

March 22, 2005

PRESENT: Dan Hooper; Eric Alexander; Matthew Hayes; Karyl Spiller-Walsh;

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

Meeting called to order at 7:35 pm.

Dan - Alan is running a bit late. Said he would try to come here directly instead of going home first.

Citizen Comments – None

Public Hearing Continuation – Wingate Farm Definitive Subdivisioin Plan

Dan - we will wait a bit for alan

Matt – any time for FinCom meeting on 3-23

INVOICES

VHB \$1384.91(landscaped island and rules/regs) - motion by Karyl, seconded by Eric - all approved - no matt

VHB – CO – 116.72 – motion by karyl, alan – all yes – no matt

PGC Associates – consulting services – osrd, adaptive use overlay, ahsg; 1102.50 – motion karyl, matt – all yes

7:38pm – Alan DeToma arrives

VHB – Plan Review – 1636.69 – Wingate Farm – motion by eric, alan – all yes – no matt, no karyl

VHB – Plan Review – 3607.21 – motion by eric, alan – all yes – no matt, no karyl

Wingate Farnm –

Karyl – recuse

Rachel and Gene Walsh; Steve Poole

Dan – I understand there has been another pass and VHB reviews

Steve – we got Mark’s letter – bulk were fairly minor and we have taken care of them – a few issues left to discuss – roadway layout and radius on the curves – the curvature of the road at a

couple of points is due to tree location - the road was originally located to save large groups of trees - to save major clumps of trees - try to keep the road away from it - save for aesthetic purposes - in the layout drawing, there are 2 40 foot radius curves - need a waiver - short nature of the curve - mark's concern

Mark - what is your deflection angle on those?

Steve - I couldn't tell you exactly what that is - the actua

Mark - sight distance isn't as much an issue but delivery trucks for hay -

Rachel - hay is once a season

Dan - horse trailers

Rachel - not a daily thing,

Matt - wont have trailers passing each other

Steve - want to maintain aesthetics of the road - travel speed on the road will be 15 miles per hour

Rachel - it all ties into the low impact idea

Dan - I am a huge fan of that as long as it doesn't effect reasonable driving - they look subtle but on the ground in real life, how do those radiuses and those distances really work

Steve - 1 degree deflection - the other one is 3 1/2 to 4 degrees - but even that isn't too much -

Mark - is there any way to extend a larger radius to increase size of the smaller one

Steve - with the 18 foot width of the road and the swales, we don't have much room to go down - we might be able to do a 100 foot radius in here - we can play with this

Dan - I need somebody to tell me on the ground how this will work - I know the chief has written a note - but I don't understand this - we have 150' minimum - why is this acceptable - I want to know from behind the wheel

Gene - if you are driving at 15 miles per hour, it is like a laong driveway

Steve - it is the length of the curve that really isn't the problem

Dan - even longer would make more sense to me.

Steve - your first curve as you are coming into that - 1 degree deflection

Eric – gravel surface of 18 feet

Dan – narrower than our standard

Eric – it doesn't seem conceptually to be a problem

Steve – frequency of two cars passing is so low

Dan – is that a good tradeoff to save the rural qualities of the parcel

Eric – it is not a concern to me with single traffic in and out – but it is if there

Dan – cumulative – downhill grade, significantly different radiuses than our minimum, gravel surface, 18 foot width and trees almost on the shoulder – something has to give

Steve – trees are going to be very close to the swales

Dan – sight distance isn't the concern – but the combination of all the things –

Gino – the flip side is that they are mitigating and slowing people down

Alan – with the bend in the road to preserve the trees –

Dan – there are 3 bends

Alan – the reason for the bends is to protect trees – we have talked about getting away from asphalt to go to gravel to preserve character – if you were to expand the road 1 foot on either side, would that blow the trees you are trying to preserve

Mark – 12" of gravel

Mark – my concern is the tight radius especially the one with a 4 degree – safe consider

Rachel – the trees are not across from each other

Alan – the height and size of trees

Dan – moderately mature –

Steve – some are 24" –

Mark – I am thinking – that if you could sacrifice the trees near lot 3 that would address my alignment issues

Dan – private or public way, it is still the job of the PB to ascertain whether this is safe, sufficient access for emergency vehicles –we have been steadfast on how we have reviewed roads in the past – why would we waive a number of design criteria here

Gene – maybe because it is a good idea

Dan – perceived sense of retaining rural character

Alan – and saving trees

Dan – trees are a sacrifice for a good road almost everywhere – this road in a number of occasions has infractions to a number of rules and regs – are those in the best interest of the town

Alan – that lot – is is going to be a paddock or a house lot

Dan – all board members will agree that if that lot has frontage and access – it will be a house someday

Matt – if the two trees in the middle were removed, would that do it?

Steve – your biggest concern is lot 3

Mark – matt is right, if you took out the trees in front of lot #2, it will give you the alignment

Karyl – just to visualization comment- about size of the road – assuming there is no two way traffic comment – they are going to straight shoot the road – they will only use the curves if there is 2 way traffic

Steve – swale will be about a foot deep – arborist says trees will survive – some root loss - trees are on outside edge of the swale

Mark – a lot of the other comments are waivers that need to be considered

Matt – a 4 foot wide swale – only 1 foot deep, then the trees

Dan – I am concerned about the turning

Mark – are there other trees beyond these of concern?

Rachel – at 18 foot wide, with such a small degree of deflection, when there is a single vehicle they will stay in the middle of the road

Alan – there are four groupings of trees – if you lost the one set in front of lot #2 and straighten out the road, then it would work better

Dan – the board will come back to this and give them direction on this issue –

Dan – mark, help us go with each of the waiver requests

Mark

NAVD 1929 – originally done – current regs are for 1988 – waiver we have done before

Letter from traffic safety officer

Matt – read letter from Jeff Watson – outlines list of signage required – attach and make a part of the minutes

Waive requirement for street lighting –

Dan – typically one we would grant with a homeowners covenant requiring a lamp post at each driveway

Steve – we could do that

Gene – there are no real driveways

Gene – bollard lights as a possibility

Rachel – stable will have building lights

Matt – I could see granting that waiver without requiring any lighting

Gene – have the covenant say there will be a lamp post wherever there is a driveway

Standard cross section – waiver to allow 18 feet

Waiver – for as built instead of street acceptance plan – ok

Waive – typical roadway construction standards – OK

Waive – roadway alignment – still to decide

Waive – eliminate leveling area for first 100 feet – I think that is OK – not an issue from a sight distance issue –

Mark – there is enough room for a car to stop -

Dan – is board OK with that

Matt – it is fairly level

Mark – less than 100 feet – grade at Holliston gutter line is 2%- they have 30 feet at 2%

Alan – how would it impact them to meet the standard?

Steve – you would have to raise the road, more fill –

Alan – so for practical example – there is a more gradual descent coming in – if we were to make them do it to meet the regs, it would be steeper?

Mark – yes –

Steve – we would have to raise the road up 1 foot

Alan – the stated reason for this regulation is for sight distances - but they will have a platform

Mark – 2%

Alan – so I am trying to grasp this so I can understand it –

Mark – 35 feet at 1% - they would have to make it steeper

Alan – would that mess with the swales?

Mark – they follow the profile of the road

Mark – just looking at the profile, the biggest fill is about a foot.

Steve – at station 1 you would be a foot higher – it affects everything downstream –

Dan – I would suggest it would be a safer way to go – 3-4 inches – maybe that gives you a few more feet down the road – I hold my breath when I exit from there

Dan – what is your sense?

Dan – I think we should look toward flattening it off and getting it closer to the regs – any visibility gained coming out onto Holliston street is a good thing

Alan – my sense is the same

Matt – I agree – that is one safety issue

Mark – if your vertical curve came in at 1% - it would still need a waiver –

Roadway width 18 feet – OK

Mark – waiver for using T base vs. asphalt

Matt read letter from Aggregate Industries – march 22, 2005 – with sieve analysis for T base product –

Steve – you want to make a comparison of T Base to dense graded base –

Mark – the benefit of T base is compaction

Dan – let's fully end the discussion tonight on this – is this in the best interest of Medway Planning Board

Matt read letter from Chief Vinton – March 7, 2005 re: use of T Base product

Dan - I have made a site visit

Matt – I have as well

Eric – what is your opinion

Dan – it has taken its share of abuse – major pothole – whether the town is exercising its maintenance responsibilities

Alan – I think they understand the maintenance responsibilities

Matt – it looked like it was an overlay over gravel – what are you proposing?

Steve – we could go with a full foot of T base – we had originally been thinking of using it just as a top coat for 4 inches

Gene – we have more of a grade now in the driveway we have –

Dan – apples to apples,

Gene – finer size is what we would go with – we have had a lot of trucks in there this year

Gene – the only other comment, - permeable surfaces seem to be what people are talking about more and more – conference in Worcester

Dan – I don't know if T base counts as a permeable surface –

Mark – it is a little closer than gravel – but less pervious –

Steve – t base is probably 10% pervious

eric – I have some misgivings about the grade and material combination

dan – maintenance is my main concern – I have seen it perform OK on slopes – I don't know about runoff –

alan – private way?

Dan – yes, but we still have to make sure that the roadway is built well for taxpayers – is it adequate for emergency vehicles – this may be a unique case in its privacy, limited development, it is a road in the town of medway – how it will be maintained is an issue

Alan – the chief speaks to their application at the fire house – there wasn't any mention here about his thoughts on the use of the material

Eric – I am assuming that in his review of the plans, he is aware of the use of Tbase as the proposed material

Eric – I am coming around to this one

Dan – we will have to come back to this

Mark – waiver to eliminate curbing

Dan – seems like we have agreed to this with all the other items

Alan – the swale design doesn't work with curbing -

Mark – driveway at the end of the cul de sac – roadway ends up with the driveway – seems like there may be some confusion – applicant is not concerned

Mark – waive sidewalks

Dan – the potential for connectivity beyond is nil – either easterly or southerly –

Susy – you will want to do the payment in lieu of for the Holliston street frontage

Dan – yes

Mark – we had some discussion on some sort of turn around within the cul de sac –

Steve – distributed a handout showing a hammerhead within the cul de sac –

Dan – I would rather see an emergency vehicle easement on lot #3 -

Alan – I don't see the hammerhead getting use – fire trucks will use the parking lot

Mark – the fire department has approved the plan



Mark – what if the arena doesn't get built? It shouldn't matter what they build

Steve – access on easement on lot # 3 – no hammerhead –

Mark – several more details need to be shown on the plans

Steve – I will take care of the drainage related comments

Mark – show operations and maintenance plan on the plans

Dan- show new easements

Mark – ZBA approval of arena

Eric – not needed, per our research –

Dan – OK

Dan – if you want to close the public hearing tonight, then we have to go back to two of these items; if we don't close, I would like to speak with the Fire Chief – I think it would be best to hold off –

Matt – I would agree with holding off but should we address these issues –

Dan – I think the Chief's comments on some of these matters –

Dan – so is is the board's direction to call out a cluster of trees

Eric – choose one cluster of trees to give up

Gene – I would chose the cluster on the far end - I would save the trees toward the front of the site and that will take care of the road issues

Steve – we are talking about the lot #3 clump of trees – station 4+0

Dan – Tbase issue –

Matt – I don't have a problem with is

Dan – are you comfortable with the testimonials

Mark – when you are talking about asphalt vs. gravel – it is in the middle – it is more stable than gravel – it will be less runoff into drainage system than gravel – it will still need more maintenance than asphalt –

Susy – do you want to call out a maximum size?

Matt – maximum size is 1 ½” –

Dan – I would like to see the operations and maintenance plan – can you email it to Susy so she can send it to us.

Dan – once we sign off on this, we have no leverage on the maintenance of this private road – it is still serving people who are paying taxes – we are relying on the integrity of those who live there to fulfill the maintenance responsibilities.

Mark – for Operations and Maintenance, - you have a typical schedule – with a paved road, you can see how the standard would be reasonable – it needs to be more often with the T base –

Steve – we can do a quarterly on it –

Dan – Gino, any thoughts you want to add

Dan – I have been a devil’s advocate – I like the concept of this tremendously – but the glasses I have to wear are with our rules and regs – that is what I am trying to get across to everybody – I think we went a long way tonight

Steve- what do you want on the Tbase – let’s not layer it – 10 inches of Tbase compacted in two lifts of 5 inches. dOK

April 12 – 8:15 pm – Matt, alan – motion – all yes

Dan – we will plan to close the public hearing that night and be prepared to vote - I would like a certificate of action – draft to work from

-----

Dan – we are flip flopping the two ANR plans under discussion -

ANR – 10 Walker Street - Estate of George Pavlik

Review note from Gino Carlucci –

Gino – there are a couple of technical issues – not of significance – but the crux of the ANR issue – frontage for lot #3 is on Pearl Street which is a private way – but the paved portion of Pearl is not in the right of way – plus there is no owner listed on the other side of Pearl Street

Karyl – the paved way is not in the right of way

Jim – it is a large piece of land –

Dan – I rode up there today – just as Gino describes – the road does take that angle as is depicted on the ANR plan – there is a very large ledge laden hill – you can see how and why the roadway was put where it is due to that hill. That is what I see

Dan – give us some precedent on what it means to have literal access for ANR purposes – if I recall, it can't be illusory – it has to be

Gino – if the pavement had been in the right of way, there would still be the issue of whether there are rights to use the private way

Susy – there may be legal frontage but lot #3 doesn't have adequate access.

Jim Pavlik – I would like to provide additional info myself – I pulled out my ANR handbook – I think the basic premise still holds- in our research, I believe Pearl Street is a way that the Town Clerk certifies is a public way – I have some maps from the Town Clerk – Pearl and Walker are both identified as scenic roads – that is one of the criteria for approving an ANR plan – the lots have to front on one of the 3 types of ways – I would submit that Pearl street is certified by the town clerk as public – I have a land court plan here from 1945 which identifies Pearl Street plus

I believe there is adequate access to the buildable portion of the lot –

Gino – that is not quite correct – if you use that reasoning – it has to have the amount of frontage on the – if it is a way certified by the town clerk that is your better case – then it provides legal frontage that you need – if it is a way in existence at the time of the subdivision control law, it is an issue of whether the paved way is in the right of way

Alan – this document shows the road all over the place

Jim – I believe the land where the paved way is located is owned by the Koshivas

Dan – there is the public vs. private variable; permission or not variable;

Gino – if the town clerk certifies that it is a public way; I would like to see how she would certify this street

Dan – we can't decide on this tonight without an action by the town clerk - we have 21 days – we can do this at our April 5<sup>th</sup> administrative meeting – get a determination from the town clerk

April 5 at 7:30 p.m.

---

Quick break – 9:15 – 9:23 pm

Public Briefing Continuation - Franklin Creek Preliminary Subdivision Plan

Tim Sheehan  
John Early

Bill Halsing

Bill Halsing – we will go over some of the items we didn't get to last time –

Dan – Please take a minute to review a memo from Dave D'Amico dated March 7; followed by an email note from Dan to Dave on March 9 and a response from Dave back to us dated March 9<sup>th</sup>.

Dan – the issues related to this concerns the width of the road if additional lots find their way to use this road as frontage in the future – site to the north or if this roadway were ever extended through to High Street

Karyl – The fact that it didn't go to a hammerhead instead of a cul de sac means that they have bigger plans

Bill – still in the design stages – we have not redesigned it yet – we can do a hammerhead

Dan – private vs. public way – potential increase in number of lots to be served by this road.

Karyl – it all depends on whether you assume all of those options might be possible

Dan – I think it is reasonable to see how one ANR could be secured

Bill – you could say it is not adequate access –

Dan – do we want to prohibit this roadway from ever being expanded to go through to High Street

Bill – we can't reconfigure the road location because of the wetlands

Matt – if there are two private way cul de sacs, then there would be no maintenance issue for the town and in that sense, that would not be a bad thing as they are both private ways

Tim – would it be creating more traffic by having a through street?

Dan – you increase travel options for people – I am

John – with a private way, it would only be used as a 3 lot subdivision –

Dan – if they own the private way, they can also be bought and enticed by the abutter to expand it – would it be reasonable to expect

John – we approached mr. byrnes and he doesn't want to do anything –

Alan – I don't understand Dave's comments re: another roadway off of High Street not being in the town's best interest

Dan – What Dave means is DPS’ interest for ease of maintenance – DPS likes thru streets more than cul de sacs. Cul de sacs are more marketable –

John – we need you to give us some sense that is OK to do this as a private way – I am OK to downsize the cul de sac to a T hammerhead – we will agree to not allow mr. byrnes to use this road as frontage –

Dan –I don’t think a private way is in conflict with Dave D’Amico’s issue – he is advocating a 20 foot width; this is 18 feet as proposed

Matt – even if this is a private way, could Mr. Byrnes use this as frontage for an ANR

Gino – with a private way and an ANR, you have to research the rights of the abutter to the private way, if they don’t exist, you don’t endorse the ANR

Alan – part of me is struggling with dealing something that is not even before us

Dan – this will involve waivers to roadway construction –

Mark – maybe you should have them build it bigger for

Dan – we have to assume 4 lots and give them

Tim – what about a deed restriction

Gino – that is getting into some legal matters – some

John Spink – who are you going to run the deed restriction for the 3 parties, it can be broken at any time – you could make a commitment to the town in the deed – they could give the town a right to be in the association –

Matt – 20 feet with sloped edging is our standard for neighborhood road

John – by doing that, you are almost making it happen.

Matt- build it to accommodate the 4 houses, go with a covenant to try to prevent it from going to 4 -

Karyl – I would suggest that 18 feet private road is more than adequate size for 3-4 lots.

Dan – we need to come to a decision so we can move them forward – I would entertain a motion – how

Karyl – motion to allow the 18 foot paved surface with cape cod as adequate for 3-4 lots.  
Seconded by eric - - 4 yes, 1 no (dan)

Hammerhead design vs. cul de sac – yes, agreeable

John – I would like to make it as minimal as possible

Dan – whatever we do does not represent the fire chief

John – with the 18 foot width, we can now do the drainage calcs

Karyl - this will be contingent on 3 single family homes –

Dan – motion please to approve the preliminary subdivision plan for franklin creek as presented  
– motion by karyl, eric – 4 to 1 vote –

Dan – go to the next step to prep a definitive subdivision plan.

---

Pine Meadow Definitive Subdivision Plan - Certificate of Action

Paul – provided plan revisions – with wheelchair ramp and some drainage details

Dan – this is a draft developed September 13, 2004

Corrections to DRAFT

Paul – based on the 3-8 meeting, you didn't want the longer dead end length is that right?

Dan – the dead end length issue –

Paul – karyl kept saying if there were 7 lots,

Dan – that is one person's comments

Karyl – concerned about the last lot – situation becomes problematical – and the fact that the dead end gets us there – I saw that the 7 lots seemed like a viable solution

Paul – I thought your problem was with the number of lots

Mark – did you ever look at Dave D'amico's comments? He said he would rather see the drainage in the street

Paul – the topography of the property wouldn't allow it – he thought there were manholes in the easement, but that is not correct –

Dan – anybody want to make specific comments re:

Finish this up on April 12 and to vote that night – to vote on findings and certificate of action that night.

-----  
ANR Summer Street – Marian Community

John Spink - present a revised plan – we are subdividing this for financing purposes – one lot for spiritual center, middle lot for ARCPUD, the third parcel is possibly for a regular subdivision to connect with Kimberly, and a fourth parcel to sell off for \$ - meets all the requirements – all Gino’s comments have been addressed –

Dan – not related to the ANR, Karyl and I were with you some months back and we talked a lot about the middle land – what you are showing here doesn’t quite fit with what we discussed back then about open space

Karyl – originally, you had thought about 4 house lot anrs on summer street – I want to see an easement across the back there

Motion to endorse the ANR – 3/22/05 – eric,matt – all yes –

Board signed mylar and A-1 Form

\*\*\*\*\*

FY 06 Level Funded Budget Options

Dan – Some disconnect with FINCOM/BOS on FY 06 budget – what was presented to Greg Balukonis was a level service budget request – but it is apparent that they are seeking a level funded budget

3/17 level funded budget options – \$66,378

one option includes addition of PB office clerk  
option B with no office clerk but larger funding for consulting services

level service budget - \$73,005  
improved service budget - \$86,005

alan – is it realistic that we could operate with such reduced amounts for vhb and PGC –

alan – those are services above and beyond plan review services

dan – yes you can operate; but the mechanisms and rules and regs, bylaws, will be cut back –

karyl – the real question – are we comfortable with the plateau we will need to hit

dan – what about spending some of the consulting services \$ on more macro issues – how can the PB aid the town in evaluating more economic development

eric – you have to hammer that – if we are going to get in balance with residential vs. economic – we have to be able to plan for that – we have to have the resources to do so – I don't know how you do that effectively = that is a huge argument –

dan – the incoming BOS member Glen Trindade is extremely receptive to is – he is very supportive of the idea of a town planner – you should advocate that with him – important position to have in a full time capacity to the larger issues of planning in town – we have run the gamut here that we are mostly a responsive committee – we have maxed out the potential for volunteers to take further the planning efforts – the C1, OSRD, - it is unrealistic to think that the PB is going to have the volunteer hours to keep filling the gaps. – big projects – more proactive planning – somebody dedicated to the efforts of planning in a full time capacity –

dan – there was some discussion about possibly sharing an office clerk position with the DPS –

karyl – when I went to the GOO GOO meeting last week – I told them the reason it is working at all is because the chairman during the past 3 boards – have put in 30 hours a week – there is another whole person who is working – that work never shows up on these sheets – this isn't going to be that way forever – dan, jim and diane –

Susy – PB chairman is a defacto Planning Director

Dan – this board is getting burned out – I know I am feeling it – I see it when members don't pick up a board packet – the job still needs to be done – our discussions tonight took longer because we hadn't read – I think a planner can do a lot of that – the board should be serving as more of an executive board – not as much detail oriented

Dan – the only impression that is going to make a difference with fincom and bos – is to show how level services or improved services funding will improve the long term stability – if we don't do that, we won't just impress

Karyl – once we pull Dan out of the equation – even level funded isn't enough.

Dan – they are looking for places to chop – we might not even see level funded –

Alan – then aren't we just wasting our time here?

Dan – we need to come tomorrow night – we need to make the case

Dan – email me tomorrow I would appreciate it

SAC – check out time and location for FINCOM meeting

---



Subdivision Rules and Regulations – discussion points for issues still to be resolved

Dan – letter from DRC in support of cul de sac islands

Mark – have a homeowners association be responsible for the perimeter drains

Dan – Dick maciolek has opined that we have to allow for other forms of performance security

Karyl – low impact development techniques

Cul de sacs islands –

Eric – I think we need to stay with them, I appreciate where he is coming from

Alan – I agree

Matt – I think we should continue to do this

Karyl – they have been working – there is some additional maintenance expenses – we must do this – this is an archaic situation – it has got to change – in our neighborhoods and our shopping centers –

Dan – in a sense I do disagree – I am more sympathetic to dave's concerns – real budget issues – more roads, less staff to handle snow plowing – we are coming closer to accepting hammerheads for smaller roads – and I think the board should strongly encourage looped ways that don't exceed our dead end or lengthen the dead end to allow for loop roads and no cul de sacs – I cant stand the size of these humongous cul de sacs –

Dan – my sense is 4 to 1 in support of landscaped islands –

Meet with Mark Friday at 1 pm

-----

West Haven 40 B project

Draft notes March 1, 2005 –

Matt – we looked at this at the last meeting –

Moiton to djourn – matt, alan

12 pm

