

**Planning & Economic Development Board Meeting**  
Sanford Hall, 155 Village Street  
June 9, 2009

PRESENT: Bob Tucker; Tom Gay; Karyl Spiller-Walsh; John Williams

ALSO PRESENT: Susy Affleck-Childs, Planning Board Assistant  
Gino Carlucci, PGC Associates  
Dave Pellegri, Tetra Tech Rizzo

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 pm by Vice Chairman Bob Tucker.

Bob Tucker – Andy Rodenhiser is running late and will be here soon; Chan will be joining us later. He is at the MAPC annual meeting.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS** – None

**Northeastern University Economic Development Partnership Program**

Susy Affleck-Childs – At the June 2, 2009 meeting of the newly organizing Economic Development Committee, Marc Horne of Northeastern University’s Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy gave a presentation about Northeastern’s municipal Economic Development Partnership Program. The group was impressed with this Community Self-Assessment Program and believes this would be an excellent activity for the Town to undertake to help the new EDC as it become organized and develops its focus. The Committee voted to request and recommend that the Planning and Economic Development Board spend \$5,000 in fiscal year 09 funds to participate in this program. This is a one-time fee. \$4,000 is available from the remaining IDC funds. \$1,000 would be needed from the Planning Board’s contracted services line item which presently has a balance of \$4,600.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – How effective do you think this would be as a point of departure for the EDC considering the costs?

Gino Carlucci – One is the process; it is an organizing mechanism to gather the info. It does provide the comparative analysis, which is also educational, about the types of things the town needs to do to be considered more attractive for investment. It is especially valuable as there is a new EDC to create a basis for actions.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Sort of a Planning Board primer for the EDC.

Bob Tucker – It would also be a useful tool for all the individual departments, not just the PB and EDC—that would benefit from this. Also various boards that provide input.

Gino Carlucci – You stay in the program. You can get a new assessment.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – It gives you a comparison on what basis?

Gino Carlucci – You can ask for a comparison with just a few towns or for the entire data base.

John Williams – I was at the EDC meeting when they did the presentation. What Gino Carlucci says is important – using the data base to help us organize Medway’s presentation to potential developers – also as a primer to the new EDC – it would be a supporting mechanism – I see it as a step in a long process to help us get where we need to be.

Bob Tucker – Is there a motion?

Tom Gay – What is needed?

Tom Gay – I would support this. I move that we fund this with \$4,000 from IDC and \$1,000 from PB.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Second.

The motioned passed unanimously.

### **Franklin Creek Subdivision Modification**

Marko Vajentic, Woodstructure Construction, Inc

A motion was made to waive the reading of the Public Hearing notice by Tom Gay, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh. The motion passed unanimously. The public hearing notice is attached.

Bob Tucker – We can dive into this.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Is this an actual modification?

Marko Vajentic – We are looking to extend it by a year.

Susy Affleck-Childs – You could vote to waive the length of time and allow for more time if you wish to.

Marko Vajentic – It would help to have some more time.

Tom Gay – We had a fairly extensive discussion about other subdivisions with the issues going on over the last couple of meetings. I am kind of pretty disposed to say we should go by the ordinance (regs) as it provides. I would be more comfortable doing that, and then look at addressing the regs.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I see a short list of issues that really need to be addressed (with the regs) – There are a lot of loose ends. This is a mess.

Andy Rodenhiser – Maybe we should have a public hearing on those top 10. Susy, would you put that together, please? Your recommendations are pretty valuable. You are constantly bumping your head up against these problems.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – And set aside a little bit of time to discuss those.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I recommend June 30, 2010 as a new deadline.

Dave Pellegrini – I prepared a status report for you based on my 5/29 inspection. They added a perimeter drain with a little pump as specified by the building inspector. It is all pretty straightforward. He had mentioned that he might want to eliminate a retaining wall. He had his engineer look at it, and they decided not to. There were some problems with locations of some of the site utilities. No stubs were identifiable. I tried to help. Marko Vajentic had his new contractor find them.

Motion by Tom Gay, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh to extend the completion deadline for the Franklin Creek Subdivision to June 30, 2010. The motion passed.

### **Street Acceptance Discussion**

Andy Rodenhiser – Susy Affleck-Childs and I went to the BOS meeting with Barbara Saint André. What I am taking away is that they want us to weed thru the issues street by street and come up with a recommendation based on the facts of what we see knowing there is a diversity of issues on each one. They were pleased we weeded thru what we did on Ishmael Coffee Estates. They did vote to support street acceptance at town meeting.

Susy Affleck-Childs – The Town Administrator informed me that the Conservation Commission had communicated with her in writing that ConCom is opposed to the acceptance of the streets due to their on-going concerns about the vernal pool on Parcel D. However, there is a superseding order of conditions and a certificate of compliance from Mass DEP.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – What does it mean? Is there a conflict with the Medway ConCom and the state?

Bob Tucker – Yes. That is where the issue is.

John Williams – If there is a question on giving away leverage, I would want them to comment on the severity of the issue. We all represent the same people. We should give them (ConCom) the opportunity and to communicate with us and if we can help them we should.

Bob Tucker – The ConCom is in disagreement with the state's determination.

Andy Rodenhiser – They lost their appeal.

Andy Rodenhiser – I am told it is functioning.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – What happened to the original discussion about the fact that the vernal pool was a man made vernal pool initially.

Andy Rodenhiser – I think we have done everything we can to be amicable to ConCom.

Bob Tucker – I don't see why we need to hold them hostage as well. We have \$20,000 in the bond account.

John Williams – I am thinking back to the Economic Development Partnership presentation we went thru. One of the things we talked about is how professional the permitting process is in the town. I think we have to make an effort to outreach to the other boards. We are going to need cooperation and help from the other boards. What have we done to reach out to ConCom? How can we throw our support to them? It sounds like we are not fully engaged with them.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – We have an excellent rapport with ConCom in a lot of different manners. This might be the very first in an extremely long time when there has been a hiccup. It is a procedural problem we have now. Do we follow a state mandate, or are we missing something? Up to now we have had an amazingly excellent rapport. I think we are missing a link

Andy Rodenhiser – This has been going on for several years. My personal feeling as a member of this board is that we have to have respect for the others boards, but we don't have to do everything in lock step. I don't happen to share the same opinion always on what should be done. If there are procedural issues they should be doing everything they can. In this instance we have reached out to them, and we agreed to hold back \$ 20,000 for the vernal pool.

Tom Gay – There have been multiple reports on the progress on this.

Andy Rodenhiser – There are 3 other lots that are yet to be developed, and ConCom won't sign off on those lots because of this issue. They are inflicting a lot of pain on this developer. That is their jurisdiction, but I think they are using the leverage.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – We don't want to get into that stuff. I am trying to see how we can aid and abet ConCom. I don't know if we can or should

Bob Tucker – I think we have done what we can. They have got the courts that they are working with.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – The process is almost completed.

A motion was made by Bob Tucker, seconded by Tom Gay to recommend street acceptance for Independence Lane and Freedom Trail in the Ishmael Coffee Estates subdivision. The motion was approved unanimously.

### **Birch Hill** Subdivision

Susy Affleck-Childs – I have reviewed the file. There is a list of things we require for street acceptance that they have not provided. She (Ellen Rosenfeld) has worked really hard to get the deeds, but it is not quite complete. This is one that we will probably have to do by eminent domain.

Andy Rodenhiser – What we might need is some more discussion.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I think there is an ambiguity here.

Susy Affleck-Childs – The checklist is a reminder of what they need to provide. WE don't have signoffs from the other town boards/departments; no proof that taxes are paid, etc.

Andy Rodenhiser – Her argument was that we can't hold back on the bond reduction because of street.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – When she started the subdivision, none of this was a procedure or policy at that time. I know she had a modification, and that gave us some more leeway. It is a complicated.

Andy Rodenhiser – When you make a modification, you fall under the new rules.

A motion was made by Bob Tucker and seconded by Tom Gay to not recommend street acceptance at this time for portions of Ivy Lane Hunter Lane The motion was approved - 3 yes and 1 abstain (Karyl Spiller-Walsh).

### **The Meadows Street acceptance**

A motion was made by Bob Tucker seconded by Tom Gay to not accept these streets (Cardinal Circle and Goldenrod Drive). The motion passed unanimously.

Chan Rogers arrives – 7:45 p.m.

### **Daniels Village ARCPUD Public Hearing Continuation**

Jim Williamson – Barberry Homes

Andy Rodenhiser – You are of the opinion that you don't have to pay any funds into the plan review consultant fund, and I guess the board would like to hear some justification, because certainly we need to get a consultant to get information relative to information you are going to present to support whatever outcome is needed.

Jim Williamson – Our position is we have made no changes to the plan. It was extensively reviewed before by the Planning Board, the Design Review Committee, ConCom, the Department of Environmental Protection, and National Heritage. We spent approximately \$250,000, and there are no changes to the plan.

Andy Rodenhiser – Didn't you appeal the decision?

Jim Williamson – We appealed it in regard to one condition – re money to senior citizen. If you look at the court filing, we only had one objection to the one condition re: senior citizen center. I believe the judge found it wasn't legal to require us to make the donation and sent it back.

Andy Rodenhiser – They remanded the decision.

Jim Williamson – I guess it is up to you how you want to handle it.

Bob Tucker – And I think we have very clearly sent our opinion on that to you.

Andy Rodenhiser – You are refusing to pay?

Jim Williamson – I think the board could go ahead and approve this if you want to end this. Amend the decision and take out that single condition.

Andy Rodenhiser – On what basis?

Jim Williamson – Because it is illegal.

Andy Rodenhiser – I don't think your interpretation is shared by the majority of the board. We are okay with what the judge decided. I think the remand means it comes back, and we have to vet the project again.

Jim Williamson – It comes back to you for whatever action you feel is appropriate. I don't disagree that you don't have the right to do what you want.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – In reflecting back on Daniels Village and the discussion about larger and smaller, some good and some fair, there were some decisions along the way that I personally feel were some compromises, with the understanding that there would be a donation to the senior center. We thought it was a generous compromise to some of the things we had asked for. So, in reviewing the plan again, so if there is no contribution, there may be some changes to the plan that to take place in lieu of the donation. We may need to go back and revisit these issues.

Andy Rodenhiser – You came back with a list of issues that you were whining about that were too expensive and you asked for breaks on other things, and you got them. Senior center payment but no granite curbs. The DRC is saying it was a collaboration. The judge noted that there was not testimony that was offered about the impact of the development on the senior center. If we can provide that, we might put the condition back in there – the judge might see that.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Are you open minded to gift something to the senior center and boost some other things without going thru any engineering changes?

Bob Tucker – The court vacated the decision, and that means you start from scratch. We do have new members on the board. I would not expect them to not want to go thru the same process we went thru the first time. I understand there are costs. That is the risk you take when you go to court.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Let's ask it again. It isn't the same situation. We have an existing plan that has an intensive amount of minutes and a clearly well engineered plan and process and a very nice presentation by Jim Williamson about the open space and the sensitivity to reduce the numbers to preserve the vista. That is all in the planning. You have a very advanced starting point.

Jim Williamson – I do have the boards with me. I can make a presentation.

Susy Affleck-Childs – The judge could have thrown out the one condition, but judge vacated whole decision and remanded it back to the board for reconsideration.

Andy Rodenhiser – Without having the benefit of our consultants here to evaluate the plan, relative to the senior center analysis, how do we proceed?

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – That is one arm of the development plan that I wasn't really talking about. I was talking about density.

Tom Gay – As one of the new guys, it is more basic. We are now 2-3-4 years down the line. Things have changed. Maybe we cannot hold him to changes in rules and regs, but certainly conditions in the town have changed. We have a new engineer who has not even seen this. There are new people on this board, and personally I trust the board and developer had some in-depth negotiations and arrived at some decisions, but because this has been turned back there are questions about the negotiations on both sides. I don't think it is a whole lot to have \$2,500 be put in an account to sit and be available. I can't see wasting any more time.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I need you to take a formal vote on assessing plan review fees for outside consultants.

Andy Rodenhiser – Didn't we do this before?

Susy Affleck-Childs – You discussed and agreed and did everything but vote. You need to take a formal vote on this matter.

A motion was made by Bob Tucker, seconded by John Williams to assess the minimum \$2,500 plan review fee as a deposit toward the cost of outside consultants.

#### Discussion

Karyl Spiller-Walsh - It is a catch 22. The developer is not changing anything on the plan that had an approval.

John Williams – This is a special permit process. I suspect how they arrived at the number of units and contributions to the senior center were based on a give and take. There was a negotiation. Part of that was a promise to make a contribution.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – That is not the right assumption.

Andy Rodenhiser – I asked Jim if he was OK with the senior center payment and he said yes. Then he said no and he recanted.

John Williams – All that is part of what went into the decision. I think that could result in a different design on the property.

Bob Tucker – It is a brand new hearing.

John Williams – To remove that one condition it ruins the entire integrity of the decision.

Andy Rodenhiser – That risk was with them when they appealed it.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – In the very beginning, in the ARCPUD rules and regs, an option is provided for a retail and community center. Jim explained that when the numbers get under 100 units, it is not profitable to include such a center. He agreed to make the contribution in lieu of making the community center on site.

Andy Rodenhiser – The difficulty is that we don't have the ability to pay for a professional to validate what Jim has stated about the on-site community center.

Tom Gay – I agree with all of you. But it is a little more basic. We are reopening this thing. We need to go thru the process. We are all dedicated to the idea of not running thru money. I don't think there is any danger. I have spent a lot of time and reading thru the minutes. We are 3 years down the line here. There are conditions that have changed in the town. I just think it is good business. You claim you have already spent \$250,000. I don't think it is a lot to put \$2,500 into the (plan review) account.

Bob Tucker – We also know more now than we did then.

Jim Williamson – Are you expecting that that would be the maximum that would be charged?

Susy Affleck-Childs – No. That is a deposit.

Bob Tucker – That must have been a risk you evaluated when you decided to go to court.

Jim Williamson – It was reviewed the first time, it hasn't been changed. We did calculations. You had a very good consultant. You can go two ways – start from scratch or just take the condition out. It would be helpful to me if you want to send me a letter explaining how you anticipate the review process to proceed and what you anticipate. Do you anticipate redoing the drainage calculations?

Andy Rodenhiser – Yes. If a community center is built instead of a contribution to the senior center. You might lose units, and you might need a parking lot.

Jim Williamson – Do you think we will need to do another traffic study? This is what bothers me. If I knew it was just \$2500, that is one thing, but we don't know.

Bob Tucker – That is a risk that you take.

Jim Williamson – If you want me to do a quick overview of the site plan, I can do that.

Bob Tucker – There is a motion on the floor.

The motion was approved unanimously.



Andy Rodenhiser – Might I suggest we continue this to next Tuesday night. That would give him an opportunity to respond to the vote, and probably talk with his employer. We all need to be in on this. It will be a special meeting on June 16<sup>th</sup>.

John Williams – I am available for the next 2 Tuesdays, then a two week absence.

Andy Rodenhiser – I will be gone the first week of July after the holiday.

Jim Williamson – You are not holding me up.

Chan – I am here.

Tom Gay – OK

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I am saying it is okay, I think so.

Special meeting – Tuesday, June 16 at 7 pm – at the Senior Center to continue this public hearing.

Jim Williamson – Thank you very much.

### **Speroni Acres Subdivision – Status Report**

Fred Geisel, engineer

Lou Caccavaro, attorney

Lou Caccavaro – When we were here last, Mark Louro had expressed his concerns about drainage. I would like our new professional to explain his work and inspections and calculations. We are looking to identify what is on the ground and how that compares to what was approved and then to discuss how to proceed? Plan modifications perhaps?

Fred Geisel – We surveyed in detail – 50-60 shots on each detention pond. We looked at everything to get a clear picture. We have done some preliminary calculations.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Do you have a map to show us?

Fred Geisel – **Pond/Basin #3** is between lots 2 and 3 (between 4 and 6 Little Tree Road). In terms of capacity, it is in good shape. It doesn't have a lot of water coming into it. There is a low point right after the forebay which is fairly large and deep. There is a little standing water sitting there. There is evidence of some water. It is constructed pretty much to the dimensions it was supposed to. It is within the easement. The banks were done steeper than designed so it is wider at the base than it needs to be. It is deeper than it needed to be. If the board felt necessary we could fill in the low area so there wouldn't be standing water. If you are going to have a low point, it should be near the outlet.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – How close is that to the house?

Fred Geisel – The edge of the pond at the top of the bank is about 20 feet to the building foundation.

Andy Rodenhiser – The Haineys are to the left of the pond.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Let's get rid of that standing water.

John Williams – Is there any chance the inlet is?? Is this a permanent solution?

Fred Geisel – It is a low spot. We could raise the grade so that the water wouldn't stand – we could lessen the slope or push it off into the basin so that the slope would be lessened – the neighbors have planted forsythia and other shrubbery around the basin so it - it was probably over designed.

Donna Hainey – Absolutely I would like to see these changes. I can't go outside at night because of the bugs.

Robert Hainey – I would like to see 3 foot drain pipes all the way across.

Fred Geisel – The forebay is well constructed and it has rip rap on the down stream side, and it slows the water down but lets the water go thru.

Bob Tucker – Can I go there to look?

Donna Hainey – Yes.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – What would you do to landscape it?

Fred Geisel – Fill in and re-grade inside the basin. That would make it work better, and still be in keeping.

Andy Rodenhiser – Is there sufficient capacity in the other basins?

Fred Geisel – **Pond/Basin # 1** is between lots # 5 and 6 (between 10 -12 Little Tree Road). That was basically constructed according to the original plan – same shape and location. The top of the bank is right on the easement line. There could possibly be an issue there. We may need a slope easement. We could work on that. It seems to be just a minor area where the basin was built. There is no issue on the other side of the basin. The forebay in this case is not as deep or as wide as it was supposed to be. It needs to be dug out deeper. There is a rip rap slope. There is not enough holding capacity in this. There is no place for it to settle out. That needs to be done.

Bob Tucker – What type of depth?

Fred Geisel – 2.5 to 3 feet more. Some is siltation that occurred after construction. It filled up pretty quickly. The detention pond itself seems to be pretty good. One part was built lower than designed. We may need to add some fill toward the inside. There might be a slope easement needed - minor bit of filling inside. We might be able to do it internally and gain some height.

Andy Rodenhiser – Is there adequate access for maintenance if we have a narrow top?

Fred Geisel – There is access – room around the side also. We may need a temporary construction easement to get trucks down there.

Bob Tucker – Any standing water issues?

Fred Geisel – I have been out there 2 times with no standing water issues. There are some shrubs growing up on the sides. We would clean out while we were doing work on the basin.

Fred Geisel - **Pond/Basin #2** is at end of Little Tree Road between lots 8 and 9 (15 and 17 Little Tree Road). This is NOT where it was originally proposed. The issue I have been told is that the wetlands were closer than they were shown to be on the plan. I was told the ConCom told them to move the detention basin, so they did. They just slid it up the hill. It is the same shape but the forebay has been completely moved. I am not sure why. When we go back to the as-built it shows a PVC force main for the sewer going right thru here. If it is in the way, it can be moved.

Bob Tucker – It is a force main.

Fred Geisel – Yes, it goes along the back of the lots

Andy Rodenhiser – So there is no piping under pressure in the public way.

Fred Geisel – Right, the town doesn't want that.

Bob Tucker – Is there an association to maintain the sewer line?

Donna Hainey – No.

Andy Rodenhiser – If that pump chamber is not being maintained . . .

Fred Geisel – Each person is responsible for their own, and the rest is a PVC force main.

Lou Caccavaro – The line within the easement is for the benefit of all.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – The original design was 2-3 times the size of this as-built plan.

Andy Rodenhiser – You have reviewed the drainage calculations with Mark?

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – They should have replicated the wetlands and moved the detention pond to the house lot.

Andy Rodenhiser – Have you computed the drainage?

Fred Geisel – What I have looked at is not what was originally designed, they added another detention pond (#3) at the beginning of Little Tree Road (instead of installing a cul-de-sac at the end of the roadway). That pond was designed for more capacity than what was really needed. We need more capacity at pond #2.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Where are you going to put it?

Fred Geisel – There is some room to work. We could build on the inside. It is a fairly steep slope.

Chan Rogers – It is very precipitous.

Fred Geisel – Steep but negotiable and stable. We could lessen the slope. We might be able to add capacity on the back/outside.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Refresh me. What is in the cul-de-sac? Is it just paved? What is the diameter?

Fred Geisel – The paved diameter is 100 feet.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – What is roadway width?

Fred Geisel – 28 feet paved width.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Is there any room in the center of the cul-de-sac to put in some drainage and take out the pavement?

Dave Pellegrini – Like a rain garden?

John Williams – I am concerned about being far enough away from the wetlands.

Fred Geisel – I am a wetlands scientist also. We will have to go to ConCom. The old Order of Conditions is long expired.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – Isn't it that you are probably on the edge of the wetlands?

Fred Geisel – No, the wetlands are further back. When this was originally designed, the state said you cannot work within 100 feet of wetlands, now they say 50 feet is okay. Some of the new thinking has changed. We can probably work this out. I couldn't see the wetlands from my trips there. I need to look at the ConCom plan and see where they modified the line and see if there is any record of that and then find out how far away we are. We may be able to enlarge the forebay and make it work.

Andy Rodenhiser – So this is an update.

Fred Geisel – Yes, as long as I can figure out what is workable and basically redesign these. Here is what we need to address and then figure out the drainage calculations – with new capacity – sort of like an application – present to you and to your consultant for review.

Andy Rodenhiser – I would suggest they work simultaneous with Dave Pellegrini rather than thru us. That would save some money. Ultimately we are going to look to Dave Pellegrini for his recommendation.

Bob Tucker – As long as we get the info at the same time.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – One thing you do not have is more land. Is it possible to go into the cul-de-sac and add something there? There is no island in the middle.

Andy Rodenhiser – Let him do his math work.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – That is what he said the last time and he hasn't come up with anything. We might be receptive to waiving the width of the road a bit and having an island.

Fred Geisel – People have driveways and fences.

Bob Tucker – Don't be afraid to think outside the box.

Lou Cacavaro – Your pleasure would be for him to do a first draft.

Andy Rodenhiser – If you do a modification, the regs would be those in effect now.

Susy Affleck-Childs – It will have to be done as a plan modification.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – This is not a new problem – we have been looking at this for years.

Donna Hainey – Owen Sullivan did come out to pond #3, and he did make it deeper and make the berm higher on our side, so I thought that was fine for us.

Andy Rodenhiser – He probably did that to make it more compliant with the original plan.

Donna Hainey – I know our house is very close to it. The berm is higher where he did put it, and we put shrubs all around to hide the whole thing.

Robert Hainey – If you dig out, where would that be?

Fred Geisel – We would probably add fill.

Andy Rodenhiser – When he fixed it, he probably dug it out and made the berm higher.

Bob Tucker – I see the force main as a big issue.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I need to check on the money availability for the project in the construction inspection account. There will probably need to be more funds. Mr. Sullivan's track record is not great on this.

Lou Caccavaro – Send it to me.

Andy Rodenhiser – You might be able to buy a small piece from your next abutter, Mike Fasolino who now owns 25 Summer Street.

Susy Affleck-Childs – This board is receptive to low impact options.

## **Street Acceptance - Country View and Broad Acres**

Andy Rodenhiser – Identify the station numbers of the road. I suppose we could accept up to a certain portion, up to the bulb at the Streifers, and don't accept the rest of it. That would minimize the risk to the town. That might reduce some risk.

A motion was made by Bob Tucker, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh to not accept Broad Acres Farm Road, Stable Way and a portion of Olde Surrey Lane. The motion passed unanimously.

Andy Rodenhiser – Dave, could you also define for us a station number? Get the lot numbers.

## **Minutes**

May 12, 2009 - A motion was made by Chan Rogers and seconded by Bob Tucker to approve the minutes of the May 12, 2009 meeting as presented with a few corrections as had been provided to Susy by Chan. The motion was approved. Tom Gay abstained from voting as he had not attended that meeting.

May 19, 2009 – A motion was made by Chan Rogers and seconded by Tom Gay to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2009 meeting as presented. The motion was approved. Karyl Spiller-Walsh abstained from voting as she had not attended that meeting.

May 26, 2009 – A motion was made by Karyl Spiller-Walsh and seconded by Tom Gay to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2009 meeting as presented. The motion was approved. Bob Tucker abstained from voting as he had not attended that meeting.

## **REPORTS**

Bob Tucker – Community Preservation Committee - We did have a discussion at the last meeting with the Affordable Housing Committee and the Open Space Committee, and they are looking at joint and individual opportunities. We also had a presentation by Claudia Peters from Medway Public Schools re: the Community Services Leadership program. They are looking for opportunities in which they might be able to serve the town and organizations and interests within the town that can also be used as a learning experience. As these projects are identified and agreed upon, they receive support from a teacher who then puts together a lesson plan in conjunction with the project. It is a real community partnership. I will leave the info with Susy. For example, the 5<sup>th</sup> grade at McGovern School did a program this spring. It had to do with recycling, but they involved math, science and technology, and economics as far as curriculum areas within that one project. Other projects – Medway Walks and food pantry drive. One idea that was mentioned is how to improve attendance at town meetings? She is looking for input from town departments and committees within the town as well as individual citizen suggestions. I don't know if there is anything of interest we could conjure up. The school is looking for ways to get the youth involved in the town for its betterment – worthwhile learning experience out of – I think it is a good idea – good opportunities.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I received this info this morning and have already forwarded it to Habitat for Humanity and to the Medway Community Farm folks.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh /Design Review Committee – The DRC actually did a new cover for the master plan.

Chan Rogers – I went to a seminar on global warming, and then I went to the MetroWest 495 Partnership, both for different reasons. They looked at future for developing suburbs. We went from 200 to 300 million by developing new land and moving out from the cities. The proposals that we develop from 300 to 400 million will not be by new land but by densifying our suburbs. The presentation at the 495 session was a speaker from Virginia Tech. He is predicting that the only way we can expand is to increase our density. Statistically, the suburbs have 50% of our population – cities only have about 10% of the total population with the country – this ties into what we are talking about along route 109 in terms of increasing density – with the global warming problem – 50 years from now people will need to think about using their cars only for trips more than 5 miles – public transit or electric car use is going to be needed – dependent on non combustible engines – it all kind of ties in – the thing I was at tonight, the Metro Futures event is also aiming at this – I made the point it ties into global warming – you are going to have to start worrying about this within the next 5 years especially when China wakes up economically they depend on coal.

Gino Carlucci – On the population increase – in going from 200 to 300 million, we increased that amount faster than China did, because China is limiting child birth dramatically.

Andy Rodenhiser- I had a meeting with Ron Yates regarding the Habitat for Humanity house. We went thru a list of people and resources for him to solicit. He needs an architect to formally submit a set of drawings.

IDEA – perhaps Deidre Sullivan.

Andy Rodenhiser – I received a letter from the BOS, just a reminder about attendance at town meetings.

Chan Rogers – Everybody got the letter.

Susy Affleck-Childs – All elected officials were sent the letter.

Andy Rodenhiser – I had told you I had attended an Assessor’s meeting about the Oak Grove assessments. I had a subsequent phone conversation to update me that they are working on the problem, and in spite of only getting a few abatement requests they are going back and modifying at least 50 that they identified as being problematic – all land of limited/low value. They have identified that the contractor had made some error in calculations based on info from the state.

Andy Rodenhiser – We also have been talking about process improvement work - planning, building, assessor, future ConCom agent – to include all of those folks so there is a uniform approach.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I have been invited to be part of the interview team for the Building Inspector position. I am looking for affirmation that zoning enforcement is a key element for the job.

AGREED.

Susy Affleck-Childs – WE have received a request for a site plan certificate of completion for 133 Milford Street. Bob Tucker has offered to do an inspection for us.

Gino Carlucci – I am working on the zoning map – A black and white version is almost ready.

Andy Rodenhiser – We have spoken with Paul Yorkis relative to Route 109 and having an updated zoning map to show new boundary of the district will be valuable.

The Board gave its OK to go ahead and get the zoning map updated and printed.

Bob Tucker – During the month of July – I am about to start a project. I may end up with the second shift. My availability may be impinged.

Andy Rodenhiser - Please send Susy Affleck-Childs dates for vacations.

### **Election of Officers**

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I nominate Andy Rodenhiser for chairman. Chan Rogers seconded the nomination. Approved.

Andy Rodenhiser – I do enjoy working with you.

Andy Rodenhiser – Are there any other motions? We have two other offices - vice chair and clerk.

Karyl Spiller-Walsh – I nominate Bob Tucker as vice chair. Tom Gay seconded the nomination. Approved.

Andy Rodenhiser – We have the Clerk, now.

Motion by Bob Tucker for Chan Rogers to serve as Clerk.

Chan Rogers – I do not want to do that any more. I have other responsibilities as chairman of the Board of Water & Sewer Commissioners now.

Bob Tucker – I would like to move that Tom Gay take over duties as clerk. The nomination was seconded by Andy Rodenhiser. Approved.

Tom Gay – I agree to serve.

Bob Tucker – I agree to serve.

Susy Affleck-Childs – We will also do our liaison positions at the next meeting.



A motion was made by Bob Tucker, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Affleck-Childs  
Planning and Economic Development Coordinator

May 15, 2009

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**  
**Medway Planning & Economic Development Board**  
**Franklin Creek Subdivision Modification**

In accordance with the provisions of M.G.L, C. 41, s. 81A – 81GG and Medway's *Rules and Regulations for the Review and Approval of Land Subdivisions*, notice is hereby given that the Medway Planning and Economic Development Board will conduct a public hearing on Tuesday, June 9, 2009 at 7:15 p.m. in the Sanford Room of Town Hall, 155 Village Street, Medway, MA to consider an application of Wood Structure Construction, Inc of Medfield, MA to modify the *Franklin Creek Definitive Subdivision Decision/Certificate of Action and/or Plan*.

The subject property is a 2.7 acre site located at 18 Franklin Street, presently owned by Wood Structure Construction, Inc. (previously owned by John Early and Timothy Sheehan). On January 17, 2006, the Planning Board approved the site for a 3 lot private way residential subdivision, construction of 425 linear feet of private roadway (Franklin Creek Lane), and installation of infrastructure and utility services including a stormwater drainage system and extension of town water and sewer. The subdivision is comprised of the following parcels as shown on Medway Assessors Map 2: 2B 76-2, 2B 76-2 and 2B 76-3, all with Franklin Creek Lane addresses. The Planning Board endorsed the Franklin Creek Definitive Subdivision Plan on May 9, 2006.

In July 2007, the property was conveyed to a new owner Wood Structure Construction, Inc. Road and infrastructure construction was begun but not completed within the three year time period after the plan endorsement data as specified in the subdivision decision. A modification to the Franklin Creek Subdivision Certificate of Action is required to establish a new completion date for roadway and infrastructure. The Board will also hear any public testimony that is offered pertaining to matters of subdivision construction and possible plan modifications.

The previously approved *Franklin Creek Definitive Subdivision Plan* is on file with the Medway Town Clerk at Medway Town Hall, 155 Village Street, Medway, MA and may be inspected Monday through Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and Fridays from 8:00 am to 1:00 p.m.

Interested persons or parties are invited to review the previously approved plan, attend the public hearing, and express their views at the designated time and place. Written comments are encouraged.

*Andy Rodenhiser, Chairman*

To be published in the *Milford Daily News* – Monday, May 25, 2009 and Tuesday, June 2, 2009

cc: *Owners of Land, Abutters, and Parties of Interest within 500'*

*Planning Boards – Bellingham, Franklin, Holliston, Milford, Millis & Norfolk*