

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
October 24, 2017

7:04PM

Memorial Hall

Members Present: John Michalak, Otto Lies, William Ritter, Jeff Head, Rob Ricker, Scott Carlson

Members Not Present: Tina Stratis

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

J. Michalak called the meeting to order at 7:04PM

PUBLIC HEARING DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION-TORREY LANE CUL DE SAC- 4 LOTS-BOYLSTON CP, LLC Cont. from September 24, 2017

John Grenier, Boylston CP, LLC was present at the meeting. He stated that he believed there was a draft decision; he stated they had received that and they are fine with the conditions of approval. He stated that he believes they have addressed all the items that Engineering and Planning had asked of them. He asked if there were any further questions that he could answer.

J. Michalak opened it up for public comment; no members of the public stepped forward.

P. Harding stated that all the comments had been addressed and there were a few special conditions and a list of the waivers that the Board had historically approved.

J. Michalak asked if the Board had any further questions.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION-TORREY LANE CUL DE SAC- 4 LOTS-BOYLSTON CP, LLC.

WAIVER REQUESTS

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO GRANT WAIVER REQUEST ONE:

- 1. REQUESTED WAIVER from Section V.A.2(a)** Requiring a 50 foot Right of Way to allow for a 48.5' Right of Way.

GRANTED: This subdivision is an extension of an existing right of way which is 48.5 feet in width, it is preferred to maintain a consistent width for the limited extension to avoid negative aesthetic and maintenance effects.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO GRANT WAIVER REQUEST TWO:

- 2. REQUESTED WAIVER FROM Section V.A.2a.** Requiring 28' width of pavement to allow for 24'

GRANTED: The existing width of Torrey Lane is 24', to created a wider extension in the cul de sac is not necessary for the limited traffic and the consistent width will allow for easier maintenance

A Motion was made by W. Ritter and seconded by R. Ricker with regards to a waiver requesting the center island of the cul de sac being removed. The Board unanimously voted to approve this waiver. A new motion was made by W. Ritter and seconded by J. Head to withdraw the motion as the Town requested that the island remain intact for snow removal and maintenance purposes. The approved motion was rescinded; the Board voted unanimously to rescind this vote.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO GRANT WAIVER REQUEST THREE:

- 3. REQUESTED: WAIVER Appendix A Typical Roadway Section:** Requires sidewalk construction on both sides of roadways, the applicant is requesting relief for construction of the sidewalk on one side of the roadway.

GRANTED: The sidewalk for a cul de sac will be minimally utilized due to extremely low traffic volumes. There are no existing sidewalks on Torrey Lane, the Applicant is required to extend the sidewalk from the subdivision along the existing public way to the intersection of Hawthorne Road and Torrey Lane, providing a connection to the existing sidewalk.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO GRANT APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION TORREY LANE AS SUBMITTED INCLUDING THREE WAIVER REQUESTS AND GENERAL CONDITIONS NUMBER #1-44 AS PRESENTED. (SEE ATTACHED).

PUBLIC HEARING –HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER- 351 Bullard Street SITE PERMIT/SPECIAL PERMIT

P. Harding stated that Holden Youth Soccer requested a continuance to November 14, 2017.

R. Ricker asked if there were any outstanding issues.

P. Harding replied that T. Stratis was not present at the meeting and W. Ritter needed to recuse himself so the applicant did not want to put themselves in that position and they submitted a written request for continuance. She stated that the Board could take action on the matter at 7:15PM as stated on the agenda.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEAL RECOMMENDATION Special Permit-Expansion or change of a non-conforming use- 211 Doyle Road- Brandon and Michael Fusaro

W. Ritter recused himself from this matter.

P. Harding stated that this was the site of the florist and they wanted to continue the use and add commercial landscaping vehicles and mulch and materials to the rear of the property.

R. Ricker stated it was a grandfathered operation; he stated they were just looking to continue business.

P. Harding stated they were looking to slightly expand it outside with storage and vehicles.

J. Michalak stated that it appeared they had four abutters; he asked if they were all residential.

P. Harding stated that she was not sure but that they could be impacted. She stated that they would receive notice from the ZBA for the hearing.

R. Ricker asked if the Board could see the special permit on this matter.

P. Harding replied that they would not because the site plan was triggered by a change to the building.

R. Ricker stated that there was no Planning significance.

O. Lies stated that he thinks a florist blends nicely to the area but storing equipment in a residential area he was not comfortable with. He stated that they would see what happened with the abutters.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by S. Carlson, it was VOTED 5-0-1 (Ritter: abstain) TO TAKE NO ACTION FOR ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS RECOMMENDATION // SPECIAL PERMIT- EXPANSION OR CHANGE OF NON-CONFORMING USE- 211 DOYLE ROAD, BRANDON AND MICHAEL FUSARO BECAUSE THERE IS A LACK OF PLANNING SIGNIFICANCE.

HYS Cont.

Motion by R. Ricker seconded by J. Head, it was VOTED 5-0-1(Ritter: abstain) TO GRANT THE APPLIANTS WRITTEN REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE FOR HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER PUBLIC HEARING//SITE PLAN SPECIAL PERMIT TO NOVEMBER 14, 2017 WITH THE EXTENSION TO FILE TO NOVEMBER 28, 2017.

W. Ritter returned to the meeting at 7:20PM.

MISC

P. Harding stated that there would be a Special Town Meeting for the clean up of the future site of the DPW building. She stated there would also be a few street acceptances at that meeting; Stoney Brook Estates and Bullard.

J. Michalak asked the date.

P. Harding replied November 27, 2017. She stated the date needed to be confirmed by the Board of Selectmen but it will likely proceed. She stated they would know definitely by November 6, 2017. She stated there was also a zoning petition for a zone change at the corner of Shrewsbury and Chapel; 270 Chapel Street. She stated that if the Town Meeting moved forward they would need a public hearing on November 14, 2017.

W. Ritter asked if this was the same request as previously.

P. Harding confirmed it was.

W. Ritter asked if the DPW Building required a site plan.

P. Harding replied that it was for site remediation and clean up but eventually it would.

J. Woodsmall, DPW Director was present at the meeting. He stated that the game plan would be for the remediation of the site and demo of all or some of the building and money for the next phase of the design.

R. Ricker asked if after that happened, the next phase would be to fund the building.

J. Woodsmall replied that would hopefully be the next step.

R. Ricker asked what happened with the wedding venue in Jefferson.

P. Harding replied that the Building Commissioner issued an enforcement order to stop conducting events, the applicant submitted an appeal and the ZBA upheld the Building Commissioners' decision. She stated there was also a variance application as well.

J. Michalak asked if there was anything new with CMRPC.

P. Harding stated that she had emailed the Board training if anyone was interested they could let her know

STONEBROOK ESTATES BOND REDUCTION

George Kiritsy was present at the meeting.

G. Kiritsy stated that they had requested further bond reduction. He stated that he knows the Board has feed back form the Town but this was tentatively scheduled for street acceptance at the Special Town Meeting and they believe it was wise to table this matter until after that meeting.

W. Ritter asked if there was a timeframe the Board needed to review the matter in.

P. Harding replied that they needed to respond to the applicant within 45 days; but if the applicant is requesting to table the matter she thinks that is agreeable.

R. Ricker asked if that included the problem with the basin and the drainage.

G. Kiritsy replied that the current configuration was being reviewed by the Conservation Commission.

C. Blair stated that Isabel McCauley, Senior Civil Engineer, DPW reviewed it and provided comments and that he would be resubmitting it.

P. Harding stated that the large detention basin within the subdivision behind Joel Scott was holding water so they still had to meet Stormwater Standards. She stated that they want to use it as a wet basin but they still need to prove to the Town that it meets standards.

W. Ritter asked if they had a punch list provided to them from the Town.

P. Harding replied they did and she believed they were about 75% completed with it.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by J. Head, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO GRANT THE DEVELOPERS WRITTEN REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR STONEY BROOK BOND REDUCTION TO NOVEMBER 28, 2017 WITH AN EXTENSION TO FILE TO DECEMBER 8, 2017

PUBLIC HEARING-GREENWOOD ESTATES- Union Street Jackson Wood Investments, LLC

George Kiritsy was present for the applicant. C. Blair was present. C. Hultgren was present.

The Board opened up the Public Hearing at 7:30PM.

P. Harding stated for the record that J. Head had missed the last Public Hearing but had read the meeting minutes and signed the Mullins Affidavit.

P. Harding asked if everyone had the revised letter from October 24, 2017 from Quinn Engineering.

G. Kiritsy stated that the applicant had amended the subdivision for Greenwood Estates and that it had been a long process. He stated that a full package was submitted to the parties and Quinn Engineering did an extensive review of the package and submitted to the Board a report. He stated that they were confident that the comment had been addressed and a finished package was submitted. He stated that they believe everything that had been called to attention in the letter was addressed or things that were Planning Board consideration such as location of street lights and tree species or other small housekeeping issues.

G. Kiritsy stated that there were also a series of waivers called out in that letter. He stated that C. Hultgren was correct in noting it on his letter however it was up to the Board to say if the developer could have it granted or not so it was not an outstanding condition.

G. Kiritsy stated that since they were last in front of the Board, they had met with Conservation and they had voted to the Order of Conditions. He stated that both Con Com and the Planning Board have the updated plans. He stated that the Conservation Commission issued an Order of Conditions and the applicant was waiting on the appeal periods to pass. He stated they were now moving to this Board (Planning) for approval of the subdivision plan.

G. Kiritsy stated that he spoke with C. Blair and that engineering wise the plan was ripe for consideration. He stated that there was an issue relative to sewer. He stated that the sewer system was designed on site. He stated that where the sewer is going after it leaves the site has been presented to the DPW and their outside consultants; Weston & Sampson for consideration. He stated that they had made three proposals and that he believes that where they decided to send it for final conveyance to the system was an appropriate spot where there is capacity. He stated that there were a few offsite improvements that were needed to be completed but the system has capacity.

G. Kiritsy stated that the exact route had not been completely worked out although there were several options presented. He stated that the applicant had a meeting with the Town and Weston & Sampson yesterday. He stated that C. Blair had proposed to go into a manhole that was fed by another pump station. He stated the Town raised the issue of a surge in use. He stated that they proposed a newer system with controls to help time the issue and prevent it from happening but that the Town stated that

they do not want to use that type of system. He stated the applicant came up with a few other proposals.

G. Kiritsy stated that they were looking at a few different options but these offsite improvements were being reviewed but that there was capacity.

G. Kiritsy stated that the distribution of sewer was under Sewer Regulations. He stated this required DPW to review and approve. He stated that there was not issue with the system on site it was just a question of how it gets from their site to the sewer system and that needed to be improved under Town regulations. He stated that they were confident that a solution existed and there was capacity they just need to find an alternative that was most palatable to DPW. He stated with that being said, several alternatives have been provided to DPW. He stated that review was independent of this Board's approval.

G. Kiritsy stated that he knows they spoke about the waivers as well and he would be happy to go through any issues with that or with anything Quinn Engineering bought up as well.

P. Harding stated that Weston and Sampson did a peer review and were present at the meeting but she asked if they could possibly address any questions for C. Hultgren, Quinn Engineering first because the sewer discussion could get lengthy.

J. Michalak asked if the Town had any input on the outstanding conditions.

P. Harding stated that the Board could condition street trees. She stated that regarding the guard rails there was not enough room on the shoulder for construction. She stated that was an outstanding item and DPW requested a detail sheet showing the construction detail and the applicant stated that it was not necessary. She stated that was outstanding. She stated that it was not required in the Subdivision Control Regulations but that due to the busyness of the street, DPW wanted it.

R. Ricker asked about the common driveways.

P. Harding stated that the Board would need to be clear in the approval that the approval of the subdivision was not an approval of any common driveway.

G. Kiritsy agreed with that. He stated that the Subdivision Approval was to build the site not to build the houses.

S. Carlson asked if they could discuss the 1:1 slope; he asked how many feet that occurred for and if they were using rip rap.

C. Hultgren stated that any slope that was greater than 2:1 would be designed and certified by geo technical engineer. He stated rip was one way to do it but there were others as well that they could use if it was geo tech certified.

P. Harding stated that with the original submission of this subdivision there were retaining walls which the Town did not want to support the public way.

S. Carlson asked who would be responsible for these.

P. Harding replied the Town was responsible for the potion in the public way.

R. Ricker asked if they were comfortable with these conditions.

C. Hultgren replied that as long as someone certified them they were better than retaining walls.

O. Lies stated that he was concerned about the 1:1 even if it was stabilized.

C. Hultgren stated that they show rip rap but it would be certified and designed by a geo technical engineer. He stated he thinks the Town would want the engineer to design the slope and then certify that the slope was stable.

O. Lies stated that a slope of this magnitude was asking for a mudslide and that the retaining wall was perhaps a preferred method.

C. Hultgren stated that there were pros and cons to both but both would be certified. He stated that 2:1 or greater should be certified which was the recommendation 8 on the last page.

W. Ritter stated that he would rather not have the walls given the historical problem that the town has with them.

R. Ricker stated that he agreed with W. Ritter.

S. Carlson asked if they were just cutting in and taking all the virgin soil and stabilizing it or if they were putting something on top.

C. Blair stated that it would be structural fill, he stated that it worked really well.

S. Carlson stated that with that height he would have to go in 30ft.

C. Blair stated he was not sure how deep the crossings were but he did not think it was 30ft he thought it was about 6ft high. He stated that the geogrid there would not be issues with runoff.

C. Hultgren stated that the lower crossing was more than 6ft it was more like 20ft. He stated in general the ground sloped that way so it was not a right triangle it was more of a slope on a slope.

S. Carlson stated it was more like two stories.

J. Michalak asked what the material was in the field.

C. Blair replied gravel and sand.

J. Michalak stated there were 25ft cuts in some areas.

C. Blair replied there was no ground water or ledge.

C. Hultgren stated that the testing he saw was a sandy material.

S. Carlson asked how this would be conditioned.

P. Harding replied that they would incorporate general conditions and then recommend additional ones from Quinn Engineering letter and a variety of other things.

S. Carlson asked if the Town felt this was complete.

P. Harding stated that she did not feel as though they were ready.

W. Ritter asked if they could iron everything out and include the 3rd party review so that a decision could be prepared that included everything in it.

G. Kiritsy stated that to address the waiver; there is a request for waiver to slope from the centerline of the road. He stated that although it is more than 5% as it approaches the intersection it has a better stopping distance this way. He stated that the Board has a requirement for max grades for the cars to have a better stopping distance for intersections where they have competing traffic flow except when you approach from downgrade. He stated that they had asked for a waiver but only in the portion of the road that was below.

J. Michalak stated they were only requesting a waiver in one location.

G. Kiritsy replied yes.

S. Carlson asked what happened from Union to Highland.

C. Blair stated that they were going to fix the intersection for the exterior of the site. He stated that within the Subdivision Rules and Regulations, it stopped within the site. He stated that Union Street was within the site so if he had the road coming into the site at 7%-8% he would address it but that as far as he knows it stopped Union so was not in the site.

R. Ricker asked what the grade was of Union to Highland with the new offsite improvements.

C. Blair stated it was pretty steep. He stated that there were driveways so you couldn't cut the road they had to keep it the same.

J. Michalak asked if VHB was still reviewing it.

P. Harding stated that the Town had VHB evaluate the previously approved improvements and they were making sure that any improvements were the best solution. She stated that it was not done yet and they anticipated it in a week.

C. Hultgren stated that his office did not review the offsite and because it was traffic related they deferred comments to VHB.

W. Ritter asked if the intersection was a safety issue at that grade.

C. Hultgren replied that they deferred to VHB.

I McCauley, Senior Civil Engineer, DPW stated that preliminary comments from VHB for the interior crossing did not feel that there was a safety concern because you would cross from the inside loop going downhill. She stated that a few comments related to other traffic area in that section of the roadway was one having a crosswalk close to the crossing, they did not think that was appropriate and some other comments were to ensure that everything met MA DOT Traffic Standards.

S. Carlson asked what the width of Union Street was.

P. Harding replied she was not sure.

I McCauley stated that the proposed road meets Union. She stated that the developer presented offsite improvements that were at the intersection of Union and Highland and VHB made comments that suggested a change of the intersection to a more 90 degree T intersection.

S. Carlson stated that his question was without the T development was not going. He stated that if you have a road width of 20-22ft and now there were going to be 80+ more cars and no recovery area. He stated this was going to be another problem.

C. Blair stated that they had provided a traffic study and they do it on level of service. He stated that it did not really change with the addition of this site and it was also one of the reasons they did the offsite improvements. He stated that the site did not have a major effect on traffic but the improvements were to help the safety.

I McCauley stated that the traffic study did indicate that there was a change in level of service, but it was not drastic. She stated that their original comments said that there needed to be some mitigation levels so the developer's response was to submit the offsite improvements to Union and Highland. She stated that all comments on that indicated that the plan needed to be updated to include comments from the peer review which is basically that the majority of the changes will be at Union and Highland and not many changes proposed to Union and Wachusett. She stated that this would have to be part of the approval.

J. Head stated that he was trying to understand what Diane Drive would look like.

C. Blair stated that was the area of the crossing.

J. Head stated that it would be icy and dangerous and people would need to brake on a difficult curve in the winter with a slope on the side. He asked if that could be addressed.

C. Blair stated that there would be guardrails; he stated that it met the Towns rules and regulations.

J. Michalak asked if the slope was in the right of way.

C. Blair stated that any time they were proposing 1:1 not in the area of crossing it was outside the right of way or it would not get approved.

J. Michalak stated that 56R was outside the right of way but 57R was in it.

C. Blair agreed; he stated it was because of the crossings.

C. Hultgren stated that 57R extends into the right of way and then once it is beyond the crossing on 56R and 58R it was outside of it. He stated that one recommendation was that anytime there was a 1:1 there was a guardrail.

J. Head stated there would be guardrails that would break for each driveway.

C. Hultgren confirmed that.

J. Michalak asked about station 50.

C. Hultgren stated that was where it met with existing slope.

J. Michalak stated that the driveway was right next to it.

C. Hultgren stated they would need a wall there. He stated it was a common driveway which was not part of this approval.

J. Michalak asked the location of the wetlands.

C. Hultgren showed them on the plan.

W. Ritter asked about other zoning issues and if they were corrected.

C. Hultgren stated that the first comment incorporated a frontage lot into the subdivision to make one of their lots compliant. He stated it was separate owners; C. Blair not Jackson Woods. He stated if they were incorporating that into the subdivision it would have to be looked at. He stated it was a process detail.

G. Kiritsy stated that it was entitlement and was under common control. He stated that once they have Planning Board approval they will deed the lot and then Jackson Woods would own the entire parcel. He stated that they do not want to sacrifice the lot but once the subdivision is approved he could merge the lot.

W. Ritter asked if they were okay with that as a condition.

G. Kiritsy confirmed they were.

O. Lies asked where the guardrails were located.

G. Kiritsy stated they would be in all areas of 1:1 slopes.

O. Lies stated that was not good design and he wished there were a better option.

G. Kiritsy replied that was still a gentler slope than a cliff which would be a retaining wall.

O. Lies replied he understood the need but did not want to see a new development with guardrails.

C. Blair replied it was just in the crossing or anywhere it was steep. He stated that they were trying to not get rid of all the trees and not do as much cut and fill. He stated if they wanted it to be straighter they would need to clear cut the trees.

J. Michalak asked if 6" rip rap was going to be enough.

C. Hultgren stated that they looked at the Stormwater Calculations and guidance for the rip rap as far as how long and how wide it should be and they followed their guidance.

J. Michalak stated that 6" seemed small.

J. Michalak stated that there was a manhole and the detail showed a drop manhole that was not shown on the plans.

R. Ricker stated that was under Weston and Sampson.

C. Blair stated that he knew the Board had consulted with Weston and Sampson on this.

J. Michalak stated that 68 R and 69R were parcels that had no driveways connected. He asked if this was a fire safety issue as there was not access to the homes. It would be 30ft up a stairwell to the house. He stated that was concerning.

C. Blair stated that they made the changes that were asked of them under the Towns regulations. He stated that he agreed with J. Michalak but that the plans met the Towns regulations.

J. Michalak stated that 4ft pipe crossing for 25ft drop he thinks they would need to consider at class 1 type pipe; he stated they needed to make sure that they used the right type of pipe.

C. Blair stated that it was originally designed as classified RCD and DPW commented that they preferred to see plastic.

J. Michalak asked if they looked at turning on Diane Drive to make sure a truck could make the turn if someone was pulling out.

C. Blair replied they did and that he defers to VHB for traffic.

O. Lies stated that 80 houses generates cars and school kids. He asked where the kids would be picked up and if there was a safe place for the bus stop or if the bus was supposed to go into Union Street. He stated this would generate more traffic.

C. Blair stated that they just did this at Stoney Brook. He stated that they will clear an area and work with the district.

O. Lies stated it was not on the plan and asked for it to be in the draft.

C. Blair stated that it was and showed him the sidewalk.

O. Lies asked if that was a safe area.

J. Michalak asked if there was any public comment; no members of the public stepped forward.

Weston and Sampson

Paul (Grenk) Project Manager at Weston and Sampson was present at the meeting. He stated that there was capacity as long as the connection was made. He stated that the applicant had submitted the draft but final plans were needed. He stated that additionally he wanted to go over some comments that were not addressed in submittal.

Paul stated that they want to review the final pump station and they have comments about the retaining wall that surrounded it. He stated that they also have several comments about the force main and sewer system design. He stated that most of the comments were related to details, location of airway styles and some of the details of the structure. He stated that they were minor comments that could be addressed.

Paul stated that the major comments were about Union Street sewer and that it should be in the Diane Drive Sewer. He stated that they had not seen that yet.

C. Blair stated that there was no sewer on Union Street. He stated that he had not proposed picking up any of that and that they come out and put a manhole in.

I McCauley stated that originally the comments that they had was that if the development was running sewer Union to Highland the houses on Union should be able to connect to sewer so a sewer gravity connection should be evaluated for that section of Union Street. She stated that was with the original comments and that they had not discussed that specifically because other items were being discussed.

I McCauley stated that the way they interpret it was sewer was available for them with a force main if a gravity line were installed.

C. Blair stated he was not doing a gravity line. He stated that you can tie E-1 into force main if they want sewer. He stated that he thought this was settled when they asked him to put a manhole outside of Union. He stated if they want to run it they could but he does not think they need it and they could all be tied in with a force main. He stated he was not proposing a gravity sewer at Union.

I McCauley stated that was one of the comments that had not been addressed.

Paul stated that a comment on sewer service location and elevation conflicted on sheet page 6; 4675 and 4852 it appeared that 8" sewer was the same as 24" drain. He stated they wanted to see how they will tie in as there may be a conflict on the higher elevation with the 24" and then the lower elevation to connect by gravity. He stated that they would want the proposed elevations to confirm that you can make those connections.

C. Blair stated that they provided elevation on all of them.

Paul stated that they could review it but even with the elevation of the house on the lower side of the street there is still potential for conflict with 24" pipe and they need to ensure that there is no conflict.

Paul stated that those were the major comments on the plan and then the additional details on those plans.

R. Ricker stated that he read the review and it did not sound as though they were in favor of what was being proposed.

Paul stated that they proposed keeping Highland Station on line and pumping 2 pump stations with a timing device.

R. Ricker asked how they felt about a timing device.

Paul stated that they do not feel as though that is a good idea. He stated that there was an issue with high flow and the Town did not like to add to the system. He stated there was a gravity option that was feasible that they felt was the best option.

C. Blair stated that timing exists everywhere and were not new technology; he stated they save time and money but the Town does not want them so they won't use them.

J. Michalak asked if there was a solution that did not use the timers.

C. Blair stated that they presented the design and it could be done 24' in the ground. He stated it works and they will do it that way because that was what everyone seemed to want.

W. Ritter asked what the timer period was to resolve the outstanding issues.

C. Blair stated that there were no issues they were all resolved.

J. Michalak stated that they resolved where it was going but they need to address the technical things as well.

C. Blair stated that he has someone handling the sewer extension permit and someone that did the design on his plans. He stated he thought C. Hultgren was doing the interior sewer.

Paul stated that the main issue was the sewer surface and the other issues were related to details and locations of valves and other things like locations of the force mains.

C. Blair stated that there were a few housekeeping issues but no big problems and that he thinks they solved what they wanted to. He stated that apologized about the inside stuff but he did not read the report for the extension permit.

S. Carlson asked about capacity. He wanted to know what percentage we were at; was it 5% or lower he stated that he cannot believe they were so close.

Paul stated that it was contingent on upgrades to the three lines that were at 97% so upgrades would increase capacity.

S. Carlson asked if the cost was to the developer or to the town.

C. Blair replied it was to him; he was clear on that.

Paul stated that as it stands it would be about 450ft of sewer that would need to get upgraded.

R. Ricker asked if the capacity was real number or if there was a reserve.

Paul stated that it was capacity for design so it was calculated for designed flows.

C. Blair stated that they use the pipe at 80% full.

Pal agreed and stated that they normally look at 80%

R. Ricker asked if they consider 80% full at 100%. He stated that one of their biggest arguments is malfunction and backup, he stated it sounded risky if they were that close to capacity.

Paul stated that it was based off of potential; so that if everything was happening at the same time. He stated you don't want it flowing at 100% that was why they wanted sewer under 80%.

C. Blair stated that when they say 77% per capita that was everyone online flushing, washing, and showering etc at the same time. He stated it was never going to happen but that was how it was calculated. The worst case scenario x2.

Paul stated that under that scenario they have 6 pipes over capacity and 11 that are over 80%.

R. Ricker stated that 2 over 100 was concerning.

S. Carlson stated he wanted the Towns views on this.

J. Woodsmall stated that they were looking at individual pipes for capacity and those segments will be included for offsite mitigation to let their sewage in. He stated that Weston and Sampson will look at pipe size and capacity specific to these pipe segments. He stated they were not as concerned about capacity going into Worcester as they were with the individual pipe segments that could be alleviated by upsizing the pump.

S. Carlson asked if they were using older pump stations.

J. Woodsmall stated that this pathway was gravity. He stated they were taking the existing Highland Ave pump station offline and they would go to gravity flow so there was no other pump station along the way for sewage.

S. Carlson asked about the choke on Bancroft.

J. Woodsmall stated that the pipe segment that they need to look at which he was referencing was potentially the way the trunk sewer was configured. He stated he was not sure what DCR has done over the years but they have not had any problems or involvement by DCR since then.

R. Ricker asked if they go with the gravity plan; was DPW and Weston and Sampson in agreement with this.

P. Harding stated that she thinks they need some additional information but this seemed to be the best route.

J. Woodsmall stated that this was the preferred solution.

W. Ritter asked how long it would take to resolve these issues.

C. Blair asked if he meant in terms of sewer extension or in terms of Planning Board approval.

W. Ritter asked if the Board wanted to act on a plan as submitted without the sewer issues being finalized.

C. Blair stated that he was told that if they have a solution it was okay for the Planning Board to approve it. He stated that J. Woodsmall confirmed there was a solution; a home for it and they know what the Town wants so from Planning standpoint this was done. He stated Planning should be done with the exception of internal sewer stuff.

R. Ricker asked if they were comfortable conditioning for this.

P. Harding stated that she thinks they need to know where the sewer is going exactly and they can work out the details.

S. Carlson asked if the study at Union and Highland had any bearing on the development because it was an offsite improvement.

J. Michalak stated that he thought they would want it included as conditions. He stated they would want VHB's approval of the applicants plan.

S. Carlson asked if the Fire Department would sign off on the plan.

R. Ricker stated they would have a 90 degree turn down onto Diane Drive from Union and up Highland. He stated that was tight.

W. Ritter asked how long this would take to complete. He stated the Board was not ready to act on it tonight but asked what the timeframe to get what they needed in terms of traffic report and looking at the intersections in particular Diane Drive and Union Street.

C. Blair asked what he needed to do.

W. Ritter replied that the Town would be getting the traffic report and would then forward it to him.

I McCauley stated that she would recommend that regarding the offsite improvement the comments that were made should be addressed separately from the plans. She stated it would be good to have an updated set of offsite improvements showing site distance and a few other minor things.

C. Blair stated that Green International did that.

G. Kiritsy stated they would forward another copy to the Town.

I McCauley stated that some of the comments from C. Hultgren regarding the guardrails may require some updates as well.

C. Blair stated that he would do the interior and a few details described by Weston and Sampson.

Paul stated the force main and some of the comments about the route would need to be addressed. He stated they will look and review the route of the force main as well.

C. Blair stated he just wanted to make sure they have an idea of what they are looking for; he stated the next meeting was on November 14, 2017 and there was no reason this couldn't be done by them.

W. Ritter suggested November 28, 2017.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE DEVELOPERS WRITTEN REQUEST FOR A CONTINUANCE OF THE PUBLIC HEARING TO NOVEMBER 28, 2017 WITH A DECISION TO FILE TO DECEMBER 8, 2017.

R. Ricker stated that he wanted to congratulate DPW on the great job they did on Snowbury Lane as well.

J. Woodsmall thanked him and stated he would pass it along; he stated the team takes a lot of pride in their work.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 24, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MEETING AT 9:01PM.

The October 24, 2017 minutes were approved on January 23, 2018

APPROVED: _____