

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**GEORGETOWN PLANNING BOARD**  
**July 25, 2007**

**Present:** Mr. Rob Hoover, Chairman; Mr. Harry LaCortiglia; Ms. Matilda Evangelista; Mr. Larry Graham, Consulting Engineer; Ms. Sarah Buck, Town Planner; Ms. Michele Kottcamp, Assistant

**Absent:** Mr. Tim Howard and Mr. Hugh Carter

Mr. Hoover- opens the meeting at 7:12PM.

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

**Reviews of zoning and subdivision regulations: Major development review**

Ms. Buck- Outdated requirements are no longer relevant. One new item as a result of the Spring Town Meeting is that we need to add impact statement guidelines into the Subdivision Regulations. I put the marked up copy of the guidelines put in place by the Town of Greenfield. I would recommend first to do the cleanup. I would be happy to send around a first draft of my changes for the Board's review. It has not been touched or amended since 2000.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Are these things that have to go to Town Meeting or do we do these in house?

Ms. Buck- We have to hold a Public Hearing, but we do not go to Town Meeting.

Ms. Evangelista- We need to start, the sooner the better.

Mr. Hoover- I am ready to get started.

Ms. Buck- I will go ahead and put in your packets the first initial changes of my own pass through.

Mr. Hoover- I have a large list of my requested changes. Should we first identify the issues?

Ms. Buck- Agrees to distribute an electronic copy of the Subdivision regulations. We need to also reorganize the amendments. How does an hour sound to cover that?

{The Board agrees to cover first pass of the amendments in one hour}

Mr. Hoover- Were there any issues with Greenfield initially?

Ms. Buck- I will check with them. I will make the call and double check if it goes in Zoning or Subdivision Regulations.

Ms. Evangelista- There seems to be a lot of repetition.

Ms. Buck- The overlap may be between the residential of 50 or greater lots as well as commercial development.

Ms. Evangelista- There is always a gray area in Zoning and it is not seen in Regulations. Unless an applicant asks for a waiver, you can't change anything.

Mr. Hoover- One of the challenges is that the applicant looks to the Zoning when applying for a subdivision. If things are moving targets, that would put a difficult burden on the applicant. Ordinances are grandfathered and that is what they go by.

Ms. Buck- If someone comes in without asking for any waivers then they are giving you what you want. The OSRD allows us to play a lot more with design.

Mr. Hoover- Does that address everything?

Ms. Buck- I think we could do it the second meeting in September and I will get back to everyone to confirm the date.

Mr. LaCortiglia- In the Spring, 5-6 articles were presented and 4 were passed. A lot got passed over. Will we be presenting those again and any other changes at the Fall Town meeting?

Mr. Hoover- Historically that is not the time to put through Zoning amendments. It is usually done once per year.

Ms. Buck- We are already late if we expect to put it through at Fall Town Meeting. We are trying to get Longview Way and others accepted.

Mr. Hoover- It was a legitimate mistake to not communicate then with ZBA.

Ms. Buck- If we start with the Subdivision Regulations, let's get past those first.

Ms. Evangelista- There could be a lot of applications between now and May. To me the lot width issue is critical.

Mr. Hoover- How about we just explore one?

Ms. Buck- I will need to add "lot width zoning amendment" to our upcoming September discussion.

### **Sign Street Acceptance plan for Acorn Way:**

Ms. Buck- The street acceptance for Acorn Way was passed at Town Meeting last Fall. Members just need to sign the mylar. {Board signs approved mylar plan}

### **Other Business:**

Mr. Hoover- Every organization including the Planning Board needs to establish a list of priorities and goals for the year, especially for the Town Planner. The only way to figure it out is that we put a list together. I have already compiled a list. I will send my list to Sarah to modify and then the Board can review it and expand upon it.

Ms. Evangelista- Peter Durke has many issues regarding road acceptances. He has many issues/comments that he has put in writing to the Board. He felt that anything to do with drains and water issues, the contractor should contact Larry Graham. Minor issues should go to the Board. However, what do we consider “minor” issues? It can be interpreted many ways.

Mr. Hoover- We will address street acceptances as part of the Master Plan and Fall Town Meeting.

Ms. Buck- That would be a good one to add to the list of priorities that we need to add to the Board’s running list of “to do’s”. It is a huge time issue.

Ms. Evangelista- I think it’s critical because of the Chapter 90 money.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Do we start with the longest road first? We have to look at the ones that will maximize the Chapter 90 money and give the Town the biggest bang for the buck.

Ms. Evangelista- Peter has a booklet of what the requirements are in Chapter 90.

Mr. LaCortiglia- I want to plead to the audience that someone who has the desire to be appointed the CIP representative, please talk to Sarah, the Town Planner. If no one steps up, I will do it. The Capital Improvement Committee is so important. They look at everything out there. They also look at the long term debt.

### **Vouchers & Correspondence:**

Ms. Buck- You may take home the correspondence and pass along to other members if you don’t have time to read at tonight’s meeting.

Mr. Hoover- Jack Moultrie’s construction reviews are very comprehensive.

Mr. LaCortiglia/Ms. Evangelista- Requests from Ms. Buck the original emails and photos from Jack Moultrie be forwarded to them via email. I would just like to have them in color to reference we get them in our packet.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Motion to approve the vouchers for July 25, 2007 totaling \$6,132.50.

Ms. Evangelista- Second

All in favor? 3-0; Unam (2 absent – Mr. Carter and Mr. Howard)

### **Continued Public Hearings**

#### **Harmony Lane:**

Mr. Bob Grasso of Professional Land Services – This is a continuation of Harmony Lane Definitive Subdivision. I am here to address the required revisions by the Planning Board from the last meeting. We addressed the extension of Harmony Lane to meet the railroad bed. It added frontage to Lot 3 and we added a proposed utility easement to Lot 1. Georgetown Light wanted a light pole at Central Street and points to it’s location on the plan. It is at the turnaround at the T. The easement changed along Lots 1 and 3 to be a landscaping utility easement. It is 10ft for the

light pole. We added in the notes to include a snow fence for tree protection. We moved the proposed shrub line to be on Town property for the Park & Rec. Larry Graham reviewed the revised plans and faxed me another technical review report noted as D-5. I have not yet revised Larry's minor issues from his July 25<sup>th</sup> report. There are no design changes to the plan. Larry Graham's review is on file

Mr. Graham- We had 4 previous reports from October 2006 through July 17<sup>th</sup> which have all been addressed to our satisfaction. I am satisfied with the plans including the minor changes to be addressed by the applicant.

Ms. Buck- Reads her comments from a memo which are documented and on file. Let's take #1 off the plan referencing "Homeowners Association."

Mr. Grasso- When we discuss Courts and Lanes, I was under the impression that they are considered private roads. It is not our desire for the road to be private. It would be to everyone's benefit that it be accepted as a town road.

Ms. Buck- #2 – Sugar Maples - the way the easement reads you would have to replace the trees.

Mr. Hoover- You're correct Sarah. You can substitute all Maple trees to another species. Red Maples would be sufficient at the 30' spacing as listed on the plan as a street tree.

Mr. Geffin (landscape architect)- If you want to change to another, that is no problem. I have introduced a few Elms and Lindens as well.

Mr. Hoover- With this lane and linear planting, the branches of the Sugar Maple will come together and become a canopy. Just change them to another species to keep the process moving along.

Mr. LaCortiglia- As one member I would like to see them all on the plan with the mix you want. List them all on Sheet #9. {Applicant agrees to revise Sheet #9 and re-submit with plans }

Ms. Buck- Also #3 on list should say what kind of drive it will be (gravel or asphalt). {Ms. Buck is referring to the Park & Rec. land }

Mr. LaCortiglia- Is it a problem for it to be pavement?

Mr. Gatchell - We believe it should be gravel.

Ms. Buck- Can you label it on the plan?

Mr. Hoover- Is Park and Rec's decision on the drive the final decision?

Ms. Evangelista- The Selectmen has to grant the easement.

Mr. Hoover- If Park and Rec. makes the decision, the agreement has to be in writing.

Mr. Grasso- Con Com will also have input on whether it is pavement or gravel.

Ms. Buck- Legal Counsel said it is a two step process. The attorney suggested that waiting on that would be a delay.

Mr. Hoover- Please coordinate [Mr. Grasso] with Park and Rec. to understand what their desire is.

Ms. Buck- We should take off #5 (fire alarm boxes) as it is no longer required. I did not see #7 (tree planting easement) on the plan.

Mr. Grasso- It is shown on Lots 1 and 3.

Mr. Hoover- The note requiring the trees to be protected or replaced is on Sheet #9.

Ms. Buck- Last comment – Sight line easements- it's very non specific wording.

Mr. Grasso- All the easements will be deeded to the Town.

Ms. Buck- How do we know to reference that if it becomes a problem?

Mr. Graham- It's a triangle in a reverse way with Parcel A. The other is a drainage easement..

Public Comment?

Mr. Jim Dimento of The Park and Rec. Department- This land was donated to the town a couple of years ago. This parcel is a non-buildable area. It is a win for us. We have plans for a small playground. Con Com will make the call on pavement for the drive.

Mr. Hoover- I would say to keep it gravel.

Mr. Dimento- Con Com will probably require it to be gravel. I am looking for a hard base to last a long time.

Gatchell Applicant- You could use a processed gravel or recycled asphalt.

Mr. Graham- A ¾" bentpack finished with a 6"- 9" base could work.

{Board agrees with the recommendation}

Mr. LaCortiglia- I couldn't tell the species of trees on the Park and Rec. parcel.

Mr. Geffin- I am proposing Hemlock and Birch there and spaced a little further apart. It will give screening to the parking lot. This will all be on the Landscaping Plan.

Mr. Graham- Mr. Geffin should endorse the Sheet 9 plan.

Mr. Grasso- We will coordinate with Mr. Geffin and he will sign it when it is recorded.

Mr. Geffin- Tree placement – does it matter if they are staggered and used as a screening?

Mr. Hoover- That makes sense to me. Where would they be best placed to keep the screen in place?

Ms. Evangelista- I don't see how a tree could grow there on proposed Lot 1 and Town land with so many existing trees. Any young tree would have difficulty.

Mr. Grasso- There will be no old trees overshadowing the new planted trees.

Mr. Graham- This parcel was handed to the Park and Rec. for the Town. This is not a conservation area – it is a park.

Mr. Hoover- Who has control of the trees?

Mr. Geffin- If it's close to the border, the owner can prune a tree while not causing harm to the tree. I would rather place the trees where they will do best and look best.

{ Board agrees to review Mr. Geffin's placement and species of trees on the new plan }

Ms. Buck- Town Counsel said there are two parts to this decision. The Town is granting an easement to run their drainage across and the second step is to get the revised landscaping plan. My recommendation is per the Town Counsel. I think it takes a Town Meeting vote. There is no harm to the Town. It is much better to have an approved subdivision. If the Board desires, we will need plans by next Wednesday for an August 8<sup>th</sup> public hearing to review and add "Subject to Town Counsel approval."

Mr. LaCortiglia- Motion to continue Harmony Lane to Sept. 12, 2007.

Ms. Evangelista- Second

All in favor? 2-1(Mr. Hoover); 2 absent (Mr. Carter and Mr. Howard)

### **Twisdenwood Farm:**

Ben Osgood Jr. of New England Engineering Services representing Ben Bowden, the applicant/owner- I am here to give an update. At the last meeting we received a list of changes from Larry Graham. I have here the original plan at last meeting. Quick overview- we had quite a bit of fill in this area. Larry wanted to reduce the cover over the drainage. We have done some modifications. I just wanted to address the Board of where we are at. With the new design, we lowered the road down and have followed the existing grades. 235 is the existing grade. We have lowered the roadway down based on Larry's suggestions to reduce the amount of disturbance. We have moved the pond and made it shallower. We have added storm water management. We changed the cul-de-sac to a turnaround. The infiltrator roof runoff was added in two locations. We proposed a granite curbing from Baldpate Road into the first set of catch basins. Water will flow out into the wetlands. Maintenance easement for golf course was added with a driveway apron. There is a buffer screening of trees. We have not yet hired a landscape architect. We went over the issues with Larry Graham and Sarah Buck today. We will take care of all Larry's technical issues once we receive his final comments.

Mr. Graham- I agree and have 6 pages of review notes which are 90% complete. They have addressed half of what we had in the initial report. The two things to be discussed tonight are:

- 1) How the proposed easement at the end of the cul-de-sac is to be treated
- 2) Whether or not the reduction in the paved width beyond the first driveway be below the 18' width since the proposal is to dead-end this road to the T. We suggest a further extension and a modification of the way the drainage comes off the road – it needs to be

curved or graded on the side so the water is contained in the road so we can run it through the detention basin.

Mr. Osgood agrees to talk with the neighbor where the entrance faces the neighbor across the street.

Mr. Ben Osgood- Concerning the neighbor, Ben Bowden said he will plant screening trees for the neighbor across the street depending on what the neighbor desires. Ben will plant on town land or the neighbor's land. We are willing to work with the neighbor and deal with that issue.

Ms. Buck- It is nice to have the grading corrected and the detention basin on the rural side. The detention basin is very shallow.

Mr. Osgood- The bottom portion is designed to be a wet pond and designed for the cattails to be planted there. He points to the darker green as the wetland area on the plan. Every test we have done, the water table has been between 18" and 24" on this whole property.

Ms. Buck- The cul-de-sac was moved in case it gets connected at some future point. Larry mentions that easement and whether we should carry that 50' right of way to the edge of the property which is an excellent idea. We need guidance from the Board on whether we should narrow the road. So there is the question of leaving that easement.

Mr. Osgood points to the road in question. The first portion of the road at station 6 is a 18' width but narrows to a 14' width. It goes more towards being low impact with less pavement and as little impact as possible. On the left side of roadway, grass will be sloped.

Public Comment?

Nancy McCann (Attorney for the Frackletons/abutters) – I would like to know when will new plans be submitted so the abutters can review them?

Mr. Osgood- I would like to be back with new plans on September 12<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. McCann- Pavement width is 18'. We want to have input on the screening because of the curve of the road. Headlights will come directly into the rear of their home. Regarding golf course easement maintenance – fencing might be appropriate for the additional maintenance trucks that will be using this road. Do you intend to have a site walk with this project?

Mr. Hoover- Not for this project.

Ms. McCann- It would be helpful to see how the area will lay out and have it staked. Construction issues are hours of construction and whether heavy vehicles can use other roads. We are opposed for this to become a cut through street in the future. Granite curbing makes sense. We would like the opportunity to discuss the buffering issues.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Will the easement for the golf course be shown on the next plans?

Mr. Osgood- Yes. It has a drop dead date. It is also for maintenance only. They need a permit for maintenance from the ConCom. Any ground-disturbing work means the owner has to get a permit before the ConCom. It is technically wetlands there.

Mr. Graham- If it remains a golf course, he can use it. If there is major construction, he needs a permit from ConCom.

Mr. LaCortiglia- 18' width of pavement to be reduced- that requires a waiver, correct? What is the benefit to the town for granting this waiver?

Mr. Osgood- I propose an 18' wide road. It makes sense to reduce the width.

Ms. Buck- It minimizes environmental impact from the required 18' width that is typically required. You are only serving one house and the benefit the Town gets might be better served with less pavement and lesser environmental impact. It is not good planning to keep doing dead-end roads. It is here before the Board to decide whether to grant the waiver or not. We just need to give him some direction tonight.

Ms. Evangelista- It is so wet at that vicinity around the Faragi site (Baldpate Road). Would lowering the road help with the drainage? I wonder if this will help.

Mr. Osgood- The durability of a road long-term depends on building a proper base. This design specifies all the proper materials. It would be built to a standard that prevents breaking and settling. Pavement shouldn't need to be replaced for 20 years. This design meets the Town's specifications.

Ms. Evangelista- My concern is that you are only putting in one drain and the volume of water that will pass through your sub-base to get to the drain.

Mr. Osgood- We have an extensive system to manage the water. We are taking 5 acres for the project and 14 acres will be left. The other major issue is we are saying the road should dead-end here. We are not here asking to extend the road. Just because the easement is there, it does not mean it will ever be extended. We discussed with Larry that there should be a condition stating, "The roadway should not be extended without approval from the Board." It is controlled by the Planning Board. There should be some provision so that people have the ability to come in at a later date and request to extend the road.

Mr. Hoover- I have a general comment – You can not assume that the Board will approve the plan after meeting with the technical adviser and Town Planner. Regarding the extended easement, I agree that it is good planning and in the Town's best interest. As far as the detention basin, perhaps the landscape architect can look into a rain garden there to help with the storm water management. Narrowing the road makes sense. If this is 18' for 2 lots, it will never be a major pass through, correct?

Mr. Larry Graham- Correct. As soon it is more than two lots, than the regulation says it becomes 24' in width.

Mr. Hoover- Why would you not make the whole road narrower than the 18'?

Mr. Graham- As a consideration, it could be a narrower road. They need to do something to hold the drainage in the road. They can change the grading to get the right slope in the road or they can curb it or reduce the road by 2'. There is curbing proposed where the abutters are concerned about drainage.



Mr. Hoover- It is important for you to work with the abutters on the plantings. I would agree to have a landscape architect talk to them about the type of plantings.

Mr. Osgood-Regarding the idea of an arborvite funnel - we are thinking a green hedge would be better. We don't want something that will grow out into the street.

Mr. Hoover- If the abutter is in agreement to putting plants on their property, you could do the buffering that looks natural and like it's always been there which you could talk to them about. I would suggest that you not increase the fill and sculpt the grading.

Mr. Osgood- You have a bylaw that says you can only build 35' above the existing ground.

Mr. Hoover- The septic - why can't you sculpt it in some places. When you raise the house, you have to keep it 35' at existing grade. Do not push out all the contours from the septic. What is the L driveway? Is it tying into the road?

Mr. Graham- It doesn't tie into the road. They can do with it what they want. My recommendation is that there be some language on the plan and in the decision that says, "the proposed utilities easement may at the Town of Georgetown's Planning Board's sole option or discretion be expanded for use as an extension of Twisdenwood Court on as an emergency access way or for any other reason for which private or public ways are used."

Ms. McCann- Wouldn't that be the case anyway? The Town of Georgetown would hold the easement. Our concern is if you put an easement like that on the plan, the Town is prepared for a cut through. We are opposed to that. When put on a plan, you are saying that the Town is preparing for the possibility for a connection.

Ms. Buck- The worry is a cut through and additional traffic. The chances are that Andover Street will always be faster. If there are 5 homes there some day, it relieves the burden. To include this, you can facilitate the ease of exiting by those that live there. I agree it is good planning.

Ms. McCann- If you don't put it on the plan, it makes it that much harder.

Mr. Osgood- I probably will have a letter from the landscape architect for the September meeting.

Mr. Hoover- I strongly urge you to have a landscape architect submit a plan. Less is more for the driveway which is in the best interest of the town.

Ms. Evangelista- I disagree. I can only tell you to make your own opinion when you drive down the road completely. Go down Baldpate Road all the way from Andover Street to Nelson Street.

Mr. Hoover- It is unfair to compare construction and expect that it will be exactly the same with this project.

Mr. LaCortiglia- If it is a public road, then I would say it should follow the minimum standards in the regulations.

Mr. Osgood- I have been in front of too many Boards. We want to design in compliance with the regulations.

Mr. LaCortiglia- If you bring a full fledged plan with no waivers, then we can not deny the plan.

Ms. Buck- It seems a shame that the land may look artificial. If the Board wants to go back to a “No waiver plan”, then we can back to that plan. I believe the Board would prefer to go with the plan tonight that will require waivers and in turn provide more benefit to the town.

Mr. Osgood- After tonight, my conclusion is that the road will stay 18’ and have curbing.

Mr. Hoover- I suggest that you consider the recommendations of the technical review agent and the town planner that have been doing this for such a long time. They are saying that this is in the best interest of the Town. There are also two Board members missing.

Mr. LaCortiglia- I motion to continue the Public Hearing for Twisdenwood Farm to Sept. 12, 2007.

Ms. Evangelista- Second

All in favor? 3-0, Unam; 2 absent (Mr. Carter and Mr. Howard)

### **Stone Row – request for continuance to 8/8/07**

Ms. Buck- The Applicant has asked for a continuance to August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

{ Discussion between the Board and the applicant regarding conservation restriction and getting the homeowners agreement covenant }

Mr. LaCortiglia- Motion to continue the Public Hearing for Stone Row to August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

Ms. Buck- They wanted to go to ConCom on 7-26-07 first before their Public Hearing.

Ms. Evangelista- Second

All in favor? 3-0, Unam; 2 absent (Mr. Carter and Mr. Howard)

Mr. LaCortiglia- I move to allow the extension of time for Stone Row to Sept. 30<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

Ms. Evangelista- Second

All in favor? 3-0, Unam; 2 absent (Mr. Carter and Mr. Howard)

## **Executive Session**

{Executive Session minutes to be filed in a confidential file in the planning office}

Ms. Evangelista- Motion to go into Executive Session and will not be returning to Planning Board Meeting.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Second

All in favor? 3-0, Unam

Roll call:

Mr. LaCortiglia- Aye

Ms. Evangelista- Aye

Mr. Hoover- Aye

Ms. Buck reads the proposed letter to be sent to Joel Bard, Attorney of Kopelman & Paige – paragraph 2 dated 7-25-07. {Letter on file in Planning Office}

Mr. Hoover- The only comment would be to change “expect” to “require completion.”

Ms. Evangelista- Did you follow up with Zoning if they followed up with them?

Ms. Buck- No

Ms. Buck- Agrees to send letter to the attorney.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Motion to request Sarah to send letter with corrections.

Ms. Evangelista- Second

All in favor? 3-0, Unam; 2 absent (Mr. Carter and Mr. Howard)

Mr. Hoover- Meeting adjourned at 10:05PM