

STURBRIDGE PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES OF
TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2002

Present: Mike Beaudry
Tom Creeden
Marge Cooney
Sandra Gibson-Quigley, Chair
Deb Hill
Milton Raphaelson

Also present: Lawrence Adams, Town Planner

Absent: Bill Muir

The meeting was called to order by S. Gibson-Quigley at 7:00 PM and the agenda was read. The minutes for January 8, 2002 were reviewed.

Motion: to accept the minutes of January 8, 2002, by T. Creeden

2nd: M. Cooney

Discussion: None

Vote: All in favor

ANR'S

Mashapaug Road – Sturbridge Realty (Land Planning Inc.) – Comments and issues were raised by T. Creeden and M. Cooney regarding Lot 11. They felt it was a nonbuildable lot because it lacked a practical access. The plan was approved with Lot 11 designated as “not a buildable lot.”

Main Street – Dean Stickney (Jalbert Engineering) – Approved as presented

S. Gibson-Quigley recognized T. Creeden who asked William Swiacki for the disposition of the Brookhill Subdivision open space land. W. Swiacki said no commitment had been made. The Conservation Commission had written a letter (12-14-01) to W. Swiacki and the Selectmen stating they would be interested in receiving the parcel as conservation land. W. Swiacki is waiting for a response from the Commission as to their intentions for the use of this land.

DRAPER WOODS SUBDIVISION - PUBLIC HEARING

William Swiacki, Owner and Wayne Belec, Waterman Associates

M. Cooney read the legal notice. The Board of Health had no issues with the project since sewer tie ins had been approved by the Board of Selectmen (10-01-01). The proponent, William Swiacki made the presentation. W. Swiacki identified the following materials: the definitive plan dated 11-26-01 (filed with the Board on 11-27-01); Form C; drainage study; project impact study; traffic impact study; a cover letter

dated 11-27-01; notice of submission; transmittal letter; approval letter of the preliminary plan dated 6-05-01; an addendum to the traffic study dated 12-10-01; an updated certified abutter's list; it was noted 46 lots were being proposed, not 49 lots as originally stated in the legal notice. W. Swiacki gave S. Gibson-Quigley a copy of the January 23, 2002 Environmental Monitor, Page 10 which evidences the decision of the Secretary of Environmental Affairs not to require a separate state level environmental impact report.

Points relating to the proposed definitive plan:

- General road layout - a single road reducing the linear footage of the road to about 340 linear feet.
- Number of lots reduced from 53 to 46 lots resulting in an increase of open space site area to 40% or 22 acres.
- Wetlands delineation has been completed, but not filed – Conservation Commission has not officially reviewed or approved this work. W. Swiacki believed they would do so within the required notice of intent filing.
- Explanation was given for the project's name change and road name selections of Draper, Harding and Elliot.

W. Swiacki introduced project consultants: Wayne Belec, project engineer; Jeff Richards, landscape architect and Mike Abend, traffic studies.

S. Gibson-Quigley read a memo dated 1-22-02 from Police Chief Button stating that he had no issues with the plan as proposed. Tom Chamberland's memo dated 01-28-02 stated he had not been able to fully review the plans. He did have issues that he wanted to discuss. S. Gibson-Quigley asked for discussion on the road and the phasing of the proposed project. W. Swiacki stated the phasing was developed based on the site features. Phase One, the 14 lots near Brookfield Road, Phase Two, the central area and Phase Three being the lots to the east of Clark Road. The DPW Director and Town Planner identified a preference for the construction of Draper Woods Road (Road A) to be constructed in its entirety up front. W. Swiacki agreed to that and had designated it in Phase One. The lots that had legal frontage on this initial road seemed the logical ones to be released from the covenant upon the completion of the infrastructure improvements. W. Swiacki believed it would be 32 lots. There was a discussion regarding the construction of 4 corner lots and whether or not they fronted on Road A or the cul-de-sac.

S. Gibson-Quigley asked L. Adams to explain why the DPW Director requested Draper Woods Road be completed as part of Phase One. The major interest was to make sure that there were safeguards in place should the project fail. Part of the concern was that if the project failed the town not be left with a long dead end road. The DPW wanted to have a through road connecting the two roads (Brookfield Road and Clark Road) since it is more efficient to plow a through road than to go into long turnarounds. The road also had some major infrastructure. Its completion would allow the DPW to loop the waterline around Clark Road. One hydrant and one dry well would be servicing 46 homes in the case of a fire.

M. Cooney asked the projected time frame for Phase One, Two and Three. W. Swiacki expected to complete the project within a five-year period. Sheet 12 on the plans was referenced regarding the reduction in the width of the road in front of the culvert (this would be a concrete box culvert, not aluminum as originally indicated) from 50' to 40'. M. Cooney requested that the 50' width be maintained because she could foresee a problem plowing the road. W. Swiacki stated the DPW Director felt that a 45' road would be acceptable as opposed to the 40'. W. Swiacki supported his proposed road by siting 2 examples within town where roads were of equal width. T. Creeden asked how the measurements were

determined for Roads B & C, Harding & Elliot, at 420' & 440' long. They were measured from the right of way line on Draper Woods Road (Road A) to the center of the cul-de-sac in each case. T. Creeden asked for the 8% slope to be identified on Draper Woods Road. W. Swiacki deferred the question to Wayne Belec. The 6%-8% grade measured approximately 200', of which 110' was 8%. T. Creeden asked if L. Adams could have the DPW Director comment on this issue. L. Adams stated that DPW Director, Greg Morse was not comfortable with the plans as they were being presented, namely the 45' road width, though he was not concerned with the slope of the road. M. Beaudry asked who from the town indicated it was acceptable to defer from standard procedures (reduction of road width from 50' to 40'). W. Swiacki said it was the result of trying to reduce the impact on the wetlands at this crossing. Referencing Page 10, M. Beaudry had a problem with Lots 7 and 14 on Draper Woods Road where there was an 8% grade at the intersection.

T. Creeden felt that 18 of the lots within the subdivision did not meet current bylaw for frontage. He asked L. Adams if this subdivision was grandfathered in under the previous bylaw. It had been filed the day before the Town Meeting of 2001 which changed the frontage requirement. L. Adams had concerns with Lots 1 and 6, but did note that a 100' requirement for frontage was in effect when the project was filed. L. Adams commented that the 100' frontage should not be measured on a curve and asked the designers to recalculate the frontage per Town of Sturbridge definitions.

L. Adams addressed other issues such as:

- Sign improvements on Route 148 and Clark Rd. – the traffic impact study recommended them. He asked if the proponent was willing to pay for the signs.
- DPW has concurred there should be 5 streetlights; they should be included on the plan.
- 5 Year Phasing – a 2 year limit is presently the town's bylaw. A phasing proposal should include calendar time as well as geographical areas (lots released by number). These have not been presented.
- Counting of lots on Road A – requesting 36 lots with frontage on the road to be released, but only 26 lots have access on Road A.
- If Phasing goes beyond the 2 year limit there should be a commitment to a schedule for the release of lots within the timeframe.
- Stonewalls exist within the property. Was there interest in using the stone and relocating the wall somewhere on site since these were historic?
- Greg Morse's concerns – the Phasing; the sewer connection permit; reducing the number of retention basins; no top coat on the road until the end of the project; a concrete culvert is required for the entire width of the road at the wetland crossing; under drains were requested on the cut areas
- A hydrant must be included on the plans
- A speed sign should be included on the plans

S. Gibson-Quigley opened the hearing to the public.

David Barnicle, 8 Ladd Rd., requested an overview of open space (space that is not built on). W. Swiacki explained the open space was located in 2 parcels and was increased from 17 acres to 22 acres. Two commitments have been made 1) the parcels would be restricted as to use, passive recreation and/or conservation and 2) these would be natural drainage points. Ownership would not be suitable for the town; it would be more likely a homeowner's association.

D. Barnicle expressed concern in calling open space a parcel of land that was only going to be accessed by the ownership and included in which, was represented by replication areas, detention or retention basins,

both of which need to be left alone so they can function. If this parcel is used for passive recreational purposes, they are not left alone to function.

John Hoffman asked if there were any trade offs being made on the regulations or the bylaws for this open space. S. Gibson-Quigley stated that was not being done.

T. Creeden asked if there were any proposed areas for active recreation. It was stated there were not, however, two thirds of the open space was uplands and one third was wetlands.

Motion: to continue the public hearing to February 12, 2002 at 8:45 PM, by
T. Creedan
2nd: M. Beaudry
Discussion: None
Vote: All in favor

REVIEW OF DRAFT SUBDIVISION CONTROL RULES AND REGULATIONS

The Board was asked to continue to read the subdivision draft. L. Adams recommended detention ponds be on separate parcels which the town owns. Open space means it is not to be built on in the future.

SCHEDULING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR ZONING AMENDMENTS AND SUBDIVISION CONTROL

Zoning bylaws and general bylaws that were in process did not need to have public hearings. The subcommittee was still working on the draft. It is possible that they would be able to make a recommendation at the next meeting. The public hearings on all the zoning would be February 26th. The Finance Committee needed to publish the bylaw in early March. L. Adams asked the Board to allow him, under Planning Board authority, to proceed with appropriate postings of public hearings. The non-conforming use bylaw was discussed. It was requested that the Board look at the rate of development bylaw. The intent of this bylaw was to take the peaks out of development in any one year. It would last for 5 years. There was a ground water protection bylaw that protected the wells and included an overlay map. Other bylaws – scenic roads bylaw & temporary uses bylaw.

Motion: to post the zoning amendments and subdivision control bylaw for scheduling of the public hearing to be held on February 26, 2002, by D. Hill
2nd: M. Cooney
Discussion: None
Vote: All in favor

Motion: to completely eliminate the first footnote to Chapter 19 Intensity Regulations which states ½ acre area if lot is serviced by town water and sewer relating to suburban residential. The effect of this will be that throughout all of suburban residential, whether it be serviced by water or sewer or not, the requirement will be ¾ acre and 100 foot of frontage, to make it a zoning amendment and post it for public hearing, by T. Creeden

2nd: M. Beaudry
Discussion: M. Cooney wondered if the Board should hold off on this. M. Beaudry felt the rate of growth issues might deter some of the building that was happening. He did not want to go to Town Meeting with numerous restrictive articles for fear that none would pass. D. Hill asked if the Board went to

flexible development and allowed ½ acres with more open space, how would that impact the fact that the ½ acre lots were taken out at this time. She felt it confusing. L. Adams would like to see the Board take up larger lot zoning when and if they address flexible development.

Vote: In favor: T. Creeden, D. Hill

Opposed: M. Beaudry, S. Gibson-Quigley, M. Cooney, M. Raphaelson

Motion: to amend the zoning bylaws regarding the maximum impervious surface in Commercial, Commercial II, General Industrial and Industrial Park from 70% to 60%, by T. Creeden

2nd: D. Hill

Discussion: Originally the intent was to get the concept through and then ration it down as time went on.

Vote: In favor: M. Beaudry, D. Hill, M. Cooney, T. Creeden

Opposed: M. Raphaelson

PLANNER'S UPDATE

L. Adams reminded the Board to review The Preserve for the public hearing scheduled February 12, 2002.

M. Loin – ANR lots – Farquhar Road - There was some question as to how this might affect the access to the Park Place project.

Motion: to adjourn, by M. Raphaelson

2nd: M. Cooney

Vote: All in favor

Adjournment at 9:20 PM