

March 1, 2005

PRESENT: Alan DeToma, Karyl Spiller-Walsh; Matthew Hayes; Dan Hooper

ABSENT WITH NOTICE: Eric Alexander

ALSO PRESENT: Mark Louro, Gino Carlucci, Susan Affleck-Childs

Meeting called to order at 7:38

Public Hearing – Sign Design Guidelines

Gary Jacob as Chairman of the DRC – a few minor edits – one of the things we have been working on is design guidelines to go along with the new sign bylaw – these are suggestions on what we would like to see in terms of signs – persuasion – we have found that many people really don't think out their signs – local folks generally like our suggestions – we want to be able to have this to give to folks even before they come in for a permit – we can also use this and point to this if they haven't reviewed – suggestions – we have tried to deal with the various categories that might be viewed as critical – key issue is relationship to the neighborhood – we think we have covered many of the general criteria – but these are things that someone new would not necessarily think of

Dan – I think it is excellent – especially for the local smaller business establishments – do it right one time – good for the town, we are playing a part - DRC is playing a vital role in as much as a citizen sense and a design sense. You brought up one of my questions – what venue for distribution would you suggest?

Gary – they could be available in town hall – give out to new businesses – should be available with the sign permit package – third area would be to put some stuff on the web for the DRC – download as appropriate –

Matt – general question, how does this relate to the general zoning bylaw –

Gary – we tried to make it so that it would complement it – good design – the zoning bylaw could be changed without affecting this –

Matt – question on F 3 – 70% matter.

Dan – I have a few comments of an editorial nature only

Alan – general comment – K2 – what if there appears to be something that may be in conflict

Gary – an additional sentence in the beginning about compatibility with sign bylaw and how that takes precedence –

Matt – question on L 2 – re neon

Matt – R4 – delete first “and”

Karyl – B3 – compatible vs. complementary

Susy – graphic illustrations could be added

Karyl – this is general but yet it give some feeling

Dan – it conveys an interest by the town in sign design – short of it, you have this staid bylaw with no flavor and no concern or consideration for the touchy feely – this says there are people who have a collective interest in how things look and we are here to help

Paul Yorkis – I have a whole bunch of comments – I would first like to propose that your introductory paragraph be removed as it talks about CONTROL – these are guidelines and the bylaw is the controlling feature – I would like to emphasize that these are meant as guidelines vs. controls – the spirit of the DRC is advisory and I would hope that the introductory paragraph reflect the advisory nature of it

Dan – you have echoed my concern

Paul A – A-3 – strike s at end; concern about “professionally” designed signs being – I would take that out – you can't require that

Karyl – after being on the DRC for 1 ½ years – we have had lots of instances of novice sign designs that are non inexpensive – we have found it is hard to go back with those people and we have recommended that they go back and get professional design

Alan – I would suggest – Professionally

Chan – There is no recognition for professional sign designers - - Please explain what your agenda is – I came here expecting a public hearing on rules and regs

Chan – the document lacks any relationship to anything – it should have some statement in the preamble – where it fits into the PB process –

Dan – some reference to sign bylaw –

Paul – C2 – seems inconsistent with focus of the AUOD – this seems to be in conflict – good job with AUOD – we need to be sensitive to that district and its mixed use nature –

Alan – sensitivity to residential uses

Gary – you could have a sign that met the bylaw but shined into a neighbors bedroom

Dave – any suggestions you can give people on resources –

Gary – A beginner’s guide to sign design

Karyl – when there is a willing applicant and a professional sign design

Dan – convey our thanks to the rest of the committee –

Jim Wieler – I would like to reemphasize some of paul’s points – this is excellent – alan picked up on something on F3 -

Continue to first meeting in April – REVISE and republish

Chan – as a total outsider coming into the meeting, what is the relationship of these design guidelines to the DRC and what does the PB have to do with this.

Dan – the DRC is appointed by the PB – to stamp an official adoption

Susy – bylaw that created the DRC authorized est of design guidelines to be adopted by PB for use b the DRC

Public Hearing – Subdivision Rules and Regulations

Dan – I think we take this best that we not take this quite so editorally – lets get those to Susy Affleck-Childs

Dave D’amico – Landscaped islands in the middle of our cul de sacs - - the new regulations require landscaped islands – I don’t think there is any differentiation on length of cul de sacs –

7.9.6 – if we were going to have them, I think what you have is the best of what I would hope for – reduced size - . . . but, I don’t really like the idea at all and want to scratch – we do the plowing in town and hire contractors – some of my comments are related to that position and as a taxpayer – from DPS perspective – anytime you do anything to disrupt the conituity ofpavemnt – you induce a problem that will lead to cracking, etc. that will need maintenance – the island being in the middle will create a problem for the paving around it –

alan – how would the island differ

dave – you are adding linear length of curbing which is going to cause maintenance problems as opposed to just straight paving – there is a difference, don’t sit there and think that it is maintenance free – it is extra when you have the island – from a plowing perspective it is just one more thing in the way – normally we just push down the center – this whole thing creates another way of having to do business s- more complex – it wont lend itself as nic ely to where we put snow – some problems with plowing – in the course of plowing, lielihood of damage to equipment –

dan – from a dps perspective, is there actually more time spent? I would think an island eliminates some square footage from having to be plowed. Does an island make for a longer effort than would be –

dave – I would say yes, but probably just minutes – not significantly -

dan - I should hop in the truck with you guys some time – Jimmie Smith – to see what the problem is – definitely take more time

dave – taxpayer perspective – as I sit and thought about it more, why do we want these – what is the purpose – it would imagine is the aesthetics – they have no functional purpose beyond that – perhaps it could be used for infiltration area (alternative not a standard) if we are just looking at aesthetics – not a bad thing – think about every town or place you have been that you like – main drags vs. neighborhood streets – we are asking taxpayers to spend extra money to benefit individual neighborhoods – if you want to make a developer put money into a tree fund for the benefit of the whole town, that's great – I don't see spending a penny for individual issues

alan – what additional costs other than snowplowing

dave – curbing interfaces – cracks – water, and maintain the island

alan – some potential maintenance issues?

Dave – how many phone calls am I going to get regarding maintenance of these – why do you want to do this? I like to play street hockey

Chan – who is going to maintain them? I think it is unacceptable from a public works point of view to have a landscaped island in the middle of a cul de sac

Paul – I understand the aesthetic value in the landscaped island - I also understand from my current residence – a large expanse in a cul de sac gets used as a playground and that use for most of the year has significant community value as well – the people on Diane and Kimberlee drive bring down portable street hockey nets and set them up – and I think that is a good use of a street and what is interesting is that it is families – and that has value – I can't

Gary – I live in a neighborhood with Antioch experience – I think we have 5 cul de sacs and everyone has an island in it – none of them are landscaped in a fancy fashion – some are mowed, some just have a couple of big pines – some are maintained by individual – better or worse for community values ?? – massive amount of pavement to me is very deadening – based on a concept of suburbia from the 50s – from the aesthetics, one of the things I have been trying to do is increase the aesthetic content whenever the town will ultimately be owning – from taxpayers paying for other people's cul de sacs – I think it is a community thing and not just for the neighborhood – I was in a southern city without snow issues, the cul de sacs were so pleasant – infiltration, less runoff/impervious surface, shade – just because it is not enjoyed by everybody in town doesn't mean there isn't value –

Rick merrikiin – 35 years experience, - they tend to be a real maintenance issue –

Dan – is it your experience that the curbing maintenance is a matter of type of curbing – asphalt vs. granite - is one better

Rick – bituminous gets beat up, with granite, the plows get beat up – sloped granite are small pieces - if the pavement is your concern, why don't you consider a smaller asphalt diameter for the cul de sac, because when people use the islands, they make them bigger so they can have a full circle – you are going from wider roads, - why don't you consider making the cul de sac a paved area, as small as possible

Alan – just make them grassed areas where the kids can play

Dan- from an aesthetic standpoint I do like them plus the impervious – the tough side is the plowing issue for short and long term maintenance – we aren't staffed to handle what we have now – this is a very real matter for sustainability – I am torn

Mark – what if you didn't make it a requirement but made it an option?

Dan – we are going to have to talk about this some more – we will have to come to the table to vote

Dave – perimeter drains

Mark – issue is whose jurisdiction – there are several subdivisions because of the poor soils, they put in a perimeter drain around the foundation -

Dan – that is a matter for the building inspector

Mark – so you have a perimeter drain that is required by the building inspector – where the soils are poor, we thought they could tie into the drainage system – we get involved cause we need to inspect the roadway for acceptance and there are pipes coming into the system – once you start to release lots – building inspector is aware of them but we aren't necessarily – link to town's drainage system – so there are minimums you need to have in place to protect the town –

Alan – there are methods used in commercial construction where you diaper a building to prevent water issues – if you can't raise the building elevation you do something – so I think it would be prudent to focus on it as an issue so we deal with it properly

Dan – buildings are not our purview – but there are implications

Paul – there is a really simple solution – you cannot connect a perimeter drain without a backflow – I would recommend that you put in place a process that says when the best approach is to tie the perimeter drain into the storm drainage system, then it be done thru a notification so that the PB engineer is notified in advance, and is inspected and that it be included in the as-built plans – and set the requirement for the check valves

Mark – and easements would be provided to the town

Dave – I would argue to not give the town an easement

Paul 0 home owners responsibilities

Mark – many don't know if they have a perimeter drain or a check valve – the building inspector has to inspect the perimeter drain to the outfall, why can't he make sure it gets to the next step but then we make sure it gets on the as-built plan

Gary – there is a stormwater issue – we are all working very hard for the site to have same - the ground water issue exists – if you need perimeter drains, then you are in the groundwater – you should at least have them calculate that increased runoff into your stormwater calcs – some factor that you include in the storage asins desing s- for every single house that might have a perimeter drain – you add capacity to the overall design – you could pump every day in a high ground water area

Mark – but you are still talking a fairly small amount –

Rick – you could, there are towns – put a sewer and water connection and drain connection for each lot – you do that permitting process but you would have a place for it to go – a parallel pipe to the underdrain and tie into the manholes - control them –

Jim – mark, we reviewed a couple of plans where they were doing big plastic on site – wouldn't that be a potential solution –

Mark – in high clay soils, you would need a substantial system – if the perimeter drain is picking up water and there is a gravity feed – there is a dry well scenario – with a lot of clay, you are very limited – this board doesn't have control over the construction of the house but we have to deal with the repercussions

Karyl – there is a simple solution

Dan – that is not the purview of the PB

Dave – I think we need to get together with the building inspector to work this out –

Paul – I would like to go to the definitions pages – I am confused by all these – consider some inconsistencies in your definition – if you do have a secondary street, you should have a primary – I am not sure what the benefit is for the different definitions and how you are using them later on in the document

Mark – the basis for defining different street types is to provide for different construction standards for the various street types

Paul – inconsistency – it would be helpful for them to be – address number of trips – criteria
Mark – secondary street would most likely be a through street –

3.3.3 – re: illusory – I don't understand what that means – under the mass wetlands law, an owner has the right to cross wetlands, -

mark – this is in the ANR section – if there is no physical means to egress to the property, the board can determine that there is not access –

dan – this has to do with the direct physical junction of a parcel to the way – that direct linear area – I am not sure this is worded correctly, but I know what we want it to say –

rick merrikin – does the PB want to get into

chan – illusory vs. illusionary – use of this word

rick – the problem is you are going to determine what is real or not, crossing wetlands may or not be allowed –

matt – this is whether the way exists

paul – I don't think what your intent is is how it reads –

jim wieler – perhaps strike wetlands and watercourses – don't want to imply you are getting into wetlands

paul – I did not receive an appendix with this – but it refers to “social environment” – what does that mean? Parties to take place on this land??

Susy – I will send you dir from acton

Paul – who will do the mailing on prel plan?

Paul – dead end street matter – 7.9.6 b – please draw what you mean

Gary – my suggestion in the case of a self looping, you allow a slightly longer distance – to 800 feet -

Dave- do you want to promote double cul de sacs vs. looping roads

Dan – it may be best to have illustrated examples

Paul – page 58 7.11.2 - with wetland areas, this may not be achievable –

Mark – add . . unless otherwise approved by the board

Gary – or at the request of the concomm

Paul – you can create a buildable lot under the zoning bylaw and under our rules and regs but in order to have the entrance to the buildable area, it might violate this regulation because of where the driveway has to be - Lot 16 at ICE is a good example –

Dan – does the board want to be firm on this or allow some flexibility

Paul – driveways are the last thing a decision is made

Mark – but you don't want a driveway to come out at a catch basin

Gary – my driveway is within a foot of a catch basin and I haven't had a problem

Mark – this eliminates – this will help alleviate the problem

Paul – I am just raising the issue as it relates to wetlands

Jim – why are

Dan – we are now asking for driveways to be shown –

Mark – we have addressed a number of these issues

Gary Jacob – I have a bunch I have given to Susy – content – as a member of the DRC – in general concept, one of the things you should try to do – insist that stuff is going to be turned over to the town eventually- you have the right to ask for more than just functional treatments – if people knew in advance that these items are going to be the town's in the future, we will be asked for more. – also the example near my house with the walls – just because there is a simply functional design that can be used doesn't mean it is going to be acceptable –

For example 5.7.24 - planting specs for the trees should be included on the plans –

Dan – these trees are not going to be public –

Susy – we can have a standard for tree planting in the appendix

Gary 5.7.32 – board may require use of a landscape architect for

Paul – this presumes that all cul de sac island landscaping is going to be manmade vs. natural or existing –

Dan – when a landscaped island planting is needed, a landscape design plan – the board may require a plan prepared by a registered landscape architect – if it stays

Paul – can it be a landscape plan vs. a plan prepared by a landscape architect?

Gary – 7.2 Protection of Natural Features – broader community values

7.3.1 – even if necessary for safety or orientation

7.4.2 – immediately

7.5.1 – due regard!!

7.5.1 – paul –

mark – all we are saying here – a stormwater pollution prevention plan must be prepared –

paul – it may not be happening

mark – if you have to do it, include it in both the def sub plan and concom plan

paul – where it is wetlands, the concom should be the board of jurisdiction – where it is not, the PB should be the jurisdictional body

gary – you could also state that where the two plans differ, the more stringent of the two shall apply –

rick – sometimes concoms get away

mark – I think PB is fine with whatever concom rules

gary - the SWPPP is not formalized this early on – usually not field until construction

mark – in my opinion, this is not much different from what we do today –

paul – I think it is

gary – other utilities – page 48 – town may require the developer to put in one additional conduit that is turned over to the town – to be available for use for communications by the town – rent it from the town –

dave – wearing my old engineering hat, we would always put in extra conduit – very good idea

paul – just so you know – there may not always be on the part of a developer, the goal of installing both cable and phone – the industry is changing – and it is possible and probable that the number of conduits installed is going to go down and not up – the nature of the whole telecommunications industry – we are seeing more homes that don't have phone lines land based – do you really mean that utilities shall not be located under sidewalks

gary – if the town is going to require an extra conduit, then spec it –

gary – under stormwater management – this whole concept of when the final binder is put on the street – you should require that the runoff from a subdivision be collected into the stormwater system from day one – height of catch basins

mark – we have covered that - part of the lot release requirement

gary – page 50 – item l – slopes that are stabilized – you are allowing stone over geotech fabric as slope stabilization – I talked to susy – whole new concept called living walls – sock like materials that they use – mesh tubes that you fill with gravel soil mixture and vegetate and can stack steeper than the 3:1 slope –

mark – I don't think we are stipulating that they have to use rip rap but if they do, then they need to have a geotextiel filter fabric. – rip rap is usually restricted t the weirs

gary – in a small space, may need a steeper slope

gary – page 51 – item s – headwalls – giving the board the right to require aesthetics in the surfacing materials – if you are not using natural stone, then the board should be able to approve the aesthetics -

gary – 7.9.4 – add an item c – encourage developers to use the natural grade whenever possible – require them to follow natural grade whenever possible –

gary – road widths – at the request of the concom, you should allow for narrower roads at wetland crossings – that would preclude parking –

paul – I would rather see the PB encourage – where wetland crossings exist, require the road to be narrower – more gradual –

rick – eliminate the grass strip in those areas -

paul – actually narrow the pavement

dave – how much of a straight shot are you looking at – curves, etc.

gary – you want a grass strip – place for snow to be stored – also good

paul – a benefit of doing that from a speed perspective – when the pavement does narrow and widen it has a tendency to be a traffic calming

gary – 7.13.6 - require that sidewalks be sloped 1% toward the street –

mark – the standard details shows 1.5% slope

gary 7.16 – specifically forbid concrete retaining walls as guardrails –

gary 7.17.2 – assuming we have cul de sacs – allow hydrants to be placed in cul de sac islands – closer to all the houses –

dave – mark Flaherty will probably tell you that public watering is

17.19 – require trees to be in place 2 years before street is accepted – that means they have to start landscaping earlier on

paul –contractor wants to get their bond back

gary – deal with that in some fashion

mark – make it a requiriemetn for lot releases?

17.19.4 – crimson king should not be allowed – columnar maple is not a good tree – I don't see sugar maple here –

dan – these were the suggestions of the tree warden

paul – could you add sugar maple to that?

7.19.9- have the DRC review the landsaped islands

7.21 – streetlights – if you don't go with the private approach, try to find a way to do a more attractive fixture . .

7.23.1 – open space requirements – I would suggest that you not allow wetlands to be used as part of the open space -

7.24.2 - what would be the size of the easements?

Mark – a traversable 10 foot wide from top of b ank

7.25 – site clean up – require all erosion and sedimentioan control items to be removed before street acceptance with the approval of the concom –

mark – does concom actually do a walkthrough?

7.27.4 c – as determined by the PB, agent or CONCOM – be precise

paul – I would broaden that to include DPS determining a water quality matter

paul – for a road to be accepted, there should be a certificate of compliance *****

dan – thanks Gary . . .

jim – I have 4 comments – 5.5.12 – 50 units – perhaps it should be smaller

gary – suggest that PB have discretion –

5.5.12 1 – talk to Mark and Jim for changes –

jim – we spent a lot of time reviewing plans being presented by the person who did not stamp them – 5.6

mark – the stamping engineer must provide direct oversight – if an engineer reviews a plan and is willing to put their stamp on it, -

rick – have you experienced it when an attorney presents a plan

jim – presentation by the person drawing the plan

dan – I don't know if we can get that into type

jim – this goes a huge way to improving the rules and regs

dan – we literally need to say we will bring it to a public hearing continuation at a next date –

mark – 6.5.4. c -

Paul - when these two documents are revised, please email

Rick merrikin – put them in a chart somewhere – very helpful –

april 5th - - continue public hearing

Chris Parella – Verizon –

Chris – it is the entire list of 25 streets – somewhat awkward – we are 7/8 of the way completed running a new type of fiber on every utility pole in town – we have stopped now – several months ago when I found out that I had all these scenic roads – started working on a scenic road work permit application – and taking photographs – it affords us a chance to look at some of these streets – through these pictures – the dilemma I have stumbled onto - ellis street – it is not unique in its condition compared to other scenic roads

Chris – our goal is to lash this to existing cable or strands that are on utility poles – we use a lashing machine – 3 feet square window to work in. – having seen some of the conditions in the field – it is now looking like it is more like an opportunity to do maintenance to my lines – in a majority of the cases there are tree limbs resting on the cables – I have an obligation to protect

the public utilities in the public way – those are on a scenic road – that doesn't do much for the above ground utilities – I need to maintain my existin faqilities – should something happen, like alimb to come down – there are so many things

Dan – we can cut right to the chase – have you consulted with the tree warden = has he offered any advice from a functionality standapiont from what to do? I expect he is OK with remove, eliminate

Chris – he is happy for the utitliey companies to do the maintenance – when we came to these streets – he and I decided to err on the side of caution –

Dan - how do we weigh or balance the inevitable issue so it does not destroy the appearance? Stub the tree or create a window – what are you suggesting

Chris – rely on tree warden – we would be reluctant to cut down an entire tree - -

Dan – if you lop off the top half of a fraser fir – destroy the perfect balance and geometry of it

Chris – we are all for keeping the tree as much as we can –

Dan – how do you handle trees with limbs that overhang

Chris – somewhat gray area for us – people treat public utilities and trees differently – we certainly have had the ability to treat it tree by tree – I look to the language of the bylaw, treat the tree as if it is the public way – I would want to offer it to the homeowner – I would ask them to sign a waiver -

Chris – given that I don't have many options,

Karyl – you aren't really a public utility

Chris – it is all mandated – fees, rates, manner we operate – a very regulated industry -

Chris – I have the maintenance of the poles as our responsibility in Medway –

Susy – I don't believe this situation applies to the scenic road law or our regs – only applies to construction in the ROW that impacts trees and stone walls on the scenic road

Gino – in Sherborn, we worked out something with nstar – on how to treat trees on the scenic roads – specifications developed on how to be trimmed – distances away form the wires – the tree warden goes out with nstar street by street and reviews what shouldn't be cut – the PB is involved in a blanket way – they come forward with a list of trees that will be done during the year -

Dan – we are probably all concerned about the scenic roads and how they will look.

Karyl – I see these excessive holes – I don't like it

Dan – it is an unfortunate circumstance of plantings –

Karyl – it is unfortunate that we don't have buried cable everywhere

Dan – when is buried cable ever going to happen as SOP – or are utility poles just a fact of life

Chris – the bottom line is because we are a public utility, we have an obligation to provide a service at the least cost method – that means aerial – we can have discussions on how to bury lines in certain areas – like a town common area – Norfolk – while the ground waqs open, put everything in – somebody needs to pay for the conversion and it is not going to be the utility companies

Dan – we need to take a poll here – next steps? Do a formal scenic road public hearing or just suggest that he works with Ron Dolloff

Alan – may I ask some semantics question? What is the difference between how these two processes would work

Dan – scenic road air space

Mark – is there any real benefit –

Alan – is it unreasonable if we are not going to go thru a formal scenic road process, that we have one more session on this with the tree warden to explore this further –

Chris – what I could add to that – we have asked our line man to not take action on their own – to rely on the professional arborist that goes out with the crews – that is the relationship I want to leave with the board – it is not just technicians out there doing anything – we try to pledge publically that we are not going to go crazy – everybody is so sensitive to this matter –

Dan – you have been thru all the streets in medway except these 25 – has anybody scene any scars?

Karyl – some on Holliston street –

Chris – think of the safety of having the clear line of sight – allow us the opportunity to come in

Susy - if any tree ends up being cut down, - then go thru the process –

Dan – allow the tree warden to do his job – then come back if a tree needs to be removed –

Susy – lets do a letter to confirm our understanding – send to Chris and Ron

Rick Merrikin – The Haven

Specific conditions - #1 – no more than 3 single family house lots – one of the lots is large enough for a duplex – I recollect a discussion that we had early on in this process

Dan – I recollect that one of the reasons we agreed to the reduced roadway width is the premise that is serving 3 houses - my intention of the private way spec as relayed to you was based on a 3 lot/3 unit approach - but I am not sure we can prohibit it anyway. – we have to assume that
Suggest

Rick – mr. masterson wants to acquire a little bit of an adjacent lot

Rick – I have the same issue with the selective cutting zone – the place we want this is down in the back –

Approved – matt, karyl – yes

Invoices –

CPTC - \$200 – motion by matt, alan – all yes

CO Fee for The Haven –

Motion by alan to approve CO fee for The Haven – 5643.75 – seconded by karyl YES – n matt

West Haven – next Tuesday’s meeting –

*****8

two letters from DH re: our warrant articles –

**

motion to adjourn- matt – 11:55pm –

