

April 25, 2006

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: John Schroeder, Karyl Spiller-Walsh, Andy Rodenhiser, Matt Hayes, Chan Rogers

ALSO PRESENT: Paul Carter, VHB; Gino Carlucci, PGC Associates; Susy Affleck-Childs, Planning Board Assistant

Meeting called to order at 7:07 pm

Informal Discussion – Possible Subdivision at 88 Lovering Street

Paul DeSimone, Colonial Engineering
Mr. and Mrs. Koudinya

Paul DeSimone – we were here before with a preliminary – now we are back looking at just 2 lots – we looked at 3 lots before – 88 Lovering Street – we are looking to get a second lot with adequate frontage, area and shape factor – we would like to waive paving – and do crushed gravel bluestone drive – there are catch basins out on Lovering Street – maybe add one more 4 foot sump at end of road – looking to make this like a driveway type of thing – existing driveway for 88 Lovering Street – the existing house will be turned down –

Matt – we can't create a subdivision where one of the created lots would have a house that is nonconforming.

Paul – right, the house will have to be razed or moved.

Matt – would that have to be done before

Gino – approve it but not release any lots

Chan – what does the applicant intend to do

Paul – not sure if he wants to build a new house or turn it 90 degrees – it will depend

Mr. Koudinya – it would be nicer to build a new house or an addition – that depends on the cost effectiveness of the project – it is still a beautiful house

Paul – I want to see what I can waive

Susy – what about the private way standards

Paul – I am trying to get less than that – the flow pattern is out to the street – we would do culverts on the roofs of the houses

Matt – what are you

Paul – gravel, bluestone – width is negotiable – I have talked to wayne, all he cares about is 14 feet high and 14 feet wide –

Andy – what did we do at candlewood

Matt – 2 7 foot lanes on either side of a 4 foot sidewalk - - I would think we would be looking to have it paved – we have gone so far away

Karyl – wait a minute, first of all – you are creating frontage for a second lot by putting in a road – what do the 4 drainage easements consist of –

Paul – when they did olsen circle they cut out this lot – there is a brook that comes down the east side of the street – there is nothing in the easements from ohlson circle – no pipes were installed – never utilized – they had 3 coming from olsehn circle

Karyl – can they propose a roadway over a drainage easement – could they actually build a cul de sac

Matt – you cant build a house on top of it \

Karyl- any setback requiremnts for easements?

Matt- I don't think so

Paul – roadway layout 50 feet, 60 foot cul de sac; upland areas conforms

Karyl – what is house setback to proposed roadway layout

Paul – about 11 feet, the minimum is 35 feet

Matt – permanent private way?

Paul – yes . .

Paul – why build a road for one more lot –

Susy – would board entertain alternative materials to paving

Andy – I would not support that – having dealt with that – who will pay for things, maintenance difficulty – we have the rules and regs and that is why they are there – cant see any good justification for waiving the paving of a small stretch –

Paul – if we do pave it, we will need some sort of detention area because we will be increasing impervious area and do drainage calcs, etc.

Chan – The hammerhead?

Paul – typical for your rules to do this for a private way

Matt – Gino, any comments

Gino – it is running toward the road and gravel would be aq maintenance issue – with the house moved, it would certainly meet everything looking at it preliminarily

Paul Carter – I am not sure what is happening with the wetlands area there?

Paul – it is a big area northeast portion of the site - it drops right off to the wetlands – that drainage easement area may serve some function – there are no pipes there

Karyl – I think they are flowage surfaces

Paul D – if you were to go out – it is high and dry on the northwest corner – all uplands

Andy – do those easements continue onto the adjoining lots in Oholson circle

Paul – no,

Gino – where would you put the detention basin?

Paul – probably in the front yard toward lowering street – shallow basin

Gino – detention basin would have to be on a separate parcel

Matt – I am not comfortable with gravel – what other waivers?

Paul – no sidewalk anyways; just the pavement basically

Karyl – I think the pavement waiver is the least of our worries – I think there are lots of water issues

Chan – I don't have a problem if that is the only thing, lot of concern and argument about maintenance – I don't know what else they want

John – I am inclined toward the pavement over the gravel

Paul – so pavement, what about width

Matt – I would be more willing to give up a few feet in width – I would like to see the berms to catch the drainage -

Paul – so a couple of feet in pavement is possible

Paul – thanks guys

Village at Pine Ridge – Definitive Subdivision Plan

Matt – read the public hearing notice – attach and make a part of these minutes.

John Claffey, CLAFCO
Paul Yorkis, Patriot Real Estate
David Faist, Faist Engineering
Dan O’Driscoll, O’Driscoll Land Surveying
Lowell Robinson, LA

Matt – Welcome

Paul Yorkis – I would like to introduce – john, dan, david, Lowell robinson- we would like to proceed in the following manner – we have received a letter from VHB which we would like to respond to, we have received a letter from PGC Associates which we would like to respond to – we would also like the opportunity for David to do a brief overview – we would like to have Lowell go over the landscape plan – that is new and complete – and we would like to have a discussion with the board regarding in particular, the open space area and the trails within the open space area – both letters raised questions about

Paul distributed a 4/25/06 response letter to

Paul – I will try and be brief – there are a number of items that the VHB letter notes – technical revisions to the plan – we have responded to those as to be provided by Faist on next revision – I will skip over those -

NSTAR is the lead utility in Medway – they do not provide any info to the applicant until the PB endorses a plan – you might want to change your regs so that this is to be shown on as built – we cant meet this requirement –

Andy – do you have a letter that says that

Paul – that is how nstar operates – once we get their plan, then we give it to Verizon and Comcast – their utility lines are in the same trench – nstar lays it out – it has been that way

Andy – let’s just have a no

Paul – why propose something that the utility controls

Paul – I think the regulation is what is wrong, we will request a waiver on that

Paul – this is not a street, it is a driveway, it is not a public way

Matt – does it have a name?

Paul – the abutters have asked that there not be any sign

Paul – no sidewalks are proposed within the project- there were no sidewalks shown in the special permit – this is where we are requesting some guidance – it is unclear whether waivers are needed for a driveway –

Matt – if the special permit document specifically calls for no sidewalks, then you wouldn't need it

Paul – so we will request a waiver on the sidewalks

Paul – re connection of roof drains – this is not a public way, it is a private driveway – condo association – we have no argument with technical aspects of the comments –

Paul carter – the board regulations are very clear that foundation and roof drains should not be connected – the reason being is that we don't want to take roof water and have it empty out near the foundation – that is why they have to be separate systems

Apul – we agree that a perimeter drain is required – the question is that the PB regs are there because the Town of Medway in its municipal storm drain system does not want that occurring – but this is not a municipal storm drain system – private and owned by the association – that is the distinction I am trying to emphasize

Paul – the water will go into a detention pond as part of the whole drainage system –

Paul – we need some guidance back from the Board on what waivers you want us to request – we are happy to request them – this isn't a street –

Andy- but doesn't this have to follow the road standards –

Matt – I think a waiver request is the way to address –

Susy – plus an explanation as to why

Paul read a letter from Wayne Vinton dated 4/24/06 – re: fire alarm box – payment in lieu of installation – agreeable to waive the requirement - \$1,000

Paul – the retaining wall will be 3 feet or less – it falls under the jurisdiction of the building commissioner –

Karyl – the plan says 2-4 feet

Paul – we can modify that to 3 feet –

Paul – we feel this is not subject to the tree warden because it is not a public way

Paul – technical issues will be addressed for the next plan – including the issue of the height of the retaining wall

Paul – with respect to the PGC review letter – we have a separate response – there is some overlap in them – so that we have

Paul – I would like to discuss the open space matters – the OSRD permit talks about trails in the open space. We have met with CONCOM; they have indicated that they are interested in the possibility of acquiring the property subject to the approval of the BOS; would like to do a joint site walk with the PB and through that site walk, which would be public meetings – I think some disucciosn could occur relative to the trails – I am not looking for closure this evening – I want to make sure that the full scope of this issue is addressed so that we can develop a satisfactgory plan that is acceptable to the PB and CONCOM and is in compoliance with AAB and ADA – we are in somewhat of a conundrum – 3 boards that we need to satisfy – we are not sure how to do that – partly because there are wetlands on theproe;ryt- the existing trails cross wetlands – partly because of AAB/ADA and concerns of abutters – we are confrident that the PB has some very distinct ideas of what it hopes to have happen in the open space – we would request we try to schedule a mutually convenient site walk for PB and CONCOM so site can be looked at and assess potentnitlna and give us osme direction so we can –

Matt – susy, can you arrange to get this set up?

Paul – we are happy to work with you – sooner rather than later, - with the technical revisions that needs to be done to the plans, we would like to include results of site walk in next revision –

Matt – probably a Saturday morning – soon

Paul – re candlewood drive sidewalks – we did a walk with Jimmie Smith, DPS – we walked the entire Candlewood site and found that some of the site complies with ADA/AAB and some doesn't. This is something that is not included in the VHB letter attached to the special permit. That portion of the sidewalk that needs to be fixed will be done – Gino has raised an issue about a particular site – we think we are in compliance – we would seek input of the disability commission – so we are aware of the rules and regs and we are trying to comply – with respect to the question on the STUB – that small parcel of land will be conveyed to the condo association

Paul – there is one change from the special permit

David Faist – overview of the plan – civil engineer on theproject, involved in site design and drainage design – very similar to special permit – currently it is all – p arcel A will be retained by the wasnewsky – parcel B is the condo and parcel C is theopen space to be conv3eyd to the concom – one of the things we did was to shift the access road a bit to th east to save a pine tree – the cul de sac is round vs. oval shaped from the special permit plan – swtill 20 units that are there – the – we will be preparing an exiwsting conditions plan and an actual subdivision plan –

David – we have surveyed the whole parcel – we did not cut into the hill area except for a few feet – steep hillside that goes upward from farm street – in the middle of the cart path, scrubby growth, and a small wetland area along the bottom of the site – we show the wetlands from the ANRAD – there is no existing direct channeled flow pattern – sheet flow now – there is standing water in the wetlands area – the cart path runs thru the wetlands area – we did 7 test pits out there – groundwater was a little shallower at the southern end of the site – more like 5 feet at the higher portion of the site – straight forward drainage system – one main drainage basin toward the sewage treatment plant – DAVID described the system – catch basins and – majority of roadway drainage will go to the basin and then to wetlands – drywells for roof drains where we can – 6 sets – also a small low area near access driveway – all water ends up at the same place – based on our calcs – we can control peak runoff and volume using the combination of the drywells, storage etc. – we will correct sizing of pipes leading to detention basins

Andy – can you show again the 100 year overflow –

David – to accommodate the 100 year storm event, we have extra capacity – water will flow underneath the roadway in culverts

Andy – Paul, you said that because this is private property, this is exempt from stormwater bylaw?

Paul – the comment we received from VHB questioned the appropriateness of tying in the roof and perimeter drains – I responded to that – I said that in the town of Medway, the town bylaw is to prevent perimeter drains from being tied into the stormwater system – what David has designed is a system with checkvalves that would prevent that from happening – there are 6 drywell units – the whole stormwater drainage system is going to be owned by and the responsibility of the association –

Paul Carter – the main comment is they are proposing a combined roof and foundation system and any overflow goes to the detention area – need pipe size info – and whether they would be underground or over the surface

David – perimeter drains are to keep groundwater from coming up into houses - we can accommodate splitting the perimeter and roof drains

Paul Carter – they do have one location where they propose to tie into the catch basins –

David – that was the overflow from two drywell units

Andy – are you relying on check valves to handle 100 year event

David – no

Paul Carter – you don't want to put the roof water into the perimeter drain – main concern

David – easy to solve

Matt – I would like them to continue their presentation

Paul – fire chief and safety officer have provided comments that they are OK with the changed shape

Paul – we did have the opportunity to meet with the DRC – very pleased, enthusiastic and supportive – they have not yet provided a letter to you – we also met with the Khalsas and the Sousas, the direct abutters – both families are here tonight – they have reviewed the plan and we have modified the plan to address their concerns

Loell Robinson – we had 4 tasks presented – first and foremost was to address concerns of the abutters for screening, earth of mrs – second was to provide an appropriate entry for the condo – third was to deal with the whole central area of the condos and the 4th was to address the detention basin - I stayed heavily with native materials – available and reliable – we put in some earth berms – area behind the souses - mix of plants – good for high water table - - fill in the gaps behind the souses with pines and other native plants in the area where the trail is behind

Matt – what are you doing at the detention pond?

Lowell – conservation mix around augmented by plant materials- I encourage you all to study this

Matt – adequate access for maintenance?

David – we will check that

David – it isn't a very deep pond – the bottom will be 1.5 feet above 100 flood elevation – in most cases it will be dry except for largest rain events

Karyl – I have a few issues – I want some clarification on this roadway vs. driveway – in fact are we accepting Paul's statement

Gino – I don't think it falls under the definition of a private road in the subdivision rules and regs

Paul – what I would like to do with the board's permission, when we have all the plan revisions, I would like to consult with Gino on what the waivers should be –

Matt – come up with your list and give it to gino

Paul – the bylaw doesn't speak to this condo option

Karyl – retaining wall, when we were discussing the special permit – we were told you would not – what is it going to be

John – it is going to be a real stone wall -

Richard sousa, 14 candlewood drive – question re; small detention area behind my property – you said it kind of was - could you elaborate? – that is

David – not very large, - by building a road and it goes uphill – you create a high point in this area – pipe culvert underneath the road from this small detention area – in a large storm event there would be some water there and then it would go down – not necessarily a pond, it is a low point – it is the end of the natural drainage pattern – it is an outlet –

Richard sousa –

David – low grass location with 1 pipe

Chad – the road is damming up a natural drainage flow

John – how far is the area from the back of the houses

David – about 50 feet and it will be landscaped

Paul – I would indicate that the Khalsas have expressed concern about the walking path and trails and what I would like to do is to make sure they can participate

Mr Khalsa – on the original draft – the trail went very close behind our property – we would prefer it to be further away – have trail entry further away from our back property line – there is a natural opening in a knoll that would be a good location for the trail entry -0

Matt – lets discuss at our meeting out there – we will contact you when we set that up

Mr. sousa – the entry to the trail area shows 3 parking spots – previous discussions we had raised concerns – we would hope that that area could be reduced – we understand that the mailboxes will be there – we are concerned about

Matt – was that spelled out in the special permit

Paul – we are ok if the board would like to decrease the number of spaces

Karyl – I would recommend that the 3 spaces remain – that seemed like a good compromise –

Matt – I think I agree but I would like to hold

15 candlewood drive – when you guys come out to do the walk thru – are you going to look at the pathway between island road and candlewood

paul – I apologize we didn't discuss – what was originally proposed in the special permit in terms of how that would look – the council has reviewed that and they are OK with – as long as there is no disturbance to the wetland – as long as we are not widening that – if we have to change that, it would be our responsibility to go before the council – we have made no changes

matt – did you receive an order of condnitons to do work in the buffer

david – we are filing that –

paul – but that relates to the new construction, not the emergency access between island and candlewood

paul – as long as we are not working in the wetlands the concom is OK with that . .

david – we need to check with the fire chief to check on class type

matt – when are you going to be ready to come back with the changes –

PH continuation to 5/23/06 – 7:35 pm – chan, karyl –

***** estimates for plan review fees

VHB –

Andy moiton to accept the estimate for PGC for \$525 – seconded by chan rogers – all yes

Andy motion to accept the estaimte for VHB for \$7420 – seconded by karyl – all yes, matt
recuse

River Bend Village

Eric Alexander joins meeting

Rich Cornetta – we are prepared to speak to the drainge details and we would like to start to
address these important concern s- and we are prepared to present a proposal

Rich – we were discussing a mitigation figure – we ahad arrived at around 80 trees or \$24,000
figure. We were contemplating 3 items – fencing, tree replacement and sidewalk replacement as
a global approach – board seemed to have a varied opinion – you asked us to come forth with a
proposal – I am referring to the tree numbering –

Tree #11

Mark deschenes – when we walked on site on april 10th – a couple of trees that we looked at
were trees #11 and #12 – I don't think we can save #12 - we looked at several of the mature
walnut trees – identified about 4 trees between 6 and 8 nch caliper – all are in the roadway
alignment – I would like to see if we can take those and relocate them – plus there are 3 spruce
trees along the frontage that aren't healthy and remove those - 2 pretty much gone . . so doing
something along those lines – I did not address the sidewalk yet – separate – 220 linear feet of

fence – if I can save . . . we are left with about 8400 to contribute to the town for tree maintenance fund

Matt – what are chance of those large trees surviving a relocation –

Mark – September would be pretty good – we would replace them if they died – they are beautiful specimen trees – I would hate to lose them – they would be nice to be up on the street scape

Matt – when we were out there, we picked a few areas that could benefit from some infilling – are there any other spots that could benefit from some 3” caliper trees?

Mark –playing with those moving parts . . I would be willing to put that toghere in a formal proposal

Matt – I would like to see those trees relocated

Andy – noble effort

Phil – I am happy with this – good idea to use some of the mature trees –

Mark – 6-7 inches is about the size

Phil – how will you handle if any of them die

Mark – if I move 4 I will probably lose 1, I would replace it,

Matt – the replacements will be on private property.

John Spink – so it is probably better to move them behind the right of way so they don’t get chopped in the future

Karyl – in that case, would we want to have some low shrubbery

Mark – we will do something as needed

John – we placed the clubhouse on the footprint of the existing house – the bylaw requires a 50 foot setback, so we will have to push back the clubhouse – that will give us another 20 foot of front yard to work with

Matt – sounds like it would need a variance

Gino – given that there is an exsiting foundation there, maybe the ZBA

John – drainage . . . we are going thru the riverfront that covers a considerable amount of the site – the people that are going to be interested are concom and charles river watershed – we went

and talked to them – one of the things they really wanted us to do in the drainage structures of the water going into the river – they pushed us quite hard to go with a country swale system and so we thought about it and decided we could try it – we have gone thru the process p con com liked the idea – we have gone thru it – I think we have done it – I am not sure that VHB thinks we have done it ., .

18 test pits and borings – found is nice sandy loam on top – below that 3-4 feet of granular material, 3 – 15 feet down is heavy silted layer of material – not clay but real tight – john explained natural drainage pattern – fairly significant downhill slope –

put houses on the high points – put roof drains into some kind of cistern/rock swale around the houses – houses have no basements and the grade of the slab is at the highest oints – driveways and walkways and pave them with pervious asphalt – chosen to pave roads with regular paving materials – lawns and landscaping – houses at high spots – sidewalks and driveways absorb some water – roadway does not – as the wter goes into the side yards, it goes into a series of swales that are 2-4 feet drop – cascading swale system – slows up the water system flow, removes the solids, we meet the criteria of volume and runoff – we achieve the infiltration – flows to the wetlands or vernal pools – slow it down and put it where it was going before – that is the concept – I think we have done that . . that is where we are at

matt – the weirs in your swales, are they stone?

John – we had a debate on that – I have made them just earth – there are a couple of options – hold for 3-4 hours at the most –

Another option is to put stones up

Another option is to build a berm that is a sand center wrapped in a filter with rocks on the outsides

Matt – Paul, do you now have enough info to evaluate this

Paul – I haven't seen any details of the berm in the swale – if there was, it wasn't clear – I need a detail of how they are going to be constructed and where they are going to be constructed within the swales

Andy – will lit be grassed? Will there be a problem with mowing

John - no –

Paul – in terms of the calcs, are you taking credit for infiltration

John – NO infiltration credit anywhere – I have overdesigned the hell out of – no matter what we do,

Paul – in terms of the pervious – you need to submit your construction details/manufacturers details

John – there was a slip sheet in there

Paul – not enough info

Paul – the roof drain system, there wasn't anything in the plans – there are 4 acres of roof – whatever you are proposing for the roof drain system needs to be shown on the plans and there needs to be details of it

John – there was a detail of the rock storage system in the details

Paul – we are talking about the roof drains in the front of the buildings – I didn't see any details of the roof drainage design – didn't see any calcs for the roof drainage –

John – they were all sized for the 100 year storm

Paul – that needs to be included in the site plans and the drainage calcs –

John – one of your comments was that we need a test pit at every one of these areas - that is 160

Paul – you need to show the groundwater in relation to your construction – verify the permeability – what is representative of your system – you can determine whether you need one at every location – it has to be consistent – have to have enough spacing on those to justify what you are taking credit for there . . . we need to be sure that the water is going to infiltrate there . . . if you are saying that the 4 acres of rooftop is going to infiltrate you need to know whether it will really do that . . . you need to provide the details and soils and the drainage calcs

John – one of the items of this is that the vernal pool is a C area and around it are B soils which are semi viable infiltrating . . I am not quite sure how I am going to solve that requirement you are asking . . .

Paul – the other thing relative is you are proposing some underground storage areas within your swales for water to drop down. We did look at the soils info you did provide – some of the underground storage areas looks like there are going to be issues with ground water - need to make sure that you have adequate separate from groundwater so you will have adequate storage capability – the underground storage areas are not fully shown on the site plans – these are components of the overall system and need to be shown . . .

John – I have two more items I need to ask you about – one you made a commentary on utility easements – on all the ring road and cross road – what rights does the town want to have in the water/sewer or other utility system – do you want an easement to go with –

Matt – I think that would be up to the water/sewer department – I would imagine they would want to have access

John – I would expect

Susy – have them meet with water/sewer to discuss and have them send something to us

Susy – how will the condo association know in 15 years to not fill in these swales with landscaping? Are these swales monumented? Are they easements?

Karyl – every landscaped area is actually a working swale has become an important, vital element in the movement of water from the development to wetland area

John – that is the purpose of it

Andy – the tools that are available for LID are more than just swales,

Karyl – it is such an extreme use of what is considered LID – aggressive and onerous and = how do you make it transcend – the DRC has been dealing with changes in the architecture throughout because of these changes – it seems like we are backing up – how effective is this going to be – I have no comfort zone here – too invasive, too much, in between all these buildings, - all I can envision is when the water hits really hard these buildings are going to be islands – prove me wrong

John – intended to be pensn

Eric – my concern parallels Karyl's - we are talking about LID for the drainage system – it has been pushed so far it is a Swiss watch – if any one piece of this system fails, the whole system is going to shut down

John – probably done to the opposite extreme - it was designed for the 100 year storm – we have structured the flows for the 100 year event – why all the swales? To meet the requirement for the removal of the solids –

Eric – it is going to take an ironclad operations and maintenance plan – need some clear delineation and easements for the system as proposed –

John – Do we need easements to structure this whole thing or is this whole site an easement? Does it make a difference?

Matt – what will an easement accomplish?

Eric – you have to plan for the worst situation –

Matt – is there any way to landscape some of these areas?

John – yes, they can be fully landscaped

Karyl – it would have to be done very carefully – I would like to see an example of swales and fish ladder berms – photographs – what landscaping has been successful?

Andy – when we have a frost and the ground freezes – January thaw and rain storm – what happens when the water can't infiltrate

John – it flows to the Charles river

Eric – some Yahoo backing up to fill in swales

Rich Cornetta – this is a privately owned condo association- there will be rules and bylaws – how do we have some covenants that run with the land that is linked to the bylaws – I would suggest we could draft something – that would run with the property - I don't think easement is appropriate – some type of conservation restriction that would tie any changes to the stormwater system to municipal review

Karyl – these are so close – one thing that would eliminate this problem would be to reduce number of units

John – if you have a regular subdivision you – do the same thing

Karyl – your density is so intense – there is no real detention system –

John – there are some underground areas

Paul – you are proposing 6 inch by 24 inch box culverts coming out of the catch basins – seems prone to clogging

John – before it goes to the swale it goes from the street to a drop catch basin – and there are some trench drains that go across the road – normally you don't put a trench drain across a roadway because of the type of traffic is going to beat up a trench drain-don't do it – you have a cover and elevation issue – but 6 inches – how are you going to maintain something like that – usually a 12 inch pipe is a minimum opening – I would not recommend the 6 inch by 24 inch box culverts

Paul – with the drainage calcs – you need to decide how to compare – you have to do it at each design point - you need to make a comparison of existing to proposed – you need to do it at more detail

John – I chose a design point at the end with all drainage to the river –

Paul -0 everything goes to that one point – I recommend you compare the existing and proposed at multiple design points – you just described 3 points – what are the changes – are they less, are they more

John – they are different areas from before and after . .

Pual – it is required –

Joh n- that is why the design point is the whole site

Paul – sounds like you have at least 3 design points

Matt – multiple point discharges to the river

John – I have sheet flow to the river – post and pre don't match on anything

Paul – he needs to discuss the comparisons at the various localtions- that is what is done at every site –

Karyl – is there an inerenet difficulty with this whole swale system?

Paul – no, it is really where the water leaves the site

Andy – is this a unique problem

Paul – no it is an issue with every site – I think you have 3 or 4 design points

John – I can break them up into that – I collected them all into one at the end –

Susy – handouts – notes from Dave on sidewalks and susy's handout on to do list . .

Pallavi Mande - charles river watershed – I have to commend the applicant the trying – there are several other projects that are going onthruout the state – swales to make part of th deed that goes with property transaction – hopefully we can do our part to get those resources to you – show you other places where this has been successful – we want ot work with you to take this concept to something that is workable – we would like to see more details on the boat launch and views from the river – that can happen . . .

Karyl – any visuals that you might have?

Pallavi – probably not just one project but aspects of others

July 1 for action deadline extension - andy, karyl – all yes

May 23 at 8:15 pm – continue - motion by andy, seconded by joh – all yes

Construction Observation – report from Paul Carter re: inspection of roof drain system at a house at Evergreen Meadow

Andy – concern about a pipe installation

Wayne Carlson – possible one lot subdivision

Ted Cannon on behalf on Bill and Amy Fletcher – looking at a space on lowering street – fletchers sought a variance from the ZBA and were denied for lack of fro

ntage. During discussions with the ZBA, they expressed they were reluctant to look at variances until the fletchers looked at all their options – so we wanted to see if it was feasible – Wayne Carlson has come up with some concepts in this regard

Wayne – input on how to design the road – although mathematically it can work, but in practice it can't be built because it is wet – so we are trying to get some input from you folks – would you waive this is one spot to allow for a smaller right of way

Paul Desimone – to actually waive construction of the road itself – there is an existing drive that goes within there now – I told Wayne that you would want at least 16 feet paved – could you waive 50 foot right of way and allow a smaller width –

Karyl- it is one thing to waive a road that could be built, it is another thing the waive a road that couldn't be built due to wetlands . . .

Ted – we need to show the ZBA our attempt to look at the subdivision

Paul – we would need you to waive the layout/ROW to 40 feet – real focus would be the left side option

Wayne – one house only – deed restriction - the family has the total control – there is a difference here with the Richardson's property on Ridge Street

Kalryl – what happens if Amy inherits her family's property

Wayne – deed restriction would end up on both lots

Gino – have the deed restriction say no more than 2 dwelling units – not just

Matt – what do you need from us,

Ted – if you think

Karyl – if the deed restriction could be air tight

Ted – have town counsel review it

Matt – make the ROW as large as possible to come as close to conforming – if there is no increase in impervious area – then I would consider waiving the drainage design . .

Paul – go right to a definitive

Jim and Ted Reardon – ramp needs to be 48 feet long –

Motion to approve change to 127 main street permit – chan , andy – move the ramp,

Restaurant 45 – site plan decision –

Approved

Fee estimate for plan review services for Daniels Wood - \$225 – andy, chan – all yes . . .

BOS meeting – briefed on articles for ATM 2006

They want us to do a

PGC 1012.50 - andy, chan – all yes

PGC 37.50 – andy, john – all yes

VHB – 1035 - - john, chan – all yes – matt recuse and karyl recuse

VHB – 4061.41 – chan, karyl – all yes – matt recuse

VHB – 115 – karyl, john – matt recuse

VHB – 9664.58 – karyl, chan, all yes – matt recuse

Motion to adjourn – john, chan – all yes

]11:55 pm