all the information.

Mr. Rich- Motion to accept the punch list totaling \$83,820 as surety for the punch list dated 12-7-2010. {Punch list on file in the Planning office)}

Ms. Evangelista- Second

All in favor? 4-0; Unam (Mr.Carter absent)

34 Thurlow Street OSRD Minor Modification- Mr. Cracknell agrees to review the pass over of land by Jay Ogden.

Budget Discussion –

Mr. Cracknell-References the Draft Comments, Exhibit 5

Mr. Cracknell NC - Included is a budget worksheet for your review. I have shown a slightly reduced bottom line by 15%. There hasn't been enough construction change in Georgetown to warrant paying for the Ppictometry. We have only paid the MIMAP in FY '10. We still have to pay FY'11. We have 3 streets coming in where the developers will pay the majority of the costs and 43D salaries will get reduced a year from now. He also gives an explanation of the salaries budget. This budget is due as a draft internally by the end of the week. I'd like to have a final number to submit at the next meeting.

Mr. Rich- Why can't we at the application stage ask if a roadway being built is going to be public? We should ask for the developer to pay the legal fees.

Ms. Evangelista- It has to be written in and I agree with that.

Mr. Cracknell- My understanding from Town Counsel is that there is no written law that allows a Planning Board to mandate that a street be accepted as a public way. The developer is never required to donate a street to a town.

Mr. Rich- Move to authorize Larry Graham to develop the two sketches under Exhibit B for *porous pavement and a roadway with no curb* and any other review that needs to be done for the regulations. We approve the amount of \$400 for the sketches.

Mr. Howard - Second
All in Favor? 4-0; Unam

Public Hearing 9:00PM: Subdivision Regulations (Mr. Cracknell leaves at 9pm)

Mr. LaCortiglia- Reads the Public Hearing Notice for the Subdivision Amendments at 9:00 pm.

Chris Rich - Notice is posted as stated. {Chris corrects Lanes to Courts}

Mr. LaCortiglia- George Comisky is present tonight and helped to make the LID changes for these draft amendments.

Mr. LaCortiglia- I think tonight as a strategy we can figure out how we are going to approach the changes. I would propose that we not handle this tonight. I recommend we handle the LID proposed changes at the next continuance and the other changes to the amendments ~~would~~ be handled at the subsequent continuance. How does that sound?

Mr. Rich- So moved

Mr. LaCortiglia- By general consensus all Board members agree.

Mr. Rich- I make a motion to bifurcate the amendments into the LID and non-LID(low impact development) changes on separate nights.

Mr. Howard- Second

Mr. George Comisky - Part of the grant was looking for Boards to partner with and the LID changes we are asking for will give the applicant another choice and hopefully respond positively to these changes. This is a positive direction for the town.

All in favor? 4-0, Unam

Ms. Evangelista- Asks for it to be broken down.

Mr. Rich- Requests that George Comisky send the LID changes to Nick electronically.

Mr. LaCortiglia-- What we have tonight are our Draft LID changes only. The notice deals with more than that. This should be broken out into a spreadsheet.

Mr. Comisky- There is also the sub-committee looking at site plan review that would require a bylaw revision for Town Meeting. These would have a LID type application. Could you look at a place holder for this as a future Public Hearing?

Mr. LaCortiglia- This would be a zoning code change for the future. I need a date for a continuation.[?]

Ms. Evangelista- [To Mr. Comisky] Do you have a copy of a Site Review just for the LID? That would be helpful.

Mr. Rich- Move to continue this Public Hearing to January 12th, 2011.

Mr. Howard- Second

All in favor? 4-0, Unam

Mr. Howard - Motion to adjourn meeting at 9:10pm

Mr. Rich – sSecond

Motion carries 4-0; Unam

Meeting adjourned at 9:10pm