

## **TOWN OF STOW PLANNING BOARD**

Minutes of the Tuesday January 26, 2010 Planning Board Meeting

Planning Board Members: Kathleen Willis, Steve Quinn, Ernest Dodd and Lori Clark, Lenny Golder  
Planning Coordinator: Karen Kelleher  
Administrative Assistant: Kristen Domurad

The meeting was called to order at 7 P.M.

### **Stone Building (Apple Barn) Discussion**

Kathleen Willis explained that Victoria Fletcher had asked the Planning Board to discuss the Stone Building as part of the agenda. Since Victoria could not attend the meeting she sent a letter to the Board with her suggestions and concerns for the building and the construction of the new elementary school building.

Ernie Dodd suggested another potential use for the building could be storage of artifacts, which are currently stored among several people's barns.

Kathleen reminded the Board that when Lew Halprin attended a meeting to discuss the concept of removing the stone building, the Planning Board was not in favor of taking a position in writing at that time.

Ernie Dodd asked for an update on the report to be filed with the Massachusetts Historical Commission report.

Steve Quinn said the School Building Committee had put together a report to send to the Massachusetts Historical Commission as well as the Stow Historical Commission. He stated that the MA Historic Commission has 30 days to reply. He stated that the School Building Committee needs the MA Historic Commission's signature in order to proceed with the project.

Ellen Sturgis asked why the letter from Victoria Fletcher came to the Planning Board, and if they had any authority in deciding to keep the stone building or not.

Kathleen Willis said that Victoria was just looking to the Planning Board for support. Kathleen said that she believed the Planning Board has no jurisdiction in regard to the stone building. Kathleen stated if the building were to be destroyed it would be unfortunate if in fact this was due to the Historical Commission not taking a stance earlier on in the process. She stated that the push to keep the stone building seems a little late.

Kathleen still felt that the Board should not support any view in writing at this time. Ernie Dodd stated that if the stone building is important enough to save, residents should go to town meeting and request funds to preserve it.

Kathleen stated that some alternative ideas to keep the stone building did look feasible.

Lori Clark asked Ellen, what made the School Building Committee decide to not have an alternative plan prepared to ensure that the timeline of the project would not be hampered by a decision from the Massachusetts Historical Commission.

Lori asked Ellen Sturgis why the School Building Committee had made their decision in this way.

Ellen Sturgis responded, that did ask the architect to do alternative plans which were done, but the Historic Consultant's primary message was that sending an alternative plan might send mixed signals to the Massachusetts Historical Commission and would not support the ESBC's position

Lori Clark asked if the timeline would be jeopardized if the Massachusetts Historical Society came back stating that the stone building had to stay.

Ellen said that Massachusetts Historical Commission would either come back with another line of questions or give approval for the demolition of the site. If they do come back with another line of questions it will take more time but the architects felt they could adapt the project by boarding up the stone building.

Ellen Sturgis said that the Elementary School Building Committee's report to the Massachusetts Historical Commission included concerns about safety of the site if the Stone Building were kept in the design.

Ellen said whatever the Massachusetts Historical Society's decision is, they will deal with it.

Lori asked if the building timeline would still allow them to begin in June if they are set back by another line of questions or even being told they cannot demolish the building.

Steve Quinn said that if they get a decision back within 30 days the architect may have time to prepare a new plan, but if it were delayed beyond this time then the timeline would be off track.

Lori Clark asked; if it looks like the project would be held up would the Elementary School Building Committee be willing to get an alternative plan in order to stay on schedule or would they just submit to the fact that they wont stay on schedule?

Ellen Sturgis said that it would not be logical to create an alternative plan because they don't know what the Mass Historical Commission's findings would be.

Lori Clark stated that she wouldn't want to see something torn down if it was unnecessary.

Kathleen Willis stated that it seemed like the residents who want to keep the building haven't been able to make a strong enough case to the Elementary School Building Committee in order for them to seek an alternative plan.

Karen asked if the school building timeline would be stalled if Mass Historical Commission does not respond within the 30 days or if they require the stone Building be retained.

Ellen Sturgis said it would definitely be off track if delayed further. She stated that if another 30 day period of questions were to come up from the Mass Historical Commission they wouldn't be able to get everything done in time to start the project in the spring.

Karen asked how this would impact funding.

Ellen said that the MSBA is aware of the issues with this building and that other towns have gone through similar problems.

Lori Clark commented that she felt it was sad that the situation has come what it is and that the schedule is in jeopardy.

Ernie Dodd said that it would be a shame not to start in June and delay the process of what happens in phase two.

Steve Quinn stated that he brought this concern up with the committee all along.

Kathleen Willis asked if it were true that the School Building Committee triggered the involvement of the Mass Historical Commission because of the required filing submission.

Ellen stated that discussion with the Stow Historical Commission led them to believe that they would rather see the building stay but had no legal problems with it being demolished.

Kathleen Willis stated that it seemed Victoria Fletcher's point was that people have stated in the Master Plan that they wish to keep the rural character of the town and things that remind them of historical aspects.

[Lenny Golder arrived at 7:20 P.M.]

Bruce Fletcher stated that the School Building Committee did not have any desire to save the stone building even if it was necessary in order to stay on time and budget, and even when there are admittedly alternatives that could be pursued.

Kathleen Willis said she agreed with this statement.

## **CORRESPONDENCE AND MINUTES**

### **MINUTES**

***Ernie Dodd moved to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2010 meeting as amended. The motion was seconded by Steve Quinn and carried a vote of five in favor (Kathleen Willis, Lori Clark, Ernie Dodd, Lenny Golder and Steve Quinn).***

## **APPOINTMENTS**

### **PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

Kristina Wile, Martha Monroe and Lori Clark represented the Sub-Committee.

Martha Monroe explained the makeup of the sub-committee and it's five members; Kristina Wile, Martha Monroe, Lori Clark, Tom Ruggerio, Victoria Fletcher and resident Patrick Hopkins has attended most of the meetings. The committee has been meeting once a week to identify critical areas in town for walkways as well as and establishing an action plan.

Lori Clark explained that the sub-committee had met with members of the previous sidewalk committee and now feel they are able to address the issues that were previously hindering to the past committee.

They passed out a brochure about the sub-committee's goals and asked for the Planning Boards comments and approval.

The sub-committee then shared their byways plan for the town with the Board. [Power Point presentation available in the Planning Department.]

Kristina Wile explained that the sub-committee envisions two phases of the plan. The first phase would connect the existing byways on the 117 corridors. The committee believes that finishing the byways on the 117 corridors could spark momentum for other byways around town and future byway funding.

Lenny Golder asked if the byways would accommodate biking and pedestrians. Lori Clark explained that byways are for both pedestrians and cyclist.

Kristina had met with Mike Clayton who advised her on width requirement for byways. She explained that the sub-committee envisions a vegetative buffer between the road and byway-but they will evaluate this further once the sites are measured.

Lori Clark mentioned an article Kathleen Willis had found of another town using Community Preservation Funds to help pay for byways.

Lenny Golder asked the sub-committee how snow removal on the byways would be handled. Kristina replied that the sub-committee is not advising it be mandatory for residents to clear sidewalks in front of their homes or for the highway department to add this as part of their maintenance plan. They have offered to investigate some options for snow removal on sidewalks but explained that the Highway Department would not have the capacity to do this and that it might turn residents away if they were mandated to clear their own byways.

Bruce explained that it would be very difficult to create a snow removal mandate for residents or requiring the Highway Department. Statutes would have to be accepted at town meeting; one for mandating abutters and the other for maintenance by the town.

Kathleen Willis suggested staffing a table at Spring Fest with their brochures.

Martha Monroe said once they receive the Planning Board comments and support they would like to proceed with project implementation.

The sub-committee then asked the Board for suggestions and support for their proposed location of new byways.

Lenny Golder expressed concern about the snow removal issue again.

Lori Clark replied that byways will probably used less in winter but this should not prevent the town from constructing them.

Lenny suggested byways be put on both sides of the street in Lower Village.

Kristina Wile explained there are byways along 117 extending from Lower Village to the police station. She stated that although they would like to have sidewalks on both sides of Lower Village, the committee found it to be more important to connect the existing byways to make at least one contiguous path along 117.

Bruce Fletcher was concerned that putting a byway along side the town hall would take away parking spaces.

The sub-committee commented that only three parking spaces would be lost and that they were under the impression that the town-building parking lot would be expanded. They told Bruce they would look into his concern about lost parking

Kathleen asked if the Board was in support of the presented locations. The Board agreed with the Pedestrian Walkways proposed byway locations in Phase 1.

Karen Kelleher asked about implementing crosswalks for the locations that would move pedestrians from one side of the byway to the other connecting side.

The Sub-Committee said they do have this noted in their plans.

The Board thanked the sub-committee for their work and presentation.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE (ESBC) /SYMMES MAINI & MCKEE ASSOCIATES (SMMA): PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION

Jamie Warren represented SMMA and Ellen Sturgis and Craig Martin represented the ESBC.

Jamie Warren stated their current plan has not changed much from the site plan overview they previously presented in November and have now begun fine-tuning the utility plans.

Jamie gave a summary of the traffic circulation and the added fire lane behind the building. He stated that the parking count had not changed since the presentation in November. The front parking would be designated for visitors, and volunteer staff. He showed the teacher parking in the back of the school off Hartley Road.

He explained one difference in the site plan he showed earlier in November; is an additional accessory maintenance building shown as a detached building off of the west side of the school building. They changed the plan due to special requirements for educational buildings, which would have cost more to have the facility inside the school building.

Kathleen Willis asked how large the maintenance building would be. Jamie stated that the building would be 24x24.

Jamie described the change of site impervious coverage.

He said the first phase of construction consists of building the addition. They will be fencing off the area and will use Hartley Road for a construction entrance into the site. Once the addition is occupied they will begin phase 2 with renovations to the old school building, and using Great Road as a construction entrance.

On the topic of storm water management, DEP Storm water Regulations requires a stormwater design for a 10, 50 and 100-year storm.

Jamie said there are specific DEP requirements to meet the primary 2, 10 and 100 year storms peak volume.

He stated that the peak volume is the main problem not the peak rate at 100 year storm, they are hoping to obtain a variance for this rate.

Jamie said he spoke with Sue Sullivan who found the elevation of the pond to change over time, so they would not be able to discharge into the wetlands without doing extensive work in the wetlands. He stated that the pond and the wetlands are linked and a culvert box was found under debris, which governs the elevation of this pond.

Jamie explained the hydrology of the site, indicating where rooftop run off would be directed, the location of catch basins and discharge route.

He said the fire lane behind the school would be made of pervious paving materials.

Ernie asked pervious paving would not be used for the teachers' parking lot. Jamie stated, the soil in the proposed area is not conducive to pervious paving and would cause problems.

Bruce Fletcher asked how water quality treatment requirements are met when using pervious pavement.

They will need to address water quality treatment in the Wellhead Protection Zone.

The group would like to hook up to the potential public water supply from the Assabet Water Company, but will be proceeding with an onsite well. They plan to discuss putting a waterline under the fire lane with the Conservation Commission in order to hook up with the Assabet Water Company line if it goes through.

He stated that if water is extended from Harvard Acres and becomes available, they will be able to connect at the street as well as at Hartley Road.

Jamie said they are working with the Department of Environmental Protection to get a well sited. As of now it will go on the ball field in zone 1. They will adopt regulations for the ball field restricting the use of pesticides and herbicides.

Ernie Dodd asked how many projected gallons would be used per day. Jamie estimated about 7,000 gallons per day.

Kathleen Willis asked if they had considered harvesting rainwater for irrigation purposes. Jamie said they did a cost benefit analysis, which concluded that is not financially feasible because of the need to promote infiltration.

Craig Martin has been working with the Organization for the Assabet River on a grant.

Ernie Dodd asked what pretreatment would be used for impervious surfaces.

Jamie said that they are proposing deep sump catch basements, storm septors, 1,800 gallon storm sump unit and a 1,200 gallon storm sump unit and a 450 gallon to take care of the service years which would be about the 80% requirement.

The Board asked if salt would have any impact on the porous asphalt. Jamie explained that porous asphalt actually does better in winter than impervious paving. He explained that UNH has been using this and SMMA has been incorporating porous asphalt into other school building projects.

Ernie Dodd said Sue Sullivan would review the storm water calculations. Jamie said he understands that Sue will do the peer review.

Jamie stated that 100% of the roof water area would be directed back into the ground.

Ernie Dodd noted, often developers use the drainage basins during the construction process which causes sediment build up. He told Jamie they would prefer them using temporary basins during construction so the infiltration areas are protected.

Jamie said they would make a note on their plans to require temporary sediment basins.

Jamie stated that site lighting was not included in the preliminary application materials, but will be submitted into the final application. He explained that all lighting will be full cut off and they plan to use LED lighting as the project is part of the Mass Collaboration for High Performance Schools (CHPA) program.

Testing has been done for the wastewater treatment facility. Jamie said it was difficult to find an area that would accommodate the 9 gallons/day per child requirement. They found an area off Hartley Road that would be suitable. He explained, it would be a narrow system that would handle 5, 240 gallons per day. Jamie said the design rate for loading is about 25 min per inch. This proposed wastewater treatment facility will require a retaining wall along Hartley Road because of the mounting systems; there will be a 5 foot mount on top of the season ground water and 9 feet of title 5 sand.

Kathleen Willis asked if it would be possible to landscape the area, Jamie said they are considering this.

The Board expressed concern for parking for town meetings. Jamie said cars can be parked over a treatment facility but the slope might be high in this instance.

Craig Martin reminded the Board that the teacher parking lot would be available and likely be safer than parking on the road.

Jamie said he met with Jack Wallace, Board of Health Agent and Craig Martin, Building Inspector to review the waste water system. The DEP has requested a screen sand filter system

for the wastewater treatment facility to remediate the nitrogen, because it is in close proximity to the well.

Jamie explained that in Phase 1 the new gas line and utilities would be put underground. He indicated where a green roof would be installed on the plan.

Jamie asked the Board about a requirement for the building height. He showed the board that mechanical equipment on the roof would be above height regulation for buildings.

The Board told Jamie that this would not trigger a special permit because the building structure does not go beyond the height requirement. The mechanical equipment would be equivalent to chimneys.

Jamie then asked the Board if the noise created by the mechanical equipment on the building would require a special permit because it would be over the required 3 decibels.

Karen Kelleher said that it will require a variance from the ZBA if it exceeds the requirements in the bylaws seeing as the school building is in the residential zone.

Jamie stated that the noise would be significantly greater than 3 decibels.

Lori Clark asked if the screening around the equipment would or could be sound dampening. Jamie was aware that some mechanical systems can be built with sound dampening systems in them but the one shown did not.

Steve Quinn commented that 3 decibels did not seem achievable with mechanical equipment. Lori Clark asked for a similar comparison to better understand the level of noise that 3 decibels produces.

Ellen Sturgis from the audience stated that no air conditioning or exchange machine could produce less than 3 decibels.

Craig Martin said that wind and other factors impact the level of decibels produced and how far it can be heard.

Jamie Warren asked if noise would be a problem during the construction. The Board told him that as long as they are working during the prescribed hours of operation and these hours are properly posted, there would be no requirements.

Craig Martin said that Shaw's would be a good example of the sound that the mechanical equipment the school building wanted to produce.

Lori Clark asked about pedestrian access to the playground, Jamie said pedestrian access would be the fire lane.

Lori Clark also asked if the proposed maintenance building would be seen from the street. Jamie responded, that it can only be seen from one angle. Jamie showed the Board several areas where they are proposing additional screening. Kathleen asked about screening for the teachers' parking lot off Hartley Road and was assured there would be about a 35-foot buffer.



Ernie Dodd asked if the fire lane could have gates on either end.

Jamie said that the Fire Department has requested there be no gates and the Police Department requested the same for increased ability to patrol the area.

Ernie said if the fire lanes do not have gates he would like to see “Do Not Enter” signs posted.

Kathleen Willis asked how many trees would be cut down for the project. Jamie said a few memorial trees will be transplanted but the others will be removed and new ones will be replanted on the site.

Kathleen suggested using a different landscaping plant instead of English Ivy, which she stated, can be invasive and tends to harbor rodents.

Kathleen offered an alternative low maintenance, native plant, *Arctostaphylos Uva-Ursi*, Massachusetts.

Ernie Dodd asked about the traffic summary. Jamie assured him that Bryant Associates will be submitting it shortly, but that there would be no significant impact.

Kathleen questioned the amount of parking shown in the visitor lot. Jamie said there are 54 spaces in this lot and 43 spaces in the back lot, because they are merging the schools more is added. Jamie stated they are aware that the district wants more parking but the Board wants less impervious surface.

Jamie told the Board that they spoke with the Conservation Commission to discuss an area of the building that clips the corner of the flood plain. Karen Kelleher explained to Jamie that they should be using the FIRM maps to locate flood plain lines rather than the Assessor’s Map.

The Board and Jamie agreed to schedule the hearing date for February 23, 2010 at 7:30P.M. Jamie notified the Board that they would be meeting with the Conservation Commission on the 16<sup>th</sup>. He asked if the Conservation Commission would also require a peer review for drainage. Karen explained that they usually rely on the Planning Board’s input from Sue Sullivan.

Karen offered to contact Sue Sullivan about the Conservation Commission’s upcoming hearing.

Ernie Dodd reminded Jamie to look up the decibel requirement for noise.  
The Board thanked Jamie for his presentation.

#### DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

Karen explained the “Land Use Decision Making for New Parcels of Land” document co-created by the Board of Selectmen. She described that the document’s purpose is to define the process in a clear and concise way.

The Planning Board made edits and comments to the draft. [see draft comments in Planning Board Department]

### RIDGEWOOD-REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION

Karen Kelleher explained the applicants are asking for the Board to give them the option to choose between using the requirements from the previous AAN Bylaw calculations for affordable housing or the current bylaw calculations.

The Board felt that either calculation would be suitable for them to use as the project was passed when the older bylaw was in place, and the new calculations would also be suitable, as development has not begun. The Board decided the petitioner could choose **one** of the bylaws for calculation methods of required number of affordable homes—**but must do so before breaking ground**.

Karen Kelleher offered to remind them again of their decision to donate to the sidewalk fund.

### COLLINGS FOUNDATION

Karen Kelleher notified the Board about the request sent by Bob Collings to the Conservation Commission requesting to build an access road from Barton Rd. over the proposed Liberator Lane to the Collings Foundation. Karen relayed the message she was given by town counsel that Bob Collings cannot build anything until he comes back to the Planning Board for an approved plan.

Members received a draft letter from Town Counsel, Jon Witten to the Conservation Commission with this information, and requested that the memo be revised.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristen Domurad  
Administrative Assistant