

June 22, 2006  
Sanford Hall

PRESENT: Andy, chan, bob, john, karyl, - susy, paul, carter

Open at 7:08pm

Gino – Route 109 Redevelopment Plan – draft bylaw

This is a rough draft – main product of the smart growth grant – transform shopping center into a more traditional town center – looking to make it compliant with state’s chapter 40R requirements which results in payments from the state for pursuing this type of development – if adopted, the town would be eligible, depending on how many housing units could be accommodated – 250-500 units, the town would be eligible for a one time payment of \$350,000 plus \_\_\_\_\_ per dwelling unit plus some compensation toward education costs of any new children

Andy – who does that calculation?

Gino – office of commonwealth development

Andy – have we shopped this to other boards?

Gino – I spoke with IDC, not yet with BOS and ZBA – probably not by June 30 –

Andy – you are looking for comments so that we can move forward with this as a future bylaw to bring to town meeting – what type of opportunity does this present relative to future development?

Gino – it doesn’t take anything away – it doesn’t affect anything in place – it would provide more options to

Andy – so we can meet with owners of property to get their ideas . . . – in the next 8 days, with the meetings you have with developers – can you report back to us?

Gino – yes. . .

Gino – formatted similar to OSRD bylaw, etc –

QUESTIONS?? – wholly or partially within the c1 or c2 districts?

Andy - Does that mean you recommend going beyond

Gino – some parcels straddle zoning lines . . . or we could realign the zoning boundaries – there are a couple of parcels –

Chan – I feel this is one of the most important issues that the PB will be working on during the upcoming year – one of us should go to the BOS ASAP to explain the advantages and outcomes .

Andy – gino is trying to get in meetings with the property owners by June 30<sup>th</sup>

Chan – is detailed review by the board necessary now?

Gino – any comments can be provided – there will be many opportunities

Chan – review of detail could be delayed while we work out our strategy to sell this . .

Andy – gino needs to know now if there is anything too far out

John – I think it is exciting and important – I am anxious that this go forward in a fairly timely manner – next year’s town meeting?

Andy – or even sooner if possible, but we don’t want to make mistakes

Karyl – just glancing over this, and trying to conceptualize what this would look like, we need to be clear – the implication is that it is going to a real extreme level which is totally unlike our Medway to date . . we want to encourage this and inclusive uses, but I have real concerns about the look of it already – building setbacks – think about the density that this will create – huge economic impact of 200 units with children –

Gino – that is why a lot of discussion has to take place

Andy – when I think about this area – I try to imagine whether there might be a developer who would do a parking garage here?

Gino – the concept drawing does not provide for any underground parking

Andy – as we go through this, let’s star the areas so that we can spend some time on that so he can get an idea of what we need to work on.

Gino – before design standard section, there is the submittal requirements

Gino – setback standards are to provide for the pedestrian friendly – there is a requirement for a green belt buffer adjacent to any residential zones – the density standards is one we would want some discussion on – floor area ratio of .7 – that is fairly comparable to what exists today – impervious surface not to exceed 80% - the density standards are what is needed for 40R

Andy – maybe it would be good to have the DRC take a look at this

Karyl – how the buildings look is how dense it will be – interrelated . . . I think what we need to do, he is talking about qualifying. . what we have to do is to decide what we want to be –do we want an influx with kids? To what extent?

Andy – he will get a feel for what the market is based on his discussions with the property owners

Gino – that concept drawing, . . . this bylaw is written to reflect the concept drawing buildout –

John – do you have smaller copies . . .

Gino – no; I may be able to put it on a cd

Gino – the other aspect of the density standard would be – maximum of 50% of building area could be residential –

Gino – architectural standards . . . again- very vague, not intended to dictate a particular style or materials, the main thing is the physical location of the buildings and how they are located to promote pedestrian access – to be visually appealing to pedestrians with windows and doors vs. big blank facades

Andy – it has been pointed out that zoning cannot conflict with the building code . . . can we establish standards to ensure that pedestrian nature is accomplished – so it has a village feel and look –

Gino – I think the main ones should be in the bylaw itself –

Andy – if they want to use the overlay district, they have to comply with the design standards in the bylaw

Gino – sustainable development principles are in there to encourage new development to be compliant with these principles – not required for 40R, but I thought the board would be interested in that

Gino - allowed uses . . . the only major thing is adding townhouses and multifamily residential, not single family dwellings

Gino– major entrances – this would allow 3 major entrances – at least 500 feet apart – access roads . . . also have linkage roads too . . . also provision for temporary entrance to route 109

Karyl – on linkage roads, are there any places that would open up ANR possibilities

Gino – those would be private roads with access easements

Andy – there would be frontage along the linkage road, but if it is in the overlay district ????

Gino – last section is parking, this provides for lower parking standards than currently in place – shared parking between residential and commercial – 1 space per 250 sq. ft is not far off from standard requirements – that is 1.5 spaces residential units

Susy – priority development grant option?

Gino – I will know better in a week when I meet with the state to discuss

Chan – what has to happen for June 30<sup>th</sup>

Gino – 3 meetings with property owners and your input will be incorporated into the report –

Karyl – it is very important that we really give a think as to what we want it to be and not just look for a money thing – in the long run, if we end up needing to build a new school,

---

7:40 p.m. – Open the Public Hearing for the Charles River Acres OSRD Special Permit

Andy – just to bring you folks up to speed, we are going to hear a presentation from the developer; the board may ask questions and some dialogue back and forth – the public can then ask questions – you are welcome to move around so you can see – if you have a question, please state your name and address for the record and get them into the minutes

Motion to waive the reading of the public hearing notice – Chan, Karyl – all yes

John Parmentier, Dunn McKenzie Engineering in Norfolk, MA – we represent Karop Dirazonian – David Baraducci, LA – Michael Acquafresca the property owner is here as well – this plan is different than the plan we brought in last year for a conventional subdivision – the purpose here is to bring forth a plan for an OSRD – per your new bylaw – protect natural resources, etc. – Charles River - what we have done as part of the process – second step is the definitive subdivision plan – this is the special permit phase – sort of a preliminary plan –

there is a site context and analysis plan, yield plan, and third plan is with the utilities and dwellings, ways, etc.

This land was one time a meadow which is now overgrown – lot of shrubs, and brush – situated off of Village Street and Neelon Lane - short and narrow access to 2 homes – the road ends in front of the house – perimeter of site is defined by fieldstone walls, - high up toward village street with fairly shallow slope and then a steep slope down to the Charles River – near Massasoit and Riverview and Cherokee – access is village, to Charles River to Cherokee Lane – Cherokee ends before the house – there is an unpaved part of Cherokee Lane – very woody area – the major trees areas are shaded in green, red area is the riparian zone of the Charles River; light blue is bordering vegetated wetland – also a flood plain area . . . land elevation from high to low varies about 65 feet from 230 to 164 down near the riverbank – there is a break in the slope

Yield Plan – there are 8 lots with 10 dwelling units; access from Cherokee Lane – land slope is least dramatic here compared to Massasoit – leads to flatter area for development – the calculation for number of dwelling units comes in at 11 units – we are proposing 10 units – 6 single family plus 2 duplexes – total open space is 58.7% of the area – I read the report from Gino Carlucci; I believe he feels the regs are met –

Karyl – it meets the minimum . . .

John – path connections around the site and through the open space – possibly connect with Riverview Street depending on the elevations there – we can certainly entertain doing that

David Baraducci, LA – concept plan per the regs – shows the existing vegetation and how it fits in – the most significant change from the prior plan from January – we reduced the number of structures on the site (8 buildings, 10 units) – the two duplexes at the beginning of the site – the lot in the back we will be removing the existing structure and putting in a large new house – there is some portion of the existing trees that would have to be removed for the house lots – introduced supplemental landscape for new buffer areas – adding landscape buffer areas to screen views from neighboring houses – retaining nice stand of spruce trees will remain untouched – we have a continuous pathway through the open space that would be publically accessible – Neelon lane – and then try to connect to Riverview Street – also proposing a 5.5' sidewalk and street trees – minimizing driveway widths – going to 12 foot driveways – we have exceeded the standard for side entrance garages for the single family – cohesive sense of neighborhood with close setbacks – buffer zone vegetation – looking at species types that would be attractive to wildlife – diversity and seasonal interest

John parmentier – go back and look at utilities with you – drainage for the project – from the cul de sac and – series of catch basins bring it back and discharge to a storage area before it is released – water service would be brought in off an extension of Cherokee lane to the end of the cul de sac – if the water main has to be looped, we will talk to your water department – could connect down to Massasoit – utilities will be brought in from Cherokee – bring it in above ground if possible from pole on Cherokee lane – there is a proposed gravel to connect the end of the cul de sac to Neelon lane for emergency access – at least 12 to 18 inches of gravel – with loam over the top and seeded as grass – each lot the homes will have roof water collected and piped to a trench chamber on each lot away from the foundation – this will recharge water from the roofs – we did some soil testing on the site and found that the soils are very fine, sandy loam – not conducive to absorbing water – the water table was 2.5 to 3 feet and it has receded – permeability of the soil is very slow – we expect the detention basin will be large enough to handle water – we will need to spread it over the land so it isn't discharged straight down the hill

Karyl – did you say you did some soil test

John – we did deep holes and attempted to do percs – couldn't perk at 2.5 to 3 feet – expect very slow permeability –

Karyl- gino, can we allow the riparian zone to be in the open space

Gino – yes . . . but you will notice that in the formula, the area for riparian zone is eliminated by 50%

Andy – if the emergency access road, how will that be dealt with in the winter time with snow –

John – we are flexible as to what you want it to end up being – it could be gravel –

Andy – sewerer?

John – yes – connect from Cherokee lane

Chan – the colored portion of the map we have, is that open space

David – yes,

Bob – I notice, you call for drainage to start on the property – what are we doing about this area on Cherokee extension before you get to your site –

John – I am open to suggestions

Bob – if you are going to extend the road, something needs to be done in that area -

John – there is a drainage system down at Cherokee lane at Charles River road – maybe 300 feet – generally what you want is about 300 feet between catch basins –

Bob – I think that needs to be addressed

John – about 380 feet

Andy – do you have the capacity in your drainage to take that water back on the site

John – I don't think so – the elevation is different here – we aren't sure how that would work – you could do something on Cherokee down toward

Paul Carter – if you are going to look at tying into drainage on Cherokee – you will need to talk to Dave D'Amico to see how you could tie into the existing system – you should come up with your proposal

Susy – paved widths?

John – 14.5 feet to 15 feet paved –

About 170 feet of new roadway in the Cherokee right of way

Andy – and Bob is saying that that drainage needs to be dealt with

Susy – open space??

Karop – donate to the town

Karyl – what is dead end length? From Village Street

Bob – about 1295 feet

Andy –that is why we were so concerned about emergency access

Bob - how wide is Neelon?

John – 13.5 feet at entrance to Village Street

Rich , 7 massasoit street – on the drainage piece – I live in the middle there – I see the water ranging down there – with this new cul de sac it will be roaring down to 6 and 8 Charles River road – water just comes through the neighborhood - I was under the impression that the police and fire department wanted a straight through pattern – foolish to put loam and grass – get the street name correct – it is Massapoag

Andy – we haven't gotten comments from the police and fire department on these current plans – this is a new application and they respond to each application – this is different than what was previously submitted as a conventional subdivision plan – if the police and fire have comments they will give them to us

Susan Diullo, 7 Massasoit – board of directors of Charles River Tennis Club – re drainage – I went up there last Thursday because I saw some people digging up there near the tennis club – there are some white pipes – I have been told it is the soil tests – why is that so late into this plan?

Andy – can you explain the

John- the purpose of the testing is to measure high ground water table and to determine the type of soils – this is the peak time to do so - we set our test wells- we measure fluctuations in the water table -

Susan Diullo – was that not done for the previous development? The tennis courts were built in the mid 60's – when all the trees came down for the courts there was an impact? Will this create a drainage problem onto the tennis courts?

Andy – through this process, we deal with all the drainage =- water is now allowed to run onto adjacent properties – you can just shed water onto abutting properties

Susan – I noticed somebody out taking pictures – car was McKenzie – why the day before the hearing would they be taking pictures – I would think everything would have been all done

Andy – this hearing will go on for several weeks – at some point they

John – I was out there taking pictures for my records and files – I usually do that –it wasn't for the purpose of this meetings –sometimes we look at things in a photo and we see things we didn't see in the field

Susan – quiet time of day – trying to show there wasn't much traffic then

Susan – water coming in from massasoit? Using a hydrant for hoses all the way to the development

Andy – what the water department wants a loop so that you have better water flow, quality and pressure

Judy lafavr king philpp street – why was just neelon lane considered to be part of the regular traffic pattern? Cherokee is just as narrow? Why just for emergency uses – why can't it be just one way? If neelon can be used for emergency, why can't it be used as a regular road

John – right of way/layout of neelon is about 16 feet but the pavement is about 15 feet and some of it is on private property

Susy – right of way on Cherokee is 30 feet?

Bob – yes

Andy – the Neelon right of way is only 16 feet – dead end streets longer than 600 feet we discourage, we can waive it if there is an alternative emergency access in –

Susan dilucio – we are still running into the same situation with traffic – end of charles river road – difficult to get in and out of there – very congested – I would think it would be a better traffic flow to go out to neelon to village street

Paul – I don't think a traffic study is required for a development this size – if the board decided to make it a condition, they could make it a conditions -

Chan – I want to point out the emergency access would be valuable to you too – this is a provis

Tersa, 8 charles river road – it is wonderful to have an emergency access – but it wont do us any good - this will impact my household and the others at the end of the street – we see it on a regular basis everyday – it would be nnice to have traffic diverted from our area

John – given the width of the right of way and the existing pavemtn on neelon lane, it is not a street that is easily passible with 2 cars – if you try to make that the main entrance to the site, it would be too difficult – conflicting traffic movemnts – it could not possibly be the main access to the site – but on an emergency basis it could be an entrance or escape route - there just isn't room to make neelon sider

Teresa, 8 charles river – make Cherokee in and neelon out – no one wants to make either of them 2 ways – how can Cherokee handle this??

Karyl – I think that would be one of htemajor issues to discuss – maybe there are 3 major topics to discuss – I would consider they look at one way route – charles river road is a disaster in terms of traffic at this point – the second issue is a density issue and the third is the water condition –



that we will consider – I did want to say that the LA made a good presentation about the site and using existing conditions and we appreciate that

Andy – have you spoke to Charles River Watershed? Gino, is it required?

5 chalres – the ryans – we are on the corner lot at Cherokee lane – the water comes down – our neighbor behind us had done considerable digging to put in pipes tohandle drainge – the catch basin for the water would

andy – anything that they change or do has to meet our standards so it is in strict compoliance

ryans – fyi – you need to understand – I would like to have you explain why you aren't taking care of the how Cherokee road is – what are you going to do? my driveway is 14 feet wide – I want to know that I will have enough room to park -

karop – how far off the right of way is your house

ryan- if you took any my land

andy – you might want to have your lot surveyd, you will see where the right of way is – if part of your driveway

ryan – then that is a safety hazard to my household

karyl – that may not be your proerty

andy – we can't stop someone from developing their proerty – we regulate it and controlit within our bylaws and rules and regs for standards – we have to take into consideration all these things – this developer has come in with an OSRD proposal because we encouraged them to do this as it would have less ipact on the community

andy – we need to continue the public hearing –

john – what would occur between now and then?

Paul - given the soil testing,you need to consider how you are going to address the volume issues

John – the woods that are there now, the topsoil and subsoil absorbs a lot of water – typically quite a bit of water will go into the ground – with this development we will collect the water into a detention basin and will release it gradually – we can design a swale to keep stuff form going in her direction – the street will collect runoff and then direct it to the detention pond – what I need to know, when we come back, we can bring certain things to you –

Andy – as soon as you can get anything to them the better – they need 2 weeks – also the perc tests that you weren't able to get done – will you be redoing them – I doubt we will be able to do until September – we aren't going to get a good rate –

Paul – you have gotten a lot of feedback so you have an idea of what type of

Paul – addressing the drainage on Cherokee, you need to come up with a proposal for how you will handle this.

John – the Ryans are the most restricted lot – it puts it right at our doorstep

Ryan – why should you make money off of me – you are ruining my house value –

John – maybe there is something I can do to explore

Bob – I would be interested in some more information on how you plan to handle the detention pond

John – Gino had suggested a parcel for a possible road extension

Andy – There are clearly some issues here . . . if you can get some engineering submitted - I am sorry we don't have time to deal with this tonight

Karyl – I am concerned if you start getting aggressive with swales I think we would look very negatively on that –

John – it can be done discreetly –

Andy – is it possible that you could get to us a copy of your plot plan? We want to understand the situation

Ryan – do you ever do walkarounds

Andy –

July 25, 2006 at 8:15 p.

---

8:55 p.m – River Bend Continuation –

Rich Cornetta  
Jim McCauliffe, Abbott Real Estate  
David Einis, property owner  
John Spink, CONECO Engineering

Eric Alexander joins the meeting

Rich Cornetta – jim mccaullife, mark deschenes could not be present – john spink

We are here tonight with a couple of things that have been continued – if I might propose – we do have the scenic road work permit – there is a draft that we have seen – we would be pleased to address any comments – secondly I would like to report that we had a meeting earlier this week with susy and bob engler on the affordable housing component with the LIP application – and lastly, we do have a couple of letters from VHB consulting engineer with respect to our submittals – we would like to go over those letters and with your permission, we thought it would be very productive – if we could suggest a meeting to sit down with mr. carter and ID how to respond to some of the requests that have been presented – we think it would be -

Paul – end of next week, we can set something up – I would be glad to go through with everything – I think it would make sense to meet, but even after that there is a fair amount of work that has to be done –

Jim – we are going to go through all your comments and come in with the missing material –

Andy- suggests cedar

Andy – rock or split face for the granite –

Susy – no white paint

Jim – OK on all

Motion to approve the scenic road work permit as revised – karyl – second by chan – all yes . . .

---

Paul Carter – john spink responded to our traffic review letter – is there going to be a convenience store? You referenced such.

Jim – no

Paul – are there any other developments that may have an impact that the traffic study should consider – they have studied just their site – is board comfortable

Paul – You are proposing a left turn lane? The traffic study might still show that left turn lane - you aren't proposing – check the traffic study to make sure it doesn't include things that aren't applicable - also need intersection sight distances??

Andy – master condominium documents status?

Rich – we talked with suzy about this – typically we don't submit full condo documents

Jim – usually we do the condo documents 6 months after we close on the sale

Suzy – can you put together something

Andy – status of conversation restriction?

Rich – we have received feedback from Dave Travalini and Town Counsel . . .

Andy – walkway trail plan and design specs

John – I have been talking to jim wieler - I can get prepare something

Susy – disability commission feels these trails have to meet AAB standards . . .

Andy – easements, etc.?

Rich – that is part of the conservation restriction –

Andy – LIP?

Rich – we are working with suzy on that

Karyl – DRC concerned about garage doors

Susy – there is a recommendation from the DRC from Monday night’s meeting – make a part of the record . . .

Susy – waivers status – there is an updated submittal

John – let’s just let that sit until we finish up with VHB

Karyl –

Jim – you want varying - let’s put something something in the permit to that effect

Andy – give them some flexibility –

Andy – We should accept the DRC letter with the caveat that they should vary the garage door styles

Eric – we want some variability but we don’t want to shackle them

Andy – waiver issue – I have a concern that you refer to the drawing set repeatedly – and don’t explain what the variation

Bob – concern about so many waivers on materials and workmanship – setting somebody up for a problem in the future – I do have a big issue on materials – I want you to use standard specs – it is one thing on sight distances,

Paul – I don't think the wording is acceptable – to reference what is shown on the plan

John – what that means to them is that they are going to have to buy under the mass materials system

Paul - but that is the standard – we are talking about gravel specs,

John – those are the standards for when the town is going to accept the street

Andy – I want to understand what you are asking to deviate from . . .

Susy - waiver explanation has to stand on its own . . .

Extend the subdivision for River Bend – Karyl – August 30, 2006 – chan – all in favor – yes

Continue to July 25<sup>th</sup> – 9 pm

-----  
Brief Break . . . 9:45 pm

\*\*\*\*\*

Marian public hearing continuation – ARCPUD and subdivision

Bill Proia  
Bill Drexel  
John Spink  
Rich Coppa

9:47 pm – to start

Andy – I want to ask Karyl to report on the meeting we had so we can get it into the public record – she has notes that were taken by susy - but we haven't approved them but when we do, we will get you a copy – also we asked gino to review the various bylaws and rules and regs

Karyl – june 20<sup>th</sup> – informal – andy and I, gino, paul and Susy - rich coppa, bill Drexel bill proia  
Applicant wanted the PB to provide our recommendation to the ZBA re: the flood plain special permit – got into the road width matter – original proposal was at 16 feet – we considered the 16 foot just isn't a safe solution – we brought the bridge up to 22 feet surface – that sets up a need to evaluate

Andy – it is important to note that the conversation went that way, based on what paul felt vhb could recommend and also the safety officer – but we as a board need to make a determination on the width tonight so they can go forward

Chan – but that conversation has always been permeated by concom's not allowing 22 feet

Karyl – it is not that concomm wont permit, it is that they would prefer – but we came down on the safety issues – jeff Watson felt it could go to 20 feet – we discussed his letter again –

Karyl – we talked about the structure of the bridge quite a bit – it seems as though there wasn't a deduction as to what it should be – if it were smaller, it would be less invasive and less expensive – and with overflows – board needs to decide if the overflow is acceptable

Paul – I think the board had already decided that

Andy – these guys don't want to have to go backwards on the engineering they had already done

Bill proia – we would like to talk a little bit about that more tonight

Karyl- we had some discussions on mitigation – mr. proia suggested we were tying mitigation to waiver requests in a different analysis of the site plan and subdivision rules and regs – he

Bill proia – I summarizd in writing as to how the pieces fit togheter – I don't have the waiver list together yet . . .

Karyl – there may have been a semantics difference of opinion on what design vs. construction meant

Bill proia – I have addressed that in my

Karyl – they also told us that they are going to have to do on-site septic system instead of tying into the claybrook system -

Andy – I asked gino to document the process as it applies to this particular applicant as to what is the procedure based on past practices – I asked him to put it into a document and I asked town counsel to review it – dick concurs with what gino has stated –

Gino – to try to summarize it quickly – essentially, I note that since it is not a subdivision, the subdivision control law re: waivers does not apply – but the zoning law re special permit requires the PB to make findings – also the arcpud rules and regs say that the subdivision rules and regs apply for construction standards – board can require a narrative description onhow the arcpud meets each stnadar – waivers are provided for can be approved only if they determine that the change is in the public interest – the board can rquire the applicant to provide information to make that decision – tht may be similar to our subdivision rules and regs – but not identical

Bill proia – I have a letter to pass out and I would likeyou to pass out to town counsel – I attached my earlier analysis – I don't think we are that far off – I don't think that designing to subdivision standards is part of the regulatory scheme – I would like you to look at the waiver list with the letter – if the town thinks differently, lets try to come to some agreemtn – we don't want to ssay w are drawing a line in the sand – I think thee is common ground

Andy – the point he is making that the

Bill – one of the subdivision design standards is road width – I would say that width is design but the construction standards apply to materials . . . please take a look at the letter – I think there is common ground

Andy – we will read it . . . and there will be a waiver list – I will get it to you over the weekend – we are calling it a variation list – cause that is what arcpcud calls it . . .

Karyl - more discussion from the 6/20 mtg – we did go back to the open space issue – my issues – more open space more buffer for residents along Diane and Kimberlee – that was on the table 2 years ago – it is still the same now – I want you to consider the possibilities of that – we did discuss that the Marians wants to have a 7 unit OSRD in the future – we tried to encourage them to look at that

Andy – you all have a document that they responded to us with regarding this option –

Karyl – the rationale was that they hadn't found anything – they weren't ready to invest in that road extension –

Andy – there were some commitments already made on phase I that couldn't be changed – that land can be switched to OSRD from arcpcud

Andy – I would like to try to ask the board – is there a concern about putting some kind of time frame on the applicant for submitting the engineering to get this moving to a conclusion – is there a feeling of the board on that

John – I feel we need to decide some things – we need to decide some things – we are going back and forth trying to feel each

Eric – I feel like we have been receiving information on a piecemeal basis

Andy – if we can take and knock off some key issues such as bridge width or any other key decisions that you need that will enable you to finalize your design

Chan – there appears to be a waterway opening measure

Paul – those bridge designs are based on not allowing the 100 year storm to overflow . . . . width relates to the traffic control issue too – my understanding is the only proposal we have is to not have the 100 year go over the road

Chan – we seem to change parameters – so now you are saying

Paul – what are they proposing at this point?

Andy – in order to get this in a more forward progression – Paul has agreed to work with these guys on a collaborative basis to resolve whatever the outstanding drainage issues

Paul – they gave us plans, we reviewed them, bill Drexel has met with Bethany – he has a couple of issues he wants to discuss before he finalizes the plans – we can go over all the other comments at the same time – we will be glad to go forward in that way. We don't want any misunderstanding as to what needs to be done – we can't do an interactive – we need a paper trail and documentation – it is not efficient for the board – we need to submit our comments to the board – but we are more than willing to sit down with the engineer and address the comments

Bob tucker – hasn't this been going on for quite some time – it almost sounds we are helping them design this project – I don't think we are in that business – they know the regs and it is their job to put together

Chan – the concomm set a size limit on the bridge

Christine price, - I am horribly remiss to say thank you for being so open minded about the bridge – I found it to be a heartening experience – better interaction between our boards – I guess just to recap, our responsibility under the wetlands protection act is to permit access or disturbance as minimally as possible – we could effectively deny this whole project with anything more than a 16 foot bridge – the board still believes a 16 foot bridge is doable – taking into account all the information – we would like to hear from VHB a brief summary – there are other very narrow bridges in our nearby communities that operate very successfully indicates to us that being open minded something we can do – ELM BANK on fathers day close to 2000 people and hundred of cars – I have to believe personally that if that can happen – status quo is a very comfortable place to be to regress to – I think we can do better – with reference to water going over the bridge – if we keep the bridge at a lower level, I just ask who among us who has not driven through such kind of water – you know that we are passionate about 16 foot bridge – we think it would be safer – it doesn't need a motorway – I would like to ask VHB as well – has VHB in recent years been involved with any such size bridge –

Paul carter – our problem is with the one way traffic signal – that is what we don't recommend – there is no justification for such an arrangement in the uniform code of traffic – usually only used for temporary construction situations – in this case, in permanent conditions, the long distances would entice drivers to believe the signal is not operating –

Paul – if the pb or the zba wants to make that decision, that is theirs to make

Chan – I spent my whole career in highway design business – this is going to be an entirely private road, it is not going to be a public street – I believe we take VHB's recommendation and the board can still do anything we want to – my recommendation would be to agree with the concomm. I have seen a place right here in Holliston that has more traffic – I am prepared to approve the original idea of the concomm for 16 feet but raising the road so it doesn't flood. I don't mind being one of 5 voting

Christine – if the traffic signals give a false sense of security, why not eliminate traffic signals? It works – why would it not work? Help me understand



Paul – we would recommend the 22 feet – the safety officer is OK going down to 20 feet -

Christine – have vhb ever been in a position of recommending a 16 foot road

Paul – I am not aware of

Christine – so status quo is the case here – we have examples around here – this area would have to be treated with respect – if there has never been an accident

Susy – can you verify that

Eric – I appreciate concerns regarding reasonability and passion in advocating for the 16 foot bridge – both of the examples are not applicable – Elm Bank is a much shorter bridge – I have been there and it creates a traffic mess out on route 16 as well – it is not a perfectly analogous situation either way – I don't think we can look at this situation we are reviewing and find a useful nearby analogy – that is why I think we are so reliant on vhb on their guidance

Christine – it would seem that the ones we have locally are not analogous – they are worse – are you likely to have 300 cars

Eric – the Elm Bank bridge is much shorter

Bill Drexel – we revised the plan when we changed the bridge to 16 feet – length is 150 to 175 feet -

Eric – there is still a huge difference

Bill – straight shot, no curves, visibility is there –

Eric – there was a new situation – at the last meeting, it became apparent that there is an intersection

Andy – and there is a public parking area on the other side of the bridge for viewing the statuary

Bill Drexel – we have the signals at either end of the 150 foot stretch – now only 2 signal heads now – we have a decent queuing length between the stop bar and the stop sign – we expect traffic from within the site coming out – doesn't need a long queue for that – the parking lot is before the residential area – I have seen these permanent signals in other places – I don't have any problem with safety here – I wouldn't recommend it if I didn't feel it was safe – the Uniform Manual does allow for judgement – the manual is not gospel – there is always room for engineering judgments – we have shortened it up to 150 feet or so . . . not affecting the residences – the problem we might have with concerns is that there is an existing trail there now, we want to stay within that – the thing I don't want to see happen, we don't want to be caught between commissions and boards – we want to keep our road in the cart path area –

Karyl – with spillage, what length would you need?

Bill Drexel – I don't know but it would shorten the bridge length - 3-4 inches of water in the 100 year storm – the duration of that spill, we can get a good sense of the time

John – what about velocity?

Bill Drexel – if we have the 16 foot width, we can accommodate conseration, if we go to 22 feet, we need something we cancount on

Andy – it could be that the bridge can be built in another way

Bill Drexel – cost is not the problem here –

Andy – could a span be made without impoacting the wetlands at all

Paul – you could bridge the whole thing

Chan – you are not putting in an efficient bridge, you are putting in an economical one –

Bill Drexel – the bridge we are designing is an open bottom culvert

Chan – this is a private community, I feel the government has no place in trying to regulate

John – may I ask one quwstion – is this not open to thepublic – does the public have th ability to cross the bridge?

Bill Drexel – the portion of the road that the public is invited to is 22 feet

Andy – do we want to make a motion to advise the applicant in a particular direction . . . so paul can give us a reasonable estimation of time

Paul – I cant estimate how long it should take – every design issue we make progress and then we go back

Karyl – going back to the 16 foot road – if it was a better bridge,itmight work – thekiller was the inadequate construction of the brige and the fact that it was so long – made it to me in my mind unsafe –

Bill Drexel – you are talking about the length of the 16 foot area – the width of the roadway is 16 feet but the length of the bridge is 30 feet and then there are a series of culverts on each side and those are deisnge dto regulate the flow

Chan – you could do a bridge with 3 30 foot spans –

Bill Drexel – we are caught between boards – concom wants 16 – the existing path is 18 feet – you want 22 feet that creates more impoact

Bill – we are trying to appease everybody here – going back and forth

Paul – you are proposing 150-175 long at 16 feet wide

Chan – I understand the cost would be tremendously increased –

Andy – if we are to draw some compromise, build the bridge the way it should be

Christine – final comment, democracy is good, - debate is good – I do applaud everyone's open mindedness – there is a compromise out there somewhere

John – I feel I should say to you – I drove up to elm bank – I did try it and I had to back up - there may be some people who can't read, everyone isn't courteous – I cannot say YES to a one way bridge – and it can't be such that it floods – that is where I stand – I really tried, I wanted to minimize the impact on your costs and the environment – I don't think we can compromise the safety issue

Eric – I echo what he says

Karyl – ditto

Bob Tucker – when it comes to having water going over any bridge – if somebody was to have a medical emergency or fire in the development -

Bill Proia – fire department has OK this up.

Chan – religious community has exemptions from zoning in this state – you are a controlled community

Andy – Gino, is this an exempt

Gino – no

Andy – I don't think religion has any place in the discussion at all - the public has the ability to access this and to visit the statuary either for religious purpose or study – we have a responsibility to make sure it is safe – our engineer can't recommend it – you may put a stamp on it, if the town is involved in some type of litigation – we have a duty to act in the best interest of the town –

Bill Drexel – this is a private community – I feel I can put my stamp on this – visibility is there – straight shot – you can see cars from both directions –

Gino – Christine was talking about compromise – the other day, the safety officer said OK at 20 feet – Marian said it wasn't worth going to 20 feet –

Bill Drexel – whatever you have for roadway length, there is additional culvert length

Andy – the fact tht we spent so much time onthis issue shows we are trying to collaborate - you need to go to concom and work on a design that impacts

Bill Drexel – what

Eric – motion that stipulates the PB would support a roadway width of 20 feet face of berm to face of berm without any flooding – karyl – 5 yes . . .

Andy – the applicant had made a reference that the building department controls the structure, we control the width – I spoke with Bob Speroni

Andy – we would suggest that you go to design review committee to work on the design of the bridge – make sure it is a good looking bridge

Andy – so you will get together with Paul carter – it had been my hope that we would talk about some mitigation issues – what are the issues that needs to be mitigated – what are the things that are going to impact the town – for example, there are x number of units going in and that puts us behind in meeting affordable housing goasl – I would like the board to identify what other issues

1. senior center
2. fire department – alarm system
3. increased in ambulance runs, due to higher statistics

bill proia – how are those paid for now?

Andy – there is a shortfall in what they are allowed to bill for so the town is constantly underwriting

Bill proia – the impact has to be particularized to our development –

Andy – there could be

Bill proia – quantify it and give it to us and we can respond to

Bill – just a comment on the affordable housing –

Andy – eric, can you put some calculations – w

Eric – yes, we can do something – eric, andy,

Bill proai – another request, we already made our case in writing for the sernior center- I would ask that you have town counsel review our original letter

Bill – we have agreed to voluntary mitigation in the past – we will evaluate your proposal

Bill – it is our analysis that the board cannot impose any requirements for mitigation

Susy – I am hearing that they want us to propose a mitigation

Bill – the courts have said it is the town’s responsibility to identify the impacts -

Karyl – he is asking

Eric – they will respond to our proposal

Bill – the courts have said the town should put the impacts together and let us know

Karyl –another comment, we have not had the opportunity to have legal services sit here with us, we are here guessing what our rights are – and I am not so sure that – we have had the benefit of the applicant’s attorney – we have never had legal representation here – it is high time that we have

Bill Proia – we offered if the town was having trouble paying for legal counsel – it is a consultanting service

Andy – I have a meeting with Suzanne to discuss this exact matter so we can have counsel represent us . .

Andy – do you have enough information to move forward –

Bill – karyl mentioned that there needs to be a new septic design – I would like bill Drexel to speak to this . . .

Bill drexel – we put together a conceptual plan for septic facilities to keep out of resource areas – we are proposing to use a system approved by DEP called PRESBY septic system we discussed with board of health and brought in a sample – to keep them apprised of the situation – I have about 5 different areas that are going to be gravity fed or pumped to a septic system – they can be shaped or curved to fit an area – they function very well – they have had a number of systems in place – approved by DEP for use in Massachusetts – what I have shown is the area that would be needed to comply with title 5 –

Andy – you will show your wells too

Bill Drexel – yes, we have to – wells that will supply groups of homes for 24 people or less – we will keep those far enough away from the septic systems

Andy – your time frame for all this

Bill Drexel – I will have to get back to you – I need a bit more info from PRESBY before I can

Chan – is this a package plant

Bill – each unit has a septic tank and gravity to a soil absorption/leechfield - we need to reconfigure the pipes to flow to a leechfield or a pump chamber –

Karyl – in implementing this, aren't they invasive in the buffer zones here?

Bill – we want to not increase disturbance

Andy – my concern is the time associated with coming up with this design – this appears to be massive to me – this is a lot of work – what type of time frame can we expect on this?

John Spink – this doesn't really effect anything – the septic and wells will go to the board of health

Paul – it all just needs to be shown so it doesn't conflict with drainage and roads

Andy – BOH wants us to incorporate conditions – we don't want to approve a drainage system that

Eric – BOH has to resolve its issues before we can handle this

Bill Drexel – if the wells and septic are shown

Andy – I want to know where the leechfields are going to go

Bill – yes – I don't have all the minute

Bill proia – can we leave that to the engineers to figure out

Paul – I would suggest it would be what is normally shown with subdivisions and site plans – you want to keep the differentiation between what one board approves and another

Paul – you need to size the fields so you don't want to have to come back

Bill – I will not be giving you the details that I need to give the BOH – I will give you a plan view so you know there is no conflict –

Andy – and you will show the wells as well.

Bill proia – one last request . . . – we still have to get paul the information on the flood plain analysis – could you appoint a subcommittee

SUSY – Tuesday, AUGUST 8<sup>TH</sup> 7:35 PM - continuation . . .

Rich – can we do more of these informal meetings

Andy – we did that to get us out of rut . . . we cant do it repeatedly . . .

-----  
11:30 p.m.

Pine Ridge Certificate of Action

Restuarnt 45 – awaiting written agreement from town – to be praped by

Karyl – motion to endorse plans with that oustanidn item – all yes

\*\*\*\*\*

LID Rules and Regs –

Paul – I took the input from the 5/16 meeting and added in some language changes after that –

Andy – let’s schedule the public hearing to adopt these – September . . .

Specifically invite developers to the public hearing and the engineering community

\*\*\*\*\*

CO Estimates –

Applegate Farm – Karyl -, john - \$16,315.95 –

Pine Ridge – Karyl – 9610.65 – kkaryl and John all yes

-----  
CO Report on ICE

Andy – we don’t have a procedure for how to deal with neighbor complaints – susy talked to Paul about sitting down with us on how to handle

Paul Yorkis – you may want to invite bob speroni to participate in this way

Paul Carter –

Andy – it would be good

-----  
Applegate Farm Decision

Yes

\*\*\*\*\*

formal appointment – john to appoint Rachel walsh to the DRC – seconded by chan – all yes  
Karyl recuse -

---

Motion to pay VHB – hartney acres ii – all yes –

Motion to

---

Bob Potheau – requested another extension for

Motion to extend deadline – conditioned on cleaning up asphalt materials that are dumped in front of property - karyl, chan –

All yes

\*\*\*\*\*

Grapevine Bond closure

John – motion to close the bond account – and refund the balance of the CO – seconded by chan – all yes . . .

---

VHB – Smart Growth Grant - \$2,300 – karyl, john – all yes

VHB 12,535.67 – chan , karyl -0 all yes

Katie – karyl, andy - \$ 48.93

---

CVS – request to release bond

Trellis design – look very chintzy –

Won't vote until the trellis stuff is done . .

---

Board signed plans for The Haven –

Motion to adjourn – karyl, chan –

All yes



1:10 am –