

**Sutton Planning Board
December 20, 2010
Minutes**

Approved _____

Present: T. Connors, S. Paul, R. Largess, D. Moroney, W. Whittier, J. Anderson
Staff: J. Hager, Planning Director

General Business:

Form A Plans - No Form A Plans

Minutes

Motion: To approve the minutes of 11/22/10, D. Moroney
2nd: S. Paul
Vote: 5-0-0

Commerce Park Bond Reduction and Extension – Tabled to future meeting.

Villas Bond – Tabled to future meeting.

(R. Largess arrives)

Correspondence/Other: R. Largess spoke about his attendance at the last Central Mass Regional Planning quarterly meeting. He stated it as about changes to the Open Meeting law and while he found it very dry, he noted that he still feels it is important to attend these meetings because this is where many larger decisions are made and the Town should be involved. J. Hager noted attendance also earns the Town more Local Planning Assistance time which is being used this year to upgrade the GIS system.

Public Meeting - Sutton High School/Middle School

Jen Hager, Planning Director explained that in accordance with MGL C. 40A §3, the Dover Amendment, educational uses (among others) are exempt from permitting or regulation beyond that which ensures safe operation of the site. Additionally, even if the use wasn't exempt, the overall size of the expansion does not trigger the parking regulations. Despite this fact, she has worked with the project team and at present the current set of plans would only require a waiver for number of parking spaces. Under the strict and dated Town standards, this site would require about 950 parking spaces or over 5 acres of pavement!

Alan Minkus from Strategic Building Solutions (SBS) overviewed a composite plan of the site addressing many of the concerns the Board expressed at the last meeting. It was noted the Highway Super and Planning Director had met on site with abutter Mr. Briggs of 4 Merriam Lane and discussed drainage in detail. The project team confirmed they have plans to deal with the drainage issues on the site and have developed alternatives if their initial plan doesn't appear to work.

Highway Superintendent, Mark Brigham, was present. He noted that the less obstacles within parking lots the better. He didn't particularly like the row of trees in the middle of the proposed new parking lot. It was noted in order to meet Mass CHPs standards they have to do this type of planting to reduce the heat created by large parking lots. Mr. Brigham disagreed with Mr. Nunnemacher's comments from the last meeting, stating that he feels strongly the island at the drop off area should remain as a place to stack snow, although the grading of the island should be adjusted. Additionally, Mr. Brigham noted he recommends all vertical and sloped granite edging for ease of plowing and long term maintenance costs. He noted the horrible condition of the concrete curbing on the existing site. W. Whittier noted that the drainage on the drop off cul-de-sac is on the inside edge so water has to sheet flow across causing icing issues, this should be corrected. Mr. Brigham agreed.

J. Hager noted she had the team add signature lines to the plan so the Board could endorse it then everyone would know this was the plan that the Board was in general agreement with. Her main focus was to be consistent with other Section 3 reviews where the Board has also voted on and endorsed the plans.

Motion: To approve the Site Plan with adjustments that address concerns but maintain CHPs standards, R. Largess
2nd: D. Moroney

T. Connors interjected that the plan is still a work in progress and the Board should not endorse it. He felt although there has been a review, it has not been consistent with the type of review the Board has done on other projects. He also said as State Law negates their approval in this case, and leaves them with no real enforcement ability, that the Board appreciates having the chance to see and input on the plan, but let them move on with the process. In response to a question from the Chair, J. Hager restated that her only concern was consistency with other Section 3 reviews.

Vote: 1-5-0, Motion fails as the majority of the Board agrees as the plan is exempt from permitting, there is no need for their approval or endorsement.

J. Smith stated that he felt the Board review has been a healthy process that has allowed more people to become familiar with the project and have another opportunity to provide input. It has also focused on details of the site operation that weren't completely considered to date.

Public Meeting (Cont.) – Bridle Path Rescission

The Planning Director noted that the owners of this property wanted to request an additional extension. However, as no additional progress has been made, she suggested the Board would likely not be amenable to granting another extension. As suggested, the attorney for the owners has submitted a letter requesting withdrawal of their application to rescind without prejudice so they may re-submit it at any time if necessary.

Motion: To allow the withdrawal without prejudice of the application to rescind the Bridle Path subdivision approval, D. Moroney
2nd: S. Paul
Vote: 6-0-0

December 20, 2010

Page 3

Motion: To Adjourn, D. Moroney

2nd: W. Whittier

Vote: 6-0-0

Adjourned 8:08 PM