

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**August 21, 2018**

**7:00PM**

**Memorial Hall**

**Members Present:** John Michalak, Rob Ricker, Otto Lies. Tina Stratis, Mike Krikonis

**Members Not Present:** Jeff Head, Scott Carlson

**Others Present:** Pam Harding, Director of Planning  
Liz Fotos, Town Recorder

J. Michalak called the meeting to order at 7:07PM.

**PUBLIC HEARING DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION- GREENWOOD ESTATES JACKSON WOODS INVESTMENTS**

J. Michalak stated that the Board was provided a copy of the plans and draft conditions.

P. Harding stated that she wanted to point out that there were four eligible voting members present. She stated that they knew that S. Carlson was not going to be present and the applicant choose to proceed at that time. She stated that they needed all four to vote for approval in order for the matter to pass.

C. Blair replied that he was okay with that.

J. Michalak asked if there was any updated information that C. Blair wished to provide the Board.

C. Blair replied that there was not much to update the Board on. He stated they had been waiting on one item which was a condition written up by J. Woodsmall, Director DPW. He stated that J. Woodsmall had asked for some plans to be provided and they had completed that. He stated that other than that, nothing had changed and they had satisfied every comment.

R. Ricker asked if that condition was the one about the pump station.

C. Blair replied that J. Woodsmall wanted the plans for it and he wrote in a condition regarding how he wanted it done. He stated the way it was written in was acceptable to everyone.

J. Michalak asked if the Town had any updates.

Isabel McCauley, Senior Civil Engineer, DPW was present at the meeting. She stated that as P. Harding had indicated, the Board received the draft conditions on Friday. She stated that J. Michalak was on vacation this week and he had reviewed the draft and provided comments about it. She stated that she had looked at conditions and also provided comments and at this point there was nothing big that would change the design plans it was just a matter of tying up loose ends and covering all the bases. She stated that they did add some minor comments today and she spoke with Ryan Mouridian, Water/ Sewer Superintendent to make sure that there was a lot of easement areas and to make sure that the project worked in different phases in terms of access to easements. She stated they also added some language with regards to street number and fire departments as well. She stated they addressed the comments and provided that information to P. Harding.

R. Ricker asked if the applicant had seen these changes.

P. Harding replied that they had.

R. Ricker asked if the applicant was okay with the changes.

C. Blair stated that he had received the letter on Friday and that he did have a comment about one of them. He stated that it indicated the numeration was off #8 and that there was a bottleneck and they had to replace 600ft of pipe that was in the original condition. He stated that they added that this needed to be done prior to the issuance of any building permits. He stated that he does have an issue with this from a logistical standpoint. He stated that he was not adding any new sewer to overburden the pipe at the beginning and he was hoping to do that work with the road improvements for Union Street which was going to happen after 40 permits were issued. He stated that his opinion was that needed to be done at a certain time and that that there was no new sewage at the beginning of the project. He stated it would not overburden the system and that if he could do it at a different time it would be easier for him. He stated that it was not fatal but it would be nice to have that flexibility.

J. Michalak asked which condition this was tied to.

P. Harding replied that they had recommended that #15 be approved and that the work was to be done before the issuance of a building permit. She stated that he wished to change the condition so it read that he could do the work before the 40 permit were issued.

J. Michalak stated that he would be concerned with changing this without the Town's review. He asked if they could add a condition for a new schedule and have them make that determination on the spot.

I McCauley replied that it was her opinion that it was something that could be discussed but she did not want to make the final decision right now because she wanted to bring it back to her peers and discuss the matter further. She stated that it may be something that the Town could accommodate but they would need to review. She stated that it was a bottleneck and if they were adding flow the conservative thing to do would be to have it done before but they could perhaps look and see if there was any room. She stated that they would need to rereview before they could provide an adequate response.

C. Blair stated that they could submit a schedule.

G. Kiritsy stated that he would rather have that then have something that says no build permits can be issued. He stated that would give them the flexibility to work with DPW.

T. Stratis stated that DPW wanted it done prior.

I McCauley replied they did because building permits were tied to sewer conditions.

R. Ricker stated that he thought it would be a while before the first sewer was tied in.

I McCauley stated that they were phasing the project and that a lot of components needed to be done with the first piece. She stated that DPW did not want to specify to the developer how to do it they want them to come up with and approach and give DPW the opportunity to review and discuss prior to any construction.

R. Ricker asked if there would be sufficient time for DPW and the applicant to work this out.

I McCauley stated that it would almost be separate. She stated that they will do improvements, do the pump station and redirect the flow and add a new sewer and force main, and a lot of other components as well. She stated there were a lot of offsite improvements to be done. She stated that they did not want to specify to a developer how and when to do this work but that all these things needed to be done and that with the bottleneck they felt that it was prudent to do it before the building permits.

C. Blair replied that he had to do the pump station first no matter what. He asked if they were okay with them submitting a schedule.

I McCauley stated that one was requested and they would have a preconstruction meeting where they will ask for sequencing.

G. Kiritsy asked if they could reword the condition so that it would say building permits would be issued upon approval of construction schedule by DPW. He stated that would make it so no building permits were issued until approved.

C. Blair agreed with that.

O. Lies stated that Mr. Kiritsy may be onto something but he wanted #51 to read as a condition not a statement.

I McCauley stated that she added to it “the schedule may be amended by DPW Engineering” before the wording “before issuance of building permits.”

O. Lies asked if the definition of the bottom being clean was clear to everyone.

P. Harding replied that it was in the Weston and Sampson reports.

G. Kiritsy asked if rather than coming back to the Planning Board if they could be granted the ability to work with DPW.

J. Michalak stated they could review that request.

C. Blair stated that other than that the wording was fine.

R. Ricker asked if there were any other concerns from the Town.

I McCauley stated that the one thing that she had discussed is that they would like to have a final version of the conditions in order to take a second look at it and ensure that they were not missing anything.

R. Ricker asked how many phases there would be.

C. Blair replied he thought there would be five.

I McCauley stated another condition they needed to address was the street numbering because the way it was originally numbered did not work for fire or emergency responders.

P. Harding stated that the other one that that the Board had asked to change was to add the common driveway prohibition.

C. Blair stated that they have to approve the site plan anyway. He stated that he knows that there is some slopes to deal with and that the common driveways will help with that. He stated that if the answer is no then so be it but he asked for the opportunity to come before the Planning Board to ask them.

R. Ricker stated that he read the condition twice and it was no prohibiting C. Blair from coming in for a Special Permit, it was just stating that the subdivision plan does not allow it but once the plan is approved they could come before the Board for a Special Permit. He stated it was simply stating that the common driveway was not by right.

C. Blair stated he was fine with that.

P. Harding agreed. She stated that she did not want to imply that any common driveways were approved but they could clarify it if he wanted.

J. Michalak asked how they proceeded and if they needed to read everything into record.

C. Blair waived the reading of the conditions.

T. Stratis asked about the fences around the detention pond and if the pond held water.

C. Blair stated that they fence them if they hold water because of the safety concern.

T. Stratis asked if they were deep.

C. Blair stated that it would depend if it was a retention pond or a detention pone and if they were dry they could address it with the Board in the future.

T. Stratis stated that some may need fences.

G. Kiritsy stated that they were initially deeper.

R. Ricker stated that the fences were a requirement of the bylaw.

O. Lies asked for clarification of which draft they were looking at.

P. Harding told him that they had handed a draft out today with the major changes highlighted. She stated that all major changes were also outlined on the memo.

J. Michalak asked about Condition #32. He asked if there was going to be a plan that was prepared by the developer to be recorded regarding the easements.

P. Harding stated that it shall be provided to the Town; the implication was that the developer would be doing it.

C. Blair agreed.

R. Ricker asked if those were recorded.

P. Harding replied they were.

I McCauley stated that they would need to record the new roadway as a public way.

P. Harding replied that they would need to have it accepted a Town Meeting and have a record of the plan.

G. Kiritsy stated that it would be built within a certain number of houses.

P. Harding stated that they had increased it to 40 however the Town would still need to accept the way at Town Meeting.

C. Blair stated that they could give it for Town access.

P. Harding stated that the applicant and Town Counsel could figure it out.

R. Ricker asked if the applicant was going to maintain roads and structures until accepted at Town Meeting.

C. Blair replied he would be.

R. Ricker stated that he knew that had been a discussion point in the past.

R. Ricker asked if #68 covered the bottleneck.

I McCauley stated that it was just requesting that they meet before construction begins.

J. Michalak asked if that had to do with schedules.

I McCauley replied that they did not put any schedules anywhere but they can add them or they can assume that it is standard discussion prior to construction. She stated the bottleneck and the redirection of the sewer is a number of improvements that need to be done to direct the sewer to Main Street. She stated that there would be discussion and the Town would need to know what the plan was prior to it happening so they could be ready for it.

J. Michalak asked if they needed to add that or if it was a standard condition.

I McCauley stated that they could add the sequence of operation/ schedule should be provided.

G. Kiritsy stated that it was part of the submittal. He stated that they have to meet with the Town before work begins to coordination who is inspecting, what they want done and other details.

I McCauley stated that they had been doing it with all the developers and it had been working out well. She stated that it didn't hurt to add that verbiage.

J. Michalak stated he just wanted to make sure everyone was on the same page.

R. Ricker asked why #6 was highlighted.

P. Harding stated that all changes were highlighted even a number change.

M. Krikonis asked when street signs went up, if it was at road acceptance.

P. Harding replied they went up before.

M. Krikonis asked if it was handled by the applicant or the Town.

P. Harding replied that it was in the Subdivision Control Regulations.

J. Michalak asked about Comment #44.

P. Harding stated that they felt 1:1 was too difficult to traverse that slope.

J. Michalak asked if they could traverse a 2:1 slope.

P. Harding replied they could.

M. Krikonis asked about the missing date.

P. Harding replied that on the title page they needed to fill in January 26, 2018.

R. Ricker stated that there was numerous mentions of an inspector.

P. Harding stated that the Town was requiring a 3<sup>rd</sup> party inspector. She stated that they also required Weston and Sampson to do the offsite sewer inspections.

R. Ricker asked how they could the inspectors; if it was a sewer inspector or a site inspector.

P. Harding stated that the Town said an inspector and Con Com wanted erosion control inspector and DPW wanted someone on site to monitor installation of utilities and roadways and drainage. She stated that if someone had the right qualifications it could be the same person or all different.

T. Stratis asked if that was hired by the applicant.

P. Harding stated that the applicant pays, the Town hires. She stated that this was a typical condition for something this large.

R. Ricker asked if Condition #44 was regarding the building permits.

P. Harding replied that the final grading plans needed the approval of Holden Fire. She stated it was part of the process.

R. Ricker asked who enforced #72.

P. Harding stated that the condition was in there from the order of the Con Com; she stated it could be specified.

I McCauley stated that on the section where they proposed the guardrail; she asked if they were going to terminate and then have the driveway and then pick it up again for each lot.

C. Blair confirmed they were.

I McCauley stated that a guardrail was proposed in several locations on both sides. She stated that she agreed with that for the slope down but she asked if they considered anything else for the slope up. She stated that they could condition to go over this more specifically with DPW if the applicant wished.

C. Blair stated that he believed that Quinn Engineering asked MA DOT about this. He stated that he preferred to not have it this way and they can talk about it. He stated that anything the Town wanted was fine.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by T. Stratis, it was VOTED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1 TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION- GREENWOOD ESTATES JACKSON WOODS INVESTMENTS.

R. Ricker asked about the waivers for the subdivision and if there were any issues with them.

T. Stratis asked about the street width of 24ft.

P. Harding stated that the plan was submitted with 28ft road width. She stated that the Board is ultimately not making them this narrow in the Subdivision Control Regulations however at the time, DPW and the Board took a vote to support 24ft road with for this subdivision when the applicant amended the plan.

R. Ricker stated that part of this was also prohibiting parking on one side of the street.

O. Lies stated that he was not in favor of 24ft widths in general but he is in this situation. He stated that this was unusual but he thinks that this should be addressed as a Board once and for all as the Board has been speaking about this for the last two or three years. He stated that he felt the same way as the next waiver.

P. Harding stated that they can have a meeting whenever he wishes and that the Town had hired a consultant so the matters would probably be on for the a September meeting.

O. Lies stated that these things would not come up as waivers if the Towns regulations were updated.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by O. Lies, it was VOTED BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1 TO GRANT A WAIVER FOR V.A.2 AS PRESENTED IN THE DRAFT CONDITIONS DATED AUGUST 21, 2018. (M. Krikonis: abstain).

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by T. Stratis, it was VOTED TO GRANT A WAIVER FOR V.A.3/ ALLOW REMOVAL OF ISLANDS BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1 (M. Krikonis: abstain).

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by T. Stratis, it was VOTED TO GRANT A WAIVER FOR 1:1 SLOPES AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1(M. Krikonis: abstain).

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by O. Lies, it was VOTED TO APPROVE WAIVER 4/ 6% SLOPES SPECIFIC TO THE CROSSING INDICATED ON THE PLAN INTERIOR TO THE SUBDIVISION BASED ON THE LOCATION OF THE WETLANDS BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1 (M. Krikonis: abstain).

R. Ricker stated that before they voted on the Subdivision as a whole he did have a question. He stated there were six more conditions on the draft; he asked if there were any surprises.

P. Harding stated that they were incorporated in, she stated that they changed the building permits issued for the improvements to Union to Highland from 25-40.

R. Ricker asked about Condition #6.

P. Harding replied they added language to that condition and that Condition #15 was with regards to the bottleneck on Main Street.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by T. Stratis, it was VOTED BY 4-0-1 (M. Krikonis: abstain) TO APPROVE DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION GREENWOOD ESTATES, JACKSON WOODS INVESTMENTS BASED ON THE DEFINITIVE PLANS ENTITLED AMENDED DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION PLANS GREENWOOD II, LOCATED IN HOLDEN MA DATED SEPTEMBER 7, 2015 WITH REVISIONS THROUGH JULY 11, 2017 CONSISTING OF THE FOLLOWING SHEETS LAST REVISED ON:

July 11, 2017, Sheets S01-03, S07-09, Co1, Eco1-05, Ec07-09, Do1, Do9-10

May 4, 2018, Sheets S04-05, C02-04, C06-08, -03-06, P09, P12, P-15, D04

May 10, 2017, Sheets St-1, X-01-09

September 8, 2017, Sheets S06, EC06

September 19, 2017, Sheets D02-03

June 1, 2018 Sheets C05-P14-D-05

November 9, 2017 Sheets P01-02, P-8, WC01

March 1, 2018 Sheets P07, P10-P11, P13

January 31, 2017 Sheets X10-13

July 19, 2017 Sheets D06-07

September 7, 2017 Sheets D-08

March 7, 2018 Main Street Sewer Existing Conditions Plan

June 5, 2018, Sheets SS 01-03, PS01-02

July 28, 2018 Sheets PS03

June 11, 2018 Sheets RW1-2

June 5, 2018 Sheets SS-01-03

June 1, 2018 Off Site Sewer Connection Plan Sheets 1-4

September 18, 2017 Greenwood Estates Grading Plan Sheets 1 of 3

January 26, 2018, Offsite Improvements (Union Highland Intersection Sheets 1-4

Greenwood II Stormwater Calculations

Green International Traffic Study

With all conditions numbered 1- 85 as listed in the DRAFT CONDITIONS, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS TO BE AMMENDED:

**CONDITION #15:** ADD THAT THE CONTRACTOR MAY SUBMIT A REQUEST WITH THE SCHEDULE OF WORK AND ANY ANALYSIS TO CHANGE THE ORDER OF CONSTRUCTION TO BE WITH PRIOR APPROVAL OF THE DPW.

**CONDITION #31:** TO ADD THE DATE OF THE PLAN: JANUARY 26, 2018.

**CONDITION #68:** CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE SHALL BE SUBMITTED BY APPLICANT FOR APPROVAL BY DPW PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES.

**CONDITION #86:** DPW TO ADD THAT DPW HAS THE RIGHT AFTER REVIEW OF LATEST COMMITNS TO DISCUSS CHANGES WITH THE APPLICANT/ TOWN WITHIN REASON.

C. Blair thanked the Board.

J. Michalak thanked I. McCauley and the DPW for all their work.

**BOND REDUCTION- RED TAIL ESTATES DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION // WINGSPAN PROPERTIES**

R. Ricker asked if the bio retention basin was being bonded because the subdivision was not yet accepted.

I McCauley stated that it was because the fence was installed over the pipe and the developer knows the fence needed to be removed. She stated that they thought they should hold moneys so that if the applicant doesn't do it they will have money to do the work.

Motion by T. Stratis, seconded by O. Lies, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO REDUCE THE BOND FOR RED TAIL ESTATES DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION// WINGSAPN TO \$16,690.50.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF BOND- TORREY LANE EXTENSION**

P. Harding stated that this was the subdivision that was under covenant. She stated the full bond amount was \$264,470.39 and the reduction base don current condition was to \$75,659.77.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by M. Krikonis, it was UNANIMOSSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE ORIGINAL BOND AMOUNT FOR TORREY LANE EXTENSION AS PRESENTED.

**APPOINTMENT OF CMRPC DELEGATES**

R. Ricker asked if O. Lies was still doing this.

O. Lies stated that the only comment he had was that he had not seen John Voice in some time.

P. Harding stated that he was still interested in doing this.

O. Lies stated that CMRPC was moving towards economic development as well as trying to keep up with the legal changes. He stated that the housing initiative did not make it.

P. Harding disagreed and stated the Town got their designation about a month ago and received a grant award.

O. Lies stated that he would look into it as he received a note that it did not pass.

P. Harding stated that there was an online program set up and they were accepting funding requests and grant applicants for the next year.

R. Ricker asked what the Town applied for.

P. Harding replied a roof for the library.

**MASTER PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE STATUS**

P. Harding stated that there was a Steering Booth at Holden Days and they had received 972 responses in the questionnaire. She stated the next meeting would be on September 4, 2018 and then there would be a community wide vision session on September 22, 2018. She stated that the meeting would be held at the high school and that notices would go out in the next Light Bill.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

None

Motion by T. Stratis, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 21, 2018 PLANNING BOARD MEETING AT 8:40PM.

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_