



MEETING MINUTES
February 10, 2016

Chairman: Marc Frieden

Members Present: Vincent Vignaly, Christopher Olson, Cheryl Carlson, Barur Rajeshkumar

Members Absent: None

Others Present: See Attached Sign-In Sheet

All documents referenced in these Minutes are stored and available for public inspection in the Planning Board Office located at 140 Worcester Street.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Cumberland Farms Approval Letter – Tom Reidy submitted the final revised plans which the board signed. The approval letter was also signed and will be given to the Town Clerk for a 20-day appeal period.

New Business/Review of Correspondence/Emails Received:

1. ZBA Informational Petition (North Main Street) Watermark Antiques – Special Permit to buy, sell and store used cars: There is very little parking in the front and the access is narrow and it is not known what their intention is in the back. There is not enough information in the packet. Issues that require more information are the parking requirements, parking provided, access, lighting and displays, screening, aquifer protection and Historical District limitations, what is on the second floor, and zoning. Mr. Vignaly will draft a response for the next meeting.
2. ZBA Informational Petition (Lancaster Street) – Variance to reconfigure the property line: Mr. Frieden asked why they would need a variance since it has already been approved. More clarification is needed. The applicant requested a variance but did not specify for what. There is an ANR plan that was approved in 1960s. It is not known if the deed was ever recorded and not clear why a deed can't be created from the plan on file with the Registry of Deeds. Town Counsel is reviewing. Mr. Vignaly will draft a response for the next meeting.
3. Complete Streets Funding Program email – Mr. Vignaly and Mr. Rajeshkumar will attend the workshop next week.
4. CMRPC Bicycle Parking Program email – Mr. Rajeshkumar will contact Parks & Rec to see if there is a need for bicycle racks.

Old Business/Outstanding Issues/Follow-Ups:

1. 99 Hartwell Street (Stormwater Permit) – Kevin Quinn and Rob Diverdi were present. VHB has been reviewing the site plan drainage design. Mr. Quinn stated that there is one aspect VHB feels uncomfortable advising on and suggested talking to the board. He said the existing site is classified as redevelopment which, under the Mass Stormwater Management Policy, gives them a little more flexibility in terms of uses and compliance to the greatest extent practical with the existing conditions. They are inclined to use chambers under the pavement. There is nowhere on the site to put a detention pond or infiltration basin. After they designed the chambers and looked at the soils they found that the water table is not far below the existing paved surface. In order to meet recharge standards for another part of the site they designed chambers that are intended to store just stormwater; not intended to infiltrate. The chambers don't have adequate separation to the water table. VHB found that to be a problem because it is existing pavement. Mr. Quinn said they believe that because there is new pavement doesn't change the fact that it is a redevelopment of the existing site. In order to accommodate the standards of the new pavement, it would have to be 18" higher. Mr. Vignaly asked what DEP's interpretation was. Mr. Quinn said they were asking to use the chambers for storage so the infiltration and separation doesn't really matter. DEP was not amenable to that. Mr. Vignaly said according to the Wetlands Protection Act, the redevelopment applies only to what is already paved. The portion of new pavement would have to meet all standards. He asked if there was a way to put in a permeable liner or barrier underneath to seal the bottom. They need a 2' separation of groundwater because of water quality concerns. Any water going into the ground will carry pollutants. Mr. Quinn's concern is the chambers have already been installed with open bottoms. Mr. Vignaly said the board's authority is under the Stormwater Bylaw and it clearly says it has to be in compliance with DEP Stormwater standards. Mr. Quinn said compliance includes the language that says there is room for flexibility. There is not enough separation to groundwater to infiltrate. Mr. Quinn is not comfortable with putting in sealed chambers because if the groundwater comes up even higher, the chambers will float and break up the new pavement. Mr. Diverdi was reminded that he agreed that all the work is being done at risk until we receive VHB approval. Mr. Quinn will provide a letter stating the justification and the board will contact VHB to see if there is a compromise. Mr. Diverdi also submitted a letter from Enstrat dated February 4, 2016 relating the environmental history of contamination released at the site and noting that the release has been remediated.
2. Sign Bylaw (draft Public Hearing Notice) – The board reviewed the draft changes Ms. Carlson made. She simplified the wording for the Business Centers. Possibly changing the sign bylaw 10' setback from the property line to being on the parcel, but not within 5' of an abutter was discussed. The setback for Business and Industrial zones would remove the 10' setback. Additional suggestions were made and Ms. Carlson will create a draft with the issues discussed for the next meeting.
3. Review of Planning Board Annual Report – Mr. Olson is in the process of updating and will have a draft to review at the next meeting.

Reports from Other Boards – There were no reports tonight.

Planning Board Meeting Minutes – February 10, 2016

Citizens' Comments – Carlton Barstow submitted the list of items the Homeowners Association would like to be addressed at Angell Brook. It has been forwarded to VHB for their review.

Review/Approve Invoices and Review Draft Meeting Minutes and Draft Public Hearing Minutes of January 27, 2016 – Invoices were approved. Mr. Vignaly made a motion to approve the Public Hearing Meeting Minutes and regular Meeting Minutes of January 27, 2016; Ms. Carlson seconded the motion; all voted in favor; motion approved.

A motion was made by Ms. Carlson to adjourn; Mr. Rajeshkumar seconded the motion; all voted in favor; motion approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Date Accepted: _____

By: _____
Christopher E. Olson, Clerk

Submitted by: _____
Melanie Rich