

**MEETING  
GEORGETOWN PLANNING BOARD  
Public Safety Building  
May 8, 2002  
7:30PM**

**Present:** Peter Sarno, Chairman; Christopher Hopkins, Vice-Chairman;  
Alex Evangelista; Jack Moultrie, Clerk, Dan Kostura,  
Tim Gerraughty, Alternate Member, Larry Graham,  
Planning Board Technical Review Agent & Inspector  
Kathleen Bradley Colwell, Town Planner;  
Janet Pantano, Administrative Assistant (8:30PM)

**Absent:**

Meeting called to order at 7:30 p.m.

**Form A – Prospect Street**

Mr. Angelopolis, 11 Prospect Street stated that they are planning to purchase property behind their house owned by 55 West Main Street.

Ms. Colwell stated that both landowners have signed the application.

Mrs. Angelopolis stated that they are adding the land to make a bigger yard.

Mr. Evangelista made a motion to approve the Form A on Prospect Street.  
Second by Mr. Moultrie. All in favor 5-0.

Board signed the plans.

**Pillsbury Pond – set bond/release lots**

Mr. Moultrie stated that no inspections have been called for since he started as subdivision inspector.

Mr. Sarno stated that the board generally requires a 1.5% contingency on top of the estimated cost of completion. Board reviewed the estimated cost as revised by Larry Graham and set the bond at \$1,056,951 as the total bond amount.

Mr. Kostura made a motion to set the Bond for Pillsbury Pond at \$1,057,000; this would round off the total bond amount required in the tri-partite agreement.  
Second by Mr. Hopkins. All in favor 5-0.

Lot release for lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on Ilene Circle and 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29A on Pillsbury Lane. These lots all have pavement in front of them.

Mr. Evangelista made a motion to release the lots upon the posting of the bond. Second by Mr. Hopkins. All in favor 5-0.

Board signed the FORM K partial release of covenants and the tripartite agreement. Mr. Rhuda stated that the bank would come to the planning board office to sign the tripartite agreement.

### **Crescent Meadow Lane**

Mr. Evangelista excused himself from the discussion due to a potential conflict of interest.

Discussion of subdivision plans and covenants. Town Counsel has not yet reviewed covenant. Decision requires a covenant be in place prior to the endorsement of the plan.

Mr. Sarno stated that work would not be allowed to occur until a site inspection so that may be enough to prevent construction.

Mr. Hopkins stated that he was concerned that these legal documents create the town's first lane. He is concerned that it should have town counsel approval.

Mr. Hopkins asked if the could be conditional endorsement

Ms. Colwell stated that once it is signed it would be recorded.

Mr. Moultrie asked if property could be transferred.

Mr. O'Neil stated that they would not have an issue with putting some protection on the lot.

Discussion of endorsing plan without having the covenant finalized.

Mr. Sarno stated that he would like to see a quick turn around from Kopelman & Paige. This could be a lengthy process if there are issues with the language.

Mr. Sarno asked for a motion to endorse plan? No motion

Mr. Moultrie made a motion to submit covenant to Kopelman & Paige. Second by Mr. Hopkins. All in favor 5-0.

Mr. Sarno requests comments from Kopelman & Paige at the next meeting.

### **Nelson Street – ISH/One-lot Subdivision**

Mr. Sarno stated that the Board is continuing the hearing on the proposed one lot subdivision and ISH off of Nelson Street. Board took a site walk. Some revisions have occurred to the plan and the developer met with the neighbors with a revised plan. He asked the developer to update the Board on any revisions to the plan. No revised plans have been received or reviewed by the Board or staff.

Mr. Phil Christiansen, Christainsan and Sergi, Haverhill, engineer for the developer had two sets of plans, one for the ISH and one for a one-lot subdivision. He stated that they would do the ISH first.

Showed originally submitted plan with 24 units. The developer reviewed Larry Graham's comments, listened to board and neighbors and have revised plan. The new plan was shown to the neighbors on April 29, 2002. The new plan has a revised road layout and building placement. Contains 24 units.

Existing homes shown on plan from aerial photos. Gouvain and Mazzotta homes shown on the plan. The plans shows a road 800 feet long with 26' wide pavement, the pavement in the loop in the road is 22' wide, sidewalks added in front of units, added parking spaces throughout for a total of 15 additional spaces. Moved units away from existing homes.

Second revised plan changed the configuration to two unit buildings beyond the Mazzotta property line. Road moved away from Mazzotta towards Gouvain. Overall extent of development is restricted to a small section of the land.

Mr. Graham stated that drainage would come later and assumed that there would be recharge of water onto site. Asked where low point is.

Mr. Christiansen stated that ultimately everything will be recharged, road will have more traditional drainage. There isn't any discharge point from the property so it will be recharged into the ground.

Question as to what is recharge? Mr. Graham stated that he suspects that the developer will be handling their stormwater management through recharging. He didn't see any overflow area.

Mr. Sarno stated that the hope is to keep drainage on site. Mr. Graham stated that there is no place to put the drainage on site.

Mr. Moultrie asked the permeability rate. Mr. Christiansen stated 2 minutes per inch. It is all sand and gravel water. They hit water at 8' to 12' depending on the location.

Mr. Sarno asked if there was any new information concerning the traffic impacts. Mr. Christiansen stated that no new information has been submitted as their traffic engineer has been ill.

Mr. Evangelista asked if there was any plan to buffer Mazzotta land? Mr. Christiansen stated that they plan to provide buffer. It will be landscaped and that will be included in the final plans submitted to the Board for review.

Mr. Sarno asked for an update on the Open Space. Mr. Christiansen stated that it is approximately the same however there may be additional land added from the one-lot subdivision. The one-lot subdivision was the required to have 160,000 SF (2 times the required area) however concerns were raised that a second lot could be created on the road. If the lot were reduce to 80,000 square feet they could add the extra 80,000 to the open space. This would require a waiver from the Planning Board.

Mr. Sarno asked without the additional area what is the percentage? Mr. Christiansen stated that there are 15 acres total with 8 acres of open space. With additional the 80,000 it would add approximately 2 acres of land for a total of 10 acres.

Howard Speicher attorney and Dave O'Sullivan architect for the developer were also present.

Pat Claydon 47 Central Street asked a question about recharge of the stormwater.

Mr. Sarno stated that this is a preliminary plan and that drainage plan will be developed and reviewed by town's consulting engineer for review.

Mr. Graham stated that he thinks that they will probably design detention basins, which will allow the water to drain into the ground or have subsurface drainage system under the ground. Structure will have voids in the stone so that stormwater can be routed to the ground. He will be concerned that basins are properly sized and where the ultimate overflow will go.

Myron Dubina stated that perimeter drains are required by the building code to take away water from the foundations.

Ms. Claydon asked if they could overflow over the railroad tracks. Mr. Graham stated that they can overflow the same amount of water that is overflow now. They cannot increase the flow going off site.

Mr. Hilemann, 23 Nelson Street questioned the impact on the character of Nelson Street. Nelson Street is designed as a scenic road. It is something is

special and should be preserved. Project will double the population on street. It is adjacent to Camp Denison. What impact will this have on the recreational purposes for the camp and the road. The project will change the character of the street.

Bob Morehouse Camp Denison Committee, stated that the committee is interested in the piece at the end of the property as it abuts an old camp ground. He asked the Board to negotiate that as a gift to the town if possible. That piece of land would connect Camp Denison to the old railroad bed which will hopefully be part of larger trail system in the future. The Committee tried to negotiate with the former owner but got no response and have been working on this for a long time.

Mr. Brit Macoy, 239 Central Street expressed concern about safety and traffic at the corner of Nelson and Central. He asked the Board to balance required road improvement with the historic integrity of the street. He does not want traffic lights there but is concerned about the increase in traffic.

Mr. Sarno stated that the Board has asked for a traffic study.

Ms. Phillips, 29 Nelson Street stated that if the traffic study were to be done it should be done during school times as this would make a difference on the amount of traffic from parents picking up children at school.

Mr. Morehouse stated that he has been on boards in town for years and all land in Georgetown is open to be built unless it is bought by the town. He stated that he is in favor of senior housing. He stated that if senior housing were not built then single-family homes in would be developed.

Mr. Sarno explained that they have a proposed ISH now and this is a special permit. He stated that with the ISH the town receives open space and a cluster type of development for over 55. He stated the other option would be standard subdivision and at this site they would be 2-acre lots. He stated that they have to decide what is the lesser evil.

Ms. Phillips stated that the homeowners had the impression that only homes could be built on this lot.

Pam Millett 23 Nelson stated that she lives next to the proposed driveway and is concerned about 24 cars in and out. She is concerned that she would hear the traffic out her window. She stated that you now have to be careful of cars. She stated that it is a lovely road now and would not like to see it change. She stated that the development changes her house and hopes the board would not vote for this project.

David O'Sullivan stated that the lights from cars on the road would be low so they would not shine in the abutters' window and they have tried to address the location of the driveway.

Maria Gauvain 22 Nelson Street stated that she appreciates changes made but this is a scenic route with only custom built homes and antique homes. She stated that within 2 miles of street there are no developments only individual homes. She stated that the developer stated at the meeting that each unit would be 80ft long and her home is 56ft, this is very large. She stated that now the street is beautiful. She stated that when the town voted for this road to be a scenic road if they intended this type of building.

Mr. Speicher stated that the developers have been conscience of the road being a scenic road and that you would not be able to see the units from the road. He stated that the units are set back 500ft from the road. He stated that big buildings would not confront you. He stated that they have enough land to work with and the only thing at Nelson Street is the entrance. He stated that you can not look at this in a vacuum but look at what could be built. He stated that maybe with just a few homes the entrance would be the same but the development would be closer to the street and would not have any open space. He stated that the issue for all Towns around is preservation of open space. He stated that with cluster style homes you are enabled to preserve open space. He stated that with a development for 55 and older there are no children and only two bedrooms per unit. He stated that you do not have the larger number of car trips per day. He stated that they do not have the traffic report yet, but the traffic engineers have figures that show this would have significantly lower car traffic then a conventional subdivision.

Ms. Guavain stated that she has been aware that this land would be built on but she stated that she did not expect a condominium style but conventional homes. She stated that when they bought their land they were told there would be development but not this type. She stated that no one told them there were any restrictions for them to built their home and would never do this to someone else but they never wanted this.

Mr. Speicher stated that they plan to show that this is a better use of the land.

Ms. Gauvain stated that she has a letter for the board and asked for it to be put in the record.

Mr. O'Sullivan stated that most new homes are 65ft and on this they are 80ft long but for two units. He stated that this plan is smaller than it could be and they have fit the units better to the land with the cluster homes and are trying to be sensitive to the land.

Joan Wolf 64 Nelson Street stated that she had septic concerns. She stated that there is a lot of ledge and they would have to do blasting and the soil is like clay. She stated that the septic system looks small for that many units.

Mr. O'Sullivan stated that the soils on top are different than on the bottom and there is deep sand on bottom with soil between the ledge. He stated that there is dense soil where they would be putting the septic system. He stated that with an ISH there is a difference than what is needed for a regular home.

Ms. Wolf stated that they are close to wetlands.

Mr. Christianson stated that they have been to the ConsCom and they have determined the wetlands.

Mr. O'Sullivan stated that they could put 6 homes on this site.

Ms. Gauvain asked if the units would be visible from Central Street.

Mr. Christianson stated that Nunan's would be the abutter on Central Street.

Mr. Gauvain asked about the water level.

Mr. Christianson talked about the water table.

Mr. Sarno stated that they do not want to go into specifics at this time. He stated that when the developer comes back with drainage and septic plan and then the plans would go to the boards and the board's engineer. Then the board would review the plan with more tangible information. He stated that after the site walk they noted the lack of a buffer at the entrance and the developer has come back with changes. He stated that the board does not want to get into drainage at this time.

Mr. Gauvain stated that this would be an impact on the character of the street. He stated that the ISH would be an increase of 100% to the area and with the six homes only a 25% increase to the street.

Ms. Gauvain stated that they were shown a plan that had 6 homes that would be built on this property.

Mr. Sarno stated that the plans were not approved plans.

Ted Mazzotta 18 Nelson Street stated that he appreciates what the engineers have done but that they are still concerned with privacy. He stated that they still have a straight shot to three units and lighting is a concern. He stated that the street is now is very dark. He stated that Central Street is very bright.

Mr. O'Sullivan stated that they would not be putting an excess of lighting only what is required.

Mr. Sarno stated that there are no strict rules on lighting because of the ISH. He stated that he thinks some developments are too dark. He reminded that they are not talking elderly residents here only 55 and older.

Mr. Mazzotta asked what size trees would they put in.

Mr. Christianson stated that they would do a landscaping plan.

Mr. Sarno stated that the board dictates what would be put in. He stated that buffers are standard in subdivision.

Mr. Mazzotta asked on whose property would the buffer go on.

Mr. Sarno stated the buffer would be on their lot.

Mr. Hopkins stated that if the senior housing is not built then they would not have a buffer and they would have homes in their yards.

Mr. Sarno stated that they are at the stage now to see a substantial plan that our engineer could review.

Ms. Colwell stated that they could withdraw and submit a new full packet.

Mr. Speicher stated that he does not see the point of withdrawing and would like to go forward.

Mr. Sarno stated that this is a special permit and it does require a majority vote. He stated that Mr. Graham needs 3 weeks to review and they need a week and the developer needs a month. He stated that they could meet in August.

Mr. Dubina stated that he would like to return at the July 17, 2002 meeting.

Discussion on when to extended decision date.

Mr. Evangelista made a motion to extend the decision date on the ISH on Nelson Street to September 27, 2002. Second by Mr. Hopkins. All in favor 5-0.

Mr. Sarno stated that they have a report from Mr. Graham on the one-lot subdivision Diane Way.

Mr. Graham stated that he has not had any feedback from the developer and that they did not show drainage. He stated that he does suggest a route to connect



water line to the ISH through the one-lot subdivision. He stated that site distance was an issue.

Mr. Sarno asked why he wants to join the water line.

Mr. Graham stated that with two routes if there are any problems then they could use the other and it would help with the water flow.

Mr. Christianson stated that to loop the water line they would have some concerns and they would have to cut more trees. He stated that it is less expensive to not loop.

Mr. Hopkins stated that he feels the board can not comment on this as of yet because they do not have full plans and these plans are connected if the ISH does not happen this would not happen.

Mr. Sarno stated that they could not cross the railroad bed.

Mr. Christianson stated that the cost and construction would be more involved if looped.

Mr. Moultrie stated that they should loop the water line.

Mr. Graham explained how water line could be looped and that area would be in the jurisdiction of the ConsCom. He stated that the route would be a benefit to the ISH. He stated that they should have comments from the Water and Fire Departments.

Mr. Hopkins asked if they want to vote on this plan or go to the definitive stage.

Mr. Evangelista asked about making the unit behind the Mazzotta's a two-unit and the unit across a three-unit and has the road come in on the other side.

Mr. Christianson stated that he would look at this.

Mr. Sarno stated the board could make a motion on the preliminary or they could withdrawn and submit a definitive plan.

Mr. Moultrie made a motion to deny the Preliminary Plan for Diane Way. Second by Mr. Kostura. All in favor 5-0.

Mr. Evangelista made a motion for the ISH on Nelson Street to return July 17, 2002 at 8PM. Second by Mr. Kostura. All in favor 5-0.

Mr. Ogden asked the process for getting plans to Mr. Graham.

Mr. Sarno stated go through chairman.

Mr. Evangelista made a motion for a 5-minute recess. Second by Mr. Hopkins.  
All in favor 5-0.

### **Board Business**

Discussion on the Personal Board meeting and raise in level and pay for Ms. Pantano.

Mr. Moultrie made a motion to raise Ms. Pantano's hourly salary to \$12.85.  
Second by Mr. Evangelista. All in favor 5-0.

### **Fuller Court**

Mr. Graham stated no problems with changes from the ConsCom but the drywells would have to increase.

### **Georgetown Savings Bank**

Mr. Graham stated that he has looked at the plans and he used the passenger turning template and where they extended the drive through they have reduced the driveway. He stated that they cut easterly from 20 ft to 14ft.

Mr. Moultrie stated that what was submitted to Mass Highway could not be changed without going back to Mass Highway.

Mr. Graham stated he would suggest they reduce parking spaces and keep the width of the driveway.

Ms. Colwell stated that this is starting out again with different people involved and them not talking to each other and all not knowing what is going on.

### **Cuffee Doles**

Mr. Graham stated that he had a call from Mr. Archer and they are starting drainage and he went out and they have not started yet. He stated that he would do the inspections on this site for the board if they want him too.

Board stated that they feel he should do the inspections on Cuffee Doles as the drainage was a major concern.

Mr. Moultrie asked if Mr. Graham was ok with Title 5 on this site.

Mr. Graham stated that he is satisfied with what they have done and it would not conflict with drainage.

### **201 Central Street**

Mr. Sarno stated that they have a request from Mr. Morrow on 201 Central Street regarding reducing the number of no parking signs.

Ms. Colwell stated she thought they would not want all the signs as shown on plan.

Mr. Moultrie stated he has concerns for in the winter if fire lanes are marked on the ground and are snow covered.

Ms. Colwell stated they are asking to eliminate some of the no parking fire signs and paint on curb.

Mr. Graham stated that he would suggest to leave all three on side by unit 10 and also to leave one by unit 11 and handicap parking.

Mr. Evangelista made a motion to leave these four and eliminate the others. Second by Moultrie. All in favor 5-0.

### **Littles Hill**

Ms. Colwell stated that Mr. Spear left a check and sent plan for Lot 31 to Mr. Graham to review. She stated that he is looking for the lot to be released from the covenant but not given an occupancy permit. She stated that the road is only paved part way in front of home. She stated that Mr. Brett has no problem with this.

Mr. Kostura stated that if the lot is under the ConsCom may not be able to release.

Ms. Colwell stated that they would release now and no occupancy permit would be issued until the binder coat is put down.

Mr. Sarno stated he would release but would not allow a building permit.

Mr. Hopkins stated wait until Mr. Spear presents to board then make a decision.

### **Littles Hill/Soccer field**

Mr. Moultrie stated that he pulled up some documents on the field and there is no no-cut on this. He stated that after Mr. Graham reviewed a stockade fence was approved for along his property. He stated that he did not see any conditions on landscaping.

Ms. Colwell stated that Mr. Spear is willing to do some landscaping. He asked that board look at the site.

Mr. Sarno stated that Mr. Spear has offered to do improvements.

Mr. Hopkins stated that it was at the beginning of the process on Littles Hill that the soccer field was proposed and he does not understand how abutter was unaware of field.

### **Inspection Services**

Mr. Moultrie stated that he met with Georgetown Savings Bank representative, the Police Chief and the demolition contractor about setting up jersey barriers and a chain link fence on the sidewalk for pedestrian traffic around the site.

### **Pillsbury Pond**

Mr. Moultrie stated that there was some dissention with the homeowner on the corner of Pillsbury and East Main Street. He stated that he does not want the wall proposed but wants a stone wall and would have to give an easement to the Town. He stated that the abutter is willing to grant the easement.

Mr. Moultrie stated that the light company has moved the poles back on East Main Street by the entrance and they are waiting for Verizon and Cable TV to move their lines.

### **RFP and Planner Position**

Ms. Colwell stated that the ad for the Inspector would be in the paper this week. She stated that they received one resume for the Planner position and asked if they should send a letter that they received the resume and when the interviews would be.

Mr. Sarno stated to send a letter and state interviews would be in June.

Mr. Gerraughty asked about West Newbury Planner position and if they had much of a response.

Mr. Evangelista stated that he talked to them and that they may consider sharing a planner but would not be held to a joint person. He stated that if we find someone and they want to go together we could. He stated that they want to know how we felt.

Mr. Sarno stated that the board would not be making a decision until June at the earliest.

Mr. Kostura stated go forward and if someone comes forward and is interested in a joint position then get together.

Discussion on joint planner.

Board discussed adding a line to the ad that they would consider planners from other communities.

### **Warrant Article**

Ms. Colwell stated that they received last minute changes from Kopelman & Paige on the earth removal bylaw. She stated that there was not a lot to change but in the bylaw they do not define transit so they suggest leaving as just earth removal. She stated that Robin Leal has to print warrant by May 10 and needs the changes asap.

Mr. Kostura asked why they did not give a definition of transit.

Mr. Hopkins stated to make this earth removal /importation.

Ms. Colwell stated also issue of septic systems being exempt.

Mr. Moultrie stated that they should be exempt because if the system were too large then they would go to the DEP.

Ms. Colwell stated take out 49-c.

Mr. Kostura stated the applicant must request an extension.

Ms. Colwell stated that she would make adjustments.

### **Minutes**

Mr. Moultrie made a motion to approve the minutes of April 24, 2002 as amended. Second by Evangelista. All in favor 5-0.

Mr. Moultrie made a motion to approve the executive session minutes of April 24, 2002. Second by Evangelista. All in favor 5-0.

### **Vouchers/Office Supplies**

- Return filing fee Georgetown Savings Bank-----\$1,000.00
- American Speedy-----10 ZBL's-----\$105.24
- Netway-----May-----\$19.95
- Massachusetts Municipal Association-----Planner Position ad-----\$140.00

### **Payroll**

Georgetown Planning Board  
May 8, 2002

Kathleen Bradley Colwell-----\$886.96  
Janet Pantano-----\$347.57

Mr. Moultrie made a motion to pay. Second by Mr. Hopkins. All in favor 5-0.

Mr. Moultrie made a motion to adjourn. Second by Mr. Kostura. All in favor 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45PM.

Minutes transcribed by J. Pantano

Minutes accepted as amended May 22, 2002.