

STURBRIDGE PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES OF
TUESDAY, May 7, 2002

Present: Sandra Gibson-Quigley, Chair
Mike Beaudry
Marge Cooney
Deb Hill
Bill Muir
Milton Raphaelson
Robert Wheaton

Also present: Lawrence Adams, Town Planner

S. Gibson-Quigley called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and read the agenda.

Motion: to accept the minutes of April 23, 2002 as corrected, by M. Beaudry

2nd: R. Wheaton

Discussion: L. Adams noted that the minutes, in the future, will include the total number of existing lots created on an ANR at the time of approval. These records will be maintained on a spreadsheet.

Vote: In favor – M. Beaudry, D. Hill, B. Muir, M. Raphaelson and R. Wheaton
Abstain – M. Cooney

ANR'S

None received

NEW BUSINESS

Proposed Revisions to the Subdivision Control Law – L. Adams asked the Board to review the draft of the Subdivision Control Regulations and forward any final concerns to him. A public hearing will be held in June. A copy of the regulations will be on file with the Town Clerk. State law does not require the regulations be posted in the newspaper, however the hearing must be posted. Copies will be available from the Planning Office for a nominal fee. B. Muir suggested that the Board seek input from some of the engineering people that have done business with the Town due to its length and the new material. M. Beaudry noted that these people have the opportunity to obtain copies of the regulations if they choose. L. Adams felt consultants, contractors and engineers could make their comments heard at the public hearing and that the current Subdivision Regulation written in 1962, adopted in 1965 was practically obsolete. At present, Jim Malloy, Mr. Loin, Mr. Chamberland, Greg Morse and some of the Board of Selectmen had reviewed the regulations and made their contributions.

S. Gibson-Quigley suggested that the Board had been asked to review the regulations, not to write them. L. Adams, as the Town Planner, had been working for over a year soliciting opinions from the Board, as well as others, and had been willing to revise the regulations based on acquired comments.

Sturbridge Isle Three-year Review – J. Malloy, L. Adams and M. Beaudry attended a meeting (04-23-02) with members from Sturbridge Isle. L. Adams suggested the public hearing would be held in June after proper posting. B. Muir believed the concerns would be traffic and water quality. After speaking with department heads, no issues had been found in terms of the operation. L. Adams would put that into a memo. T.

Chamberland has onsite issues regarding slope. L. Adams and J. Malloy will look into these slope issues at a site visit next week.

M. Cooney noted that the Registry of Deeds required signatures that the Board intends to use for ANR's and signing plans. She also announced that the Community Preservation Act Committee (CPA) would hold an open house at their meeting on Wednesday, May 22nd, 6:00 – 8:00 PM, light refreshments will be provided. The purpose of the meeting is to inform the public of the CPA's progress and to gain public input. The CPA Committee meets at 7:00 PM at the Town Hall on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday, of each month.

THE HIGHLANDS, Arnold Road –PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION – Robert Moss, Developer and Thompson-Liston Engineering, Inc.

S. Gibson-Quigley continued the public hearing at 7:15 PM. L. Adams reminded the Board that R. Moss had developed some alternative plans for the subdivisions at the request of the Conservation Commission. These plans had been presented to the Board at the April 23rd meeting. R. Moss wanted to know if there was sufficient support to pursue the alternatives in a formal application. L. Adams felt if there was enough support, R. Moss would withdraw The Highlands and The Sanctuary without prejudice and pursue the other alternatives. The deadline for The Highlands and The Sanctuary was April 23rd, therefore, action would need to be taken if the plans were not withdrawn that evening.

R. Moss and Ken Strom, engineer from Thompson-Liston, were present to discuss the alternative designs. The main interest was to reduce the impact on wetland crossings and minimize the size of the subdivision, whereby increasing the Open Space significantly. The Highlands had five alternative designs with various schemes of roadway lengths. R. Moss reviewed alternative #5 that eliminated all wetland crossings, reduced the number of lots to 20-22, reduced the traffic impact and the total roadway from 4,700 feet to approximately 2,000 feet. This alternative requested a single entrance in the form of a boulevard going into a traditional two-way road with two cul-de-sacs – the left measuring 800 feet and the right 600 feet. This would require a waiver from the Board. No other waiver requests would be submitted.

R. Moss was asking the Board for guidance. He wanted to stay with the original submittal knowing he would have to do an extension, unless he felt the Board would strongly consider the alternatives involving a cul-de-sacs longer than 500 feet. S. Gibson-Quigley asked how many lots within the Sanctuary were in the Town's 200-foot buffer zone and if G. Morse's issue of looping the waterlines had been addressed. R. Moss said all houses would be out of the State's 100-foot buffer, that only the houses on the west side (closest to Arnold Rd.) would be out of the Town's 200-foot buffer zone. The waterline on the boulevard would be looped with a line going out to the cul-de-sacs. M. Beaudry stated that was a tough area for town water for water quality. To create two more deadend lines would multiply the water quality problem.

S. Gibson-Quigley felt there was positive consideration for alternative #2 and #5. She had asked the Board to give their opinions. B. Muir favored alternative #2 due to the waterline configuration. He also stated that he could live with the design regarding the cul-de-sacs. M. Cooney favored #2 for the waterlines and #5 for the concept of the boulevard. She also made a point that R. Moss would be limited for votes due to the absenteeism of board members during the continued public hearings. M. Beaudry felt the Board would be willing to work with R. Moss on the alternative designs. R. Wheaton favored #5 for its concept. The reduction of houses and the roadway scheme made for a nice looking subdivision. D. Hill favored #5 because it did not impact the wetland crossings and would not require fill. S. Gibson-Quigley noted that if the Board was willing to go with design alternatives #2 and #5, they must be understanding of the longer cul-de-sac. She did not want to have the issue of cul-de-sac lengths raised again if R. Moss decided to withdraw the present plan and submit an alternative

design. M. Cooney referenced the bylaws (Pg. G18, Section 9.16) stating that the bylaw provided flexibility for lengths beyond 500 feet for cul-de-sacs.

S. Gibson-Quigley asked if there were any questions from the public.

- Roy Pelton, 78 Arnold Rd. – asked where the waterline would enter the subdivision
- Barry Gingras, 21 High St. – asked the acreage (37.5) and what would happen to the Open Space (to be determined by the Planning Board). It was noted it would not be developed.
- Emile Fortier, 72 Arnold Rd. – asked the location of the pumping station.

L. Adams noted that the Board would be supporting the longer cul-de-sacs and local conditions because of the significant trade off between the original design with roadways and lots. L. Adams and the DPW Director will discuss the fee for the new plans and make a recommendation to the Board. In addition, he would like two conditions - 1) the Definitive Plan not be involved in the review process and 2) there be an initial design brainstorming session to help the engineers understand what solutions are needed for particular issues. This session would be held only once. R. Moss would like to accelerate the new plans. The Board could approve the new plans with conditions, so changes may be taken up before endorsement.

Motion: to close the public hearing, by M. Beaudry
2nd: D. Hill
Discussion: None
Vote: In favor – M. Beaudry, D. Hill, B. Muir and M. Raphaelson
Abstain – M. Cooney and R. Wheaton

R. Moss made a request to withdraw the plans for The Highlands Subdivision without prejudice. The Board was in agreement that there would be a new fee recommended by L. Adams and the DPW.

Motion: to accept Robert Moss' request to withdraw the plans for The Highlands Subdivision without prejudice, by M. Beaudry
2nd: B. Muir
Discussion: None
Vote: All in favor

THE SANCTUARY, Arnold Road – PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION – Robert Moss, Developer and Thompson-Liston Engineering, Inc.

R. Moss showed the original layout of The Sanctuary as submitted with 40 house lots, as well as six alternative plans to the Board. These alternatives had various schemes of roadway. Alternative #5 was a subdivision with 25 house lots having no deadends and it would meet the Subdivision Regulations with no waivers. The waterlines would be looped, but this would result in a very long roadway with one wetland crossing. One-half of the number of houses would be within the 100-foot buffer zone. The number of 1:1 slopes were the same as in the original Definitive Plan. Alternative #1 involved a cul-de-sac measuring approximately 700 feet. The last alternative #6 was similar to #1, but with a 500-foot shorter roadway and 22-24 house lots. Although alternative #6 was discussed, no plan was available to the Board at this meeting.

S. Gibson-Quigley asked if there were any questions from the public.

- Roy Pelton, – 78 Arnold Rd objected to one of the house lots that had a driveway touching his property. R. Moss agreed that he would work with R. Pelton to solve the problem.

L. Adams stated that The Highlands and The Sanctuary would be separate submittals and taken up independently. The booster pump would be the only common infrastructure. M. Cooney brought to the attention of R. Moss a typographical error on the cover letter which had The Sanctuary located on the west side of Arnold Road. It should be the east side.

Motion: to close the public hearing, by D. Hill
2nd: M. Beaudry
Discussion: None
Vote: In favor – M. Beaudry, D. Hill, B. Muir and M. Raphaelson
Abstain – M. Cooney and R. Wheaton

R. Moss made a request to withdraw The Sanctuary Subdivision without prejudice.

Motion: to accept Robert Moss' request to withdraw the plans for The Sanctuary Subdivision without prejudice, by M. Raphaelson
2nd: M. Cooney
Discussion: None
Vote: All in favor

THE PRESERVE SUBDIVISION – Review and sign off on Decision

S. Gibson-Quigley asked the Board to review the Approval of Definitive Subdivision Plan (see attached) for The Preserve and state any issues they might have. B. Muir questioned item #15 (pg. 4) because it stated "All ways, roads, lighting,...shall remain private..." and at some point this could become a responsibility of the Town, L. Adams said he had a clause to be added, "until such time as the Town may accept the public improvements." B. Muir also asked who issued the blasting permits for the Town, L. Adams said it would be the fire department. R. Moss had asked for clarification on item #5 (pg.3). It was L. Adams' intent to make sure that if the project had a five-year buildout, the landscaping and utilities would be completed in each phase. He and R. Moss were recommending omitting the phrase "prior to the ...the Planning Board," with "unless covered by surety or bond." The bond would be on a phase by phase basis. L. Adams excused himself from the Board to make the necessary changes to The Preserve Subdivision Decision.

LAUREN LEDGE – Consideration of Request for Two-Year Extension for Roadway Completion

The Board reviewed a memo from L. Adams dated 05-07-02, where he recommended a one-year extension with conditions. Atty. Ed Neal was present and with the exception of condition #2, he said Hunter Ridge was not in common ownership with Lauren Ledge, agreed to the one-year extension. S. Gibson-Quigley asked for questions from the Board. There were none.

Motion: to allow a one-year extension for the Lauren Ledge roadway completion with conditions #1 and #3, by M. Beaudry
2nd: R. Wheaton
Discussion: B. Muir stated he was still aware of the problems with cul-de-sac and drainage.
Vote: In favor – M. Beaudry, S. Gibson-Quigley, M. Cooney, R. Wheaton and M. Raphaelson
Opposed – B. Muir and D. Hill

L. Adams returned to the Board with the changes to the Approval of Definitive Subdivision Plan, second section, #5 and #15 for The Preserve. Board members signed off on the Decision.

NEW BUSINESS (cont.)

May 21st meeting -

Sturbridge Candy Site Plan Review – S. Gibson-Quigley wanted to get a ruling as to whether the variance granted two years ago would still hold since it was granted for commercial and not residential. L. Adams has asked the Zoning Board of Appeals to pursue that concern and state their position on the issue. M. Cooney asked if the two-year limitation would be part of the review. The Board would be looking for a professional survey, as well.

Sturbridge Federated Church – Plans were available for the Board showing the addition of a vestibule with a handicap access and an elevator. This was a smaller treatment of an earlier informal discussion presented to the Board.

CMRPC Sponsored ANR Legislation – The final form of legislation has been prepared and will go to the Senate. L. Adams suggested this was an opportunity for the Board to make comments and to either endorse or not endorse the proposal. He would forward their comments. S. Gibson-Quigley would look for decisions from members at the May 21st meeting.

Reorganization - Planning Board Chair, Planning Board Clerk, Betterment Committee, Central Mass Regional Planning Committee, Community Preservation Act Committee

B. Muir requested a report to the Board on meetings attended by the CMRPC representative.

Motion: to adjourn, M. Beaudry

2nd: D. Hill

Discussion: None

Vote: All in favor

Adjournment at 8:40 PM