

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
November 28, 2017

7:00PM

Memorial Hall

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

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

J. Michalak called the meeting to order at 7:00PM

**HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER/ SITE PLAN/ SPECIAL PERMIT 315 Bullard Street
Construction of Soccer Fields**

W. Ritter recused himself from the matter

Patrick Healy was present on behalf of Holden Youth Soccer. He told the Board that Bill Donahue, HYS would be there shortly.

P. Healy stated that HYS had filed for a Special Permit for fields and that if they recalled it was a 12 acre site and was subdivided. He stated that there was site access from Mayo Driveway and internal to the site there was a loop parking lot with 106 parking spaces and an additional 67 spaces in front of Mayo School. He stated that they were proposing a sidewalk connection to Mayo and during non-athletic hours there will be a gate that will be closed.

P. Healy stated that there will be a covered roof to get out of the weather and a second structure for concession/offices/storage. He stated that they added additional landscaping for the neighbors and there was a retaining wall as well. He stated that there was lighting for the fields on 4 poles with 30FT candles and parking lot lights with 12 ft high fixtures. He stated that they have a two letters from DPW about the infrastructure and water/sewer drainage and they were down to two comments on the sewer detail. He stated that Green International was present with regards to the traffic study.

Green International was present at the meeting. Larry Green stated that there had been a traffic study that was requested and it showed that they have adequate site distance and internally the study confirmed that 103 spaces were required and there facility had 106 plus 67 overflow at Mayo.

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

P. Harding stated that the applicant had gone back and forth about drainage and meeting with DPW and with the exception of two minor details which was added to the draft decision, it was met. She stated the only other decision was the breakaway gate to the field from Mayo; she stated that the Town would like that to be subject to a public safety review and approval from the Fire Department and Police Department.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by J. Head, it was VOTED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER/SITE PLAN/SPECIAL PERMIT 315 BULLARD STREET CONSTRUCTION OF SOCCER FIELDS BY A VOTE OF 6-0-1

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by J. Head, it was VOTED BY A 6-0-1 VOTE TO APPROVE THE DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION APPLICATION TO CREATE A LOT WITH NO FRONTAGE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO SOCCER FIELDS LOCATED AT 351 BULLARD STREET, ABUTTING THE MAYO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SUBMITTED BY HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER.

THE SUBDIVISION APPROVAL IS CONDINGENT UPON THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS;

PLANS ENTITLED ***SITE PLAN OF LAND, PREPARED FOR APPLICANT, HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER LEAGUE, INC. HOLDEN MA*** PREPARED BY THOMPSON LISTON ASSOCIATES, INC. WITH A REVISION DATE OF OCTOBER 10, 2017 AND SHEET G1, G2, G3, U1, U2, D1, D3, AND D5 WITH A REVISION DATE OF OCTOBER 30, 2017, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS;

DRAINAGE REPORT FOR HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER LEAGUE INC.'S PROPOSED SOCCER FIELD AT 351 BULLARD STREET WITH A REVISION DATE OF OCTOBER 30, 2017, COMPLETED BY THOMPSON-LISTON ASSOCIATES, INC.

HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER AT THE MAYO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-TRAFFIC EVALUATION SUBMITTED BY GREEN INTERNATIONAL DATED SEPTEMBER 26, 2017.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by J. Head, it was VOTED BY A 6-0-1 VOTE TO APPROVE THE SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO SOCCER FIELDS LOCATED AT 351 BULLARD STREET ABUTTING MAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SUBMITTED BY HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER.

THE SITE PLAN/SPECIAL PERMIT CONTINGENT UPON THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS:

Plans entitled ***Site Plan of Land, Prepared for Applicant, Holden Youth Soccer League, Inc. Holden, MA,*** prepared by Thompson Liston Associates, Inc. with a revision date of October 10, 2017 and Sheet G1, G2, U1, U2, D1, D3 and D5 with a revision date of October 30, 2017, with the following conditions;

Drainage Report for Holden Youth Soccer League Inc.'s Proposed Soccer Fields at 351 Bullard Street with a revision date of October 30, 2017, completed by Thompson-Liston Associates, Inc.

Holden Youth Soccer at the Mayo Elementary School-Traffi Evaluation submitted By Green International Dated September 26, 2017

1. A detail for the force main connection into the existing gravity sewer on Bullard Street must be provided and approved by the Department of Public Works Engineering Office prior to the start of construction.
2. A restraint length table and thrust block table for water pipe line and fittings be added to the plans and meet approval of the Department of Public Works Engineering Office prior to the start of construction.

3. Details of the gated entrance between the proposed driveway and Mayo School must be provided and approved by the Holden Fire and Police Chief's prior to the start of Construction.

Retaining Wall

4. The retaining wall located on the property will require a building permit and may be subject to peer review for both design and construction as determined by the Holden Building Commissioner.
5. Three 24" x 36" one 11" x 17" and a pdf of the full set of plans incorporating all conditions of approval must be submitted prior to the start of construction.

W. Ritter returned to the meeting at 7:15PM.

PUBLIC HEARING- SITE PLAN SPECIAL PERMIT NEWELL ROAD//Village at Westminster Place Extension of Time

T. Stratis recused herself for this matter.

J. Michalak read the public hearing notice into record.

Paul Beady was present at the meeting as a representative of Newell Road Realty, LLC. He stated that he was present to request an extension to the Site Plan/Special Permit from the October 2017 deadline. He stated that he did want to make sure everyone was aware that the clubhouse was withdrawn and that this request was being made with all rights reserved from his client and with no waiver regarding the position that the Special Permit issued in 2002 had lapsed.

P. Beady stated that since the recession had ended sales had been slow but consistent. He stated that they have five building permits with the Building Commissioner to do single family homes on the outer loop of the road. He stated that his client had invested millions of dollars into this project and they had complied with the 2016 requirements for a one year extension and they desire to continue with construction. He stated they were hopeful that the economy continued to move forward and that they were requesting a two year extension to 2019. He stated he would answer questions as best he could but Attorney Rolof was supposed to be present but had a conflict of interest as the matter was supposed to be heard in October and was extended.

J. Michalak opened it up for public comment.

Mark Biller, Property Manager was present at the meeting. He stated that he managed the two communities. He stated that there were a few things that the residents were asking for and wanted to bring up now; he stated first there was a lot of debris, coffee cups, construction trash etc that had blown and was on the adjacent lot. He asked for the construction workers to be more courteous and clean up the mess there. M. Biller stated that there was also a small repair for 102 Tea Party and he thought this would make for a better relationship. He stated that the workers were using his water and that they could work out the details with the attorney.

Mr. Beady replied he would look into this.

M. Biller stated that they were requesting that the common mailbox structure was repaired.

M. Biller asked if they expected to do more than five houses.

Mr. Beady replied that was the extent they were discussing.

M. Biller asked if they were doing more condo's on the cul de sac.

Mr. Beady replied that the inner loop was basically done. He stated they had a seven year build out and if they do any additional attached units it would be done with a separate condo association.

M. Biller stated that they could still build there; he asked their intention.

Mr. Beady replied what was selling was the single family homes and they needed to put their money where the sales were. He stated that he was not saying that they could not do something to modify the inner loop but right now the developer was concentrating his efforts on the outer loop.

M. Biller stated that there was still construction traffic coming in the main entrance despite the signs.

Mr. Beady replied he had not heard of these issues but would look into them.

M. Biller stated there was some area dug up from the back gate and there was disturbance by the sidewalk, he asked for that to be corrected.

Mr. Beady replied that may be related to the communication line but that he would look into it.

M. Biller asked if there were specific restrictions or limitations being placed on the single family homes as far as how many people could live there.

Mr. Beady replied that was a function of the occupancy permit. He stated that two adults and two children were standard.

M. Biller stated that one was being developed with two additional bedrooms, so a 5 bedrooms home which was uncommon in an over 55 community establishment.

Mr. Beady replied the norm was 4 people; 2 and 2 and he could look into it. He stated he knows that one unit had a finished basement that the owners was paying for.

M. Biller stated that this one was a 5 bedroom and it was their understanding that there was no restriction placed on it. He asked P. Harding for comment on this.

P. Harding replied she was not sure there were any permits for a 5 bedroom but she could look.

M. Biller asked for follow up on this.

M. Biller stated that the community thinks that if there were more condos in the cul de sac they may sell. He stated that the condo owners were concerned with the sand pit in the middle

Mr. Beady replied that was not the intent and that their investment and the investors would go down if that happened.

M. Biller asked if they were going to landscape the outside of Tea Party and the inside where there was empty space.

Mr. Beady replied there was a landscape plan they needed to abide by.

Irene Fox, 4 Explorers Way was present. She stated she did not agree with the fact that the attorney said that single family homes were what was desired; she asked how they knew if they did not build them. She stated when they bought the home the plans showed more cul de sacs and they were by themselves now. She stated that she did not think it would look good with all the single family homes it would look better with more cul de sacs to finish the development.

Mr. Beady replied that they put efforts where sales were. He stated they were working off of an approved site plan and if they wanted to change that they would have to appear before the Board again.

Mike, 1 Explorers Way stated that he understood there was a landscaping plan in place but that included the cul de sacs that they were not building.

Mr. Beady replied he said they were not being built right now.

M. Biller stated that if they could put some landscaping on the inside it would look better if they did not plan to build in the near future.

Mr. Beady replied that he would refer them back to the landscaping plan. He stated if they wished to deviate from that they would have to reappear before the Board.

M. Biller stated they could mulch the entrance on Tree Party. He stated that they thought that beautification of the site would help with sales. He stated last time the residents paid half and the developer paid half but that they felt it would be in the developers best interest to beautify the site.

J. Michalak asked if the Board had any questions.

R. Ricker asked if this was a retirement community.

Mr. Beady replied that one person needed to be 55 or older.

R. Ricker stated that there must be a footprint.

Mr. Beady replied there was. He stated that he had not seen the plans but he will look at the as builds that will show the building permit to answer the question on that particular home.

R. Ricker asked if all the single family homes were one condo association.

P. Harding stated that they had created five condo associations through the ANR Process and that right now they have three.

S. Carlson left the meeting at 7:34PM.

R. Ricker stated that he had a difficult time saying that the Board approved what was actually being built.

P. Harding stated that they were changing ownership lines on the interior and creating pods of associations and that was the plan from the beginning.

Mr. Beady replied that there were single family homes that were free standing condo units.

R. Ricker replied it sounded like something was being varied.

P. Harding replied that they did not include footprints.

R. Ricker stated that it was difficult to understand the Special Permit with the retirement community and numerous condo associations. He stated that he did not like this on a special permit.

Isabel McCauley, Senior Civil Engineer, DPW was present. She stated they had been doing sewer and wire inspection and the homes were side by side duplex style homes.

O. Lies stated that they were discussing the extension and that he believed a year ago when the same thing was before them that they had asked for progress reports every six months.

P. Harding replied they reduced the extension from two years to one year in order to have them come back at the one year mark.

S. Carlson returned to the meeting at 7:38PM.

O. Lies stated he was not in favor of an extension more than one year because he wanted to get an update as to what was going on.

R. Ricker asked about the clubhouse that was being withdrawn.

Mr. Beady replied that the feedback from the Board was that they wanted full architect plans and those were not ready so they withdrew it primarily because of architecture plans and operational things that were not yet finalized.

J. Michalak asked if the Board could add additional conditions if they granted an extension.

P. Harding replied they could.

J. Michalak stated that when the public was speaking about the sandpit look in the undeveloped portions rather than going forward with landscaping plan they could ask for the developer to make that portion greener. He stated that he thinks it would be minor to ask to do that as part of an extension.

R. Ricker stated that this plan was from 2003 and was not even 1/5 of the way developed. He stated when the Board approves a project there should be an end result for the Town and residents. He stated that the end date seemed a long way away and he didn't know if that was right.

P. Harding stated that they built the site up and did all the utilities at once so the road and utilities were in from the get go.

W. Ritter stated that he did not think that the Planning Board had the authority to make the developer build more units faster. He stated that it is unfortunate that it is going on but that he thinks it is more important to work with them to keep it going then not.

R. Ricker stated that in a regular subdivision he may not be as concerned but that in the retirement community he was.

M. Biller stated that the community felt that if the developer gave significant money to improve the landscaping it would entice people to buy properties. He stated there was a lot of interest in these once upon a time but he thinks they need to work on the beautification of the property.

Mr. Beady replied that he would raise the concern with his client.

I Fox, 4 Explorers Way stated that she had lived there 11 years and there were two piles of rocks from the sand pit that they had said they would move and never did.

Mr. Beady replied that he believed those would be used.

I Fox replied that they had bought materials in and they had not used it in 11 years.

O. Lies replied he agreed with the residents that the site was unsightly. He stated that he thinks people have the right to expect more. He stated there was not much the Board could do expect add a condition to at least make a grassy field that was more attractive and kept the dust down. He stated that he suggested cutting the extension to a year and adding a condition like J. Michalak suggested.

Motion by O. Lies, seconded by J. Head, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR PUBLIC HEARING- SITE PLAN SPECIAL PERMIT NEWELL ROAD//Village at Westminster Place Extension of Time

A motion was made by R. Ricker to approve the extension of time with the added condition to loan and seed the cul de sac area.

W. Ritter asked if there was a dust issue on the site.

P. Harding replied it had stabilized with weeds.

R. Ricer replied there may be no dust but it was ugly.

J. Michalak stated that the Board needed to better define where they wanted the developer to loam and seed.

O. Lies wanted them to add a date as well.

P. Harding suggested June 30, 2018.

M. Biller stated that what the Board was calling a wasteland could be helped by cutting down the saplings and overgrowth and working with a landscaper to design around the permitted of Tea Party Circle or if they were to say 10 homes, then do the distance of 10 homes plus 5 so the residents were not always looking at construction.

Mr. Beady disagreed and stated that would mean they were going to damage trees while construction was in process.

J. Michalak reminded everyone that the Public Hearing had been closed.

W. Ritter stated he did not think they could condition for clean up as it was not a public safety or health issue.

R. Ricker withdrew the condition. J. Head seconded the motion.

W. Ritter suggested the public put together a letter and send it to the developer and copy P. Harding to help with communication.

J. Michalak stated that Condition 60 was withdrawn and J. Head seconded the motion.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by J. Head, it was VOTED BY A 6-0-1 VOTE TO APPROVE THE EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE VILLAGE AT WESTMINSTER PLACE. THIS SPECIAL PERMIT AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL INCORPORATES ALL FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS FROM THE AUGUST 19, 2003, OCTOBER 10, 2006, JANUARY 8, 2008, APRIL 14, 2009 AND NOVEMBER 29, 2016 PLANNING BOARD APPROVALS WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS AND ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:

GENERAL CONDITION #6 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

IF CONSTRUCTION IS NOT COMPLETED BY NOVEMBER 28, 2018 THE APPLICANT MUST APPLY FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME OR APPROVAL WILL BE AUTOMATICALLY REVOKED. CONSTRUCTION SHALL REFER TO THE COMPLETION OF ALL COMMON AREAS, UTILITIES, DRAINAGE, AND OFF SITE IMPROVEMENTS. ONCE CONSTRUCTION IS COMPLETE THE APPLICANT MUST NOTIFY THE HOLDEN PLANNING BOARD, THE BOARD MUST ISSUE A CERTIFICATION OF COMPLETION ENSURING THAT ALL THE CONDITIONS HAVE BEEN SATISFIED.

T. Stratis returned to the meeting at 7:55PM.

PUBLIC HEARING-DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION GREENWOOD ESTATES- Jackson Woods Investments, LLC

C. Blair was present at the meeting. He stated that he had just received a letter from P. Harding and did not have a chance to review it. He stated that from the last hearing there was nothing mentioned regarding off site improvements but he needed to read the letter. He stated it appeared as though they were making statements regarding a 1% flat area and he could not comment on that. He stated the offsite was approved before and as it was if the Town wanted to make a few changes that were not too

costly he was happy to do it but if it was a costly change he would need to look into it. He asked I. McCauley, Senior Civil Engineer, DPW if this information was from VHB.

I McCauley stated that the developer had proposed offsite improvements off Union Street and that was peer reviewed by VHB. She stated that she wanted to clarify that the comments had all been addressed as well. She stated they were addressed as a separate report and the original plans needed to be updated so the site plans reflect the most recent changes. She stated that the Town hired VHB independently to see if there was any alternatives to what was proposed. She stated VHB did have two comments for review. One was that as you were coming down Highland Street the plan included a bump out for a one way access and there would be a bump out to reduce speed. She stated that VHB asked that a berm be provided to help reduce the speed. She stated now there was a new T intersection up the hill there would be more of a 90 degree angle onto Highland and the profile of the roadway on Union originally showed a shelf area. Up Union, flat area, and then up again so they asked that the profile be smoothed out to a 6% instead of the flat shelf. She stated those were the suggestions they made.

C. Blair stated that he would be happy to accommodate but he needed to make sure there was enough area to do so as he had a variance.

I McCauley stated that it should not change that.

C. Blair asked 6%; he asked what the grade was currently.

I McCauley stated it was 10% and then 2% and then 10%. She stated they have a plan that is marked.

C. Blair stated that he would have to look.

I McCauley stated the reason why it was being recommended was because when you are coming down at a good speed and then there is a flat area you don't realize is there. She stated the flat area is where the turn to go into the T intersection would be for Highland. She stated they think overall the new recommended design was a better one and it should not effect the frontage. She stated that regarding the 6% slope, they have steeper roads.

C. Blair stated that as long as that was the case, this was an offsite improvement and it was approved previously. He stated he did not think it should hold up the subdivision approval but if it was not overly expensive he would be happy to do it.

I McCauley stated that an improvement was presented and it was said that the Town wanted to look at alternatives. She stated the developer responded by stated that a prior administrator said they wanted it designed in this manner. She stated that they (DPW) felt that this was a significant change and they wanted to make sure there was nothing better that could be done.

J. Michalak stated that it was his understanding that the Town was still looking at it and they were adding a berm and changing the profile of the road.

C. Blair stated that cut and fill could be different and he wanted to make sure it was not obtrusive. He stated that he was happy to do it this way but he needed to look at it first.

J. Michalak stated that he felt that I McCauley's observation made sense. He stated that he thought it made sense to have one slope rather than a grade change unless there was reasons for that design.

C. Blair stated that it was designed like this because if you come up that slope there is a place to level off and have a few cars sit. He stated he likes it better but could look at it the other way.

R. Ricker stated that C. Blair needed time to look over the Towns recommendation.

C. Blair agreed; he stated that this was brand new information and he needed to look at it.

R. Ricker stated that the subdivision was not approved yet so whatever tweaks needed to be done needed to be done. He stated the Board had just received the information tonight as well.

C. Blair stated that sometimes they design differently. He stated he was happy to oblige as long as it was not substantial.

C. Blair stated that the Weston and Sampson review items were submitted and it was just detail sheets. He stated that it was done a month ago so he assumed it was fine. He stated that regarding the sewer system they agreed the path that it would take and that was pretty much all that they needed. He stated that J. Woodsmall had agreed and that this was not part of the Subdivision. He stated the they had submitted the information to Quinn Engineering as well.

S. Carlson stated that they were discussing site development but there was not sewer capacity offsite. He stated that they could not approve that.

P. Harding stated that they needed to be certain there was a path.

S. Carlson replied they could not do anything with the site until this was completed.

C. Blair stated that he was told that they could not approve a subdivision if they don't know if there is capacity. He stated that they know where the sewer is going; it was coming up through a force main through the subdivision to Highland Street and then it would tie into a manhole at Pioneer. He stated for every subdivision in Town, the sewer extension came after subdivision approval as long as there was adequate sewer capacity. He stated they have a path and that it was his understanding that was what was needed for subdivision approval.

T. Stratis asked because of the number of houses, if there should be more than one sewer.

J. Michalak stated it would depend on the pipe.

C. Blair stated that they have run the numbers at 80% which is what is considered full . At 80% full there is enough capacity as per J .Woodsmall and Weston and Sampson for whatever they would be adding. He stated there is an 8" pipe that needed to be replaced with a 10" pipe for about 400ft that they would be doing.

C. Blair stated that this subdivision was previously approved without the sewer extension permit. He stated as far as he was concerned everything had been addressed.

J. Michalak stated that they were speaking about stuff that had been done since the last meeting. He stated that they think they have done everything but the Board needs to hear that from the Town.

I McCauley stated that regarding the sewer, she feels that the design of the pump station is integral and to design the pump station you need to know the route and where it will go and that was all submitted to Water/Sewer yesterday showing the preferred route of going up Highland. She stated that it was looked at by Weston and Sampson but when it was looked at preliminary there was a section that was a choke point that was not submitted. She stated that they did not send over actual plans just schematic designs so that was what she meant by outstanding items.

I McCauley stated that on November 15 she received a letter and plans for comments that were related to the interior pipe line and made of the comments were addressed but a few were still outstanding. She stated they just received the main design of the sewer pump station yesterday.

C. Blair stated that no one had ever asked for the sewer pump station in order to approve a subdivision. He stated that what happened here was that Holden has a type of pump station that they like to use and they (developer) wanted to us a suction lift. He stated it was going to be decided but it was part of the sewer extension permit not the subdivision. He stated that the Town now wanted to add another 72 homes from another subdivision to this system so it changed everything. He stated in all his years no one had ever asked for a sewer pump station design before a subdivision was approved it had always been done after.

C. Blair said with regards to Weston and Sampson, that is all done.

I McCauley stated that the design of the pump station would determine the size of the force main that would change the plans. She stated that there was design that needed to be done and reviewed and completed in order to know where the sewer was going.

I McCauley stated that Quinn Engineering also stated that slopes greater than 3:1 should be designed by a proper engineer and that a slope analysis should be done. She stated there was also another comment about manholes that have pipes into it. She stated that it was unsure if it could be constructed and that was not yet addressed.

C. Blair stated that they had dealt with that at the last meeting and submitted the information it was being done like that because of the depth of the manholes.

I McCauley stated it was not the size but the amount of pipes into it. She stated she had not seen one like that and wanted to have a second look but there was no response to her comment.

C. Blair stated he thought he addressed it at the last public hearing.

I McCauley stated that he had said it would be addressed during construction but she thinks it needed to be discussed during review not construction.

C. Blair replied it was done all the time.

P. Harding stated that they would need the detail of it.

I McCauley stated they were speaking not about the drop but the number of pipes in it.

J. Michalak stated they needed to know the diameter of the pipe and the thickness to make sure there is enough structure in the pipe and what levels they are entering in at. He suggested showing it in a profile.

W. Ritter asked from the Towns perspective was there anything other than hearing from Weston and Sampson and the pipe profile left to review.

I McCauley replied there was not.

W. Ritter asked when we anticipated hearing back from Weston and Sampson.

I McCauley replied about a week or two.

C. Blair asked what was outstanding from Weston and Sampson.

W. Ritter stated they were given some comments yesterday they were reviewing.

C. Blair stated that was the pump station.

I McCauley stated that from DPW's perspective they feel as though the pump station design should be completed with the Subdivision Plans. She stated that at this point it is close but not ready.

C. Blair stated it had never been done like that before.

S. Carlson stated he drove this road everyday. He asked if they wanted the entire road to pitch instead of flattening at some point. He stated they would need that pitch on an icy day and it did not make sense and he did not get the change.

I McCauley stated that she also made that drive daily and to have a flat shelf area in that location would not help. She stated that it was probably there for some relief but that 6% was not the same slope as the rest of the intersection.

S. Carlson asked the location.

I McCauley stated that it was not at the entry point, it was closer to Highland before where the new T intersection will come in.

S. Carlson stated that he thinks there should be plot relief.

J. Michalak stated that it was 10% then 2% and then 10% again rather than 6% throughout

S. Carlson stated that it was not a flat area there was still some grade.

The discussed the location of this proposed change.

I McCauley stated from the last meeting they had schematic designs for the pump station. She stated that they were working with Weston and Sampson and that while they were quick this was the main discussion point and what they provided was a schematic not a complete design plan.

C. Blair stated what they had asked was that there were two different types of pumps that worked. He stated they spoke with Weston and Sampson and asked if they could use the suction lift pump and when they met with J. Woodsmall they were told that they needed to eliminate this from the design. He stated once they agreed to eliminate it from the design all they have to do is use the other one and it is done.

J. Michalak stated that the Town wanted plans to prove they work.

C. Blair replied the Town had them.

I McCauley disagreed. She stated originally the developer wanted to go through the other pump station so they went through the exercise of evaluating a pump station and it was determined that this was not a viable option. She stated now the new alternative was to go in the other direction and it seemed that the direction had flow from an existing pump and the applicant was proposing an alarm system to communicate to pumps when they were not working. She stated that DPW said no to that so they went onto the next option which was to have a new pump station. She stated that for every option that was presented they asked for the documentation to prove what was requested was going to work and it happened that they moved to a different option. She stated that was what happened over time.

C. Blair stated that they had sent an email to Ryan Mouridian about what the Town would accept before they analyzed everything. He stated that they had done all this analysis and then J. Woodsmall says no; he stated that if they were told that in the beginning it would be one thing. He stated that they can change their mind but he doesn't want all the blame. He stated he is doing everything that everyone wants him to do to accommodate the new system. He stated he will get the final answers but did not know if he could get it in two weeks time.

T. Stratis asked about the shared driveways and special permits. She asked how they could accept the subdivision without that.

P Harding suggested indicating that they would exclude the approval of common driveways.

S. Carlson asked if it would just be lots without standard driveways.

P. Harding agreed it would be and that they would require special permits for all common driveways. She stated that the applicant had shown that these were buildable lots.

J. Michalak stated that the driveways did not connect to the homes. He asked if there were any safety concerns from fire.

The Board discussed the time frame of the work and the meeting schedule.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE DEVELOPERS WRITTEN REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION/ GREENWOOD ESTATES/ JACKSON WOODS

INVESTMENT TO JANUARY 23, 2018 WITH THE TIME TO FILE DECISION TO FEBRUARY 2, 2018.

APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED – MALDEN STREET-KREG-R-1 Lot Line Adjustment

P. Harding stated that there was a lot width violation and she contacted the applicant but had not yet received the revisions.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by T. Stratis, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO DENY THE ANR FOR MALDEN STREET-KREG- R-1 LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT DUE TO THE LOT WIDTH VIOLATION AND REQUEST THAT THE REVISED PLANS BE RESUBMITTED.

MASTER PLAN UPDATE COMMITTEE

P. Harding stated that CMRPC was working on revising the build out from 2000 and a 10 year update to the Master Plan to begin in January or February. She stated that typically when the Master Plan is being completed someone from the Planning Board is involved as the Planning Board does have jurisdiction over the Master Plan. She stated lat time S. Carlson was involved in it as well as D. Lindberg.

S. Carlson stated that depending on the meeting he could do it. He stated it was a lot of time.

P. Harding stated that because it was an update it should not be as involved.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by T. Stratis, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPOINT S. CARLSON AS THE MASTER PLAN DELEGATE FROM THE PLANNING BOARD.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

Misc

O. Lies stated that he wanted to bring to the Towns attention information from the marijuana moratorium. He passed along information he had to the Board.

P. Harding stated that if Town voted down the allowance to prohibit marijuana it could be voted at through Town Meeting, if it did not it would need to go to ballot.

O. Lies stated that there was more to come on this matter.

O. Lies stated that he believes there needs to be an effort made to bring more civility to the meetings. He stated that he was unhappy with some of Mr. Blairs actions and thinks that applicants should rise and step forward to speak to the Board. He stated that he also does not agree with the banter back and forth and comments should be made through the chair. He stated they had banter before tonight and while tonight's was orderly he thinks that in the past it has been out of hand. He stated that he thinks the meetings have gotten too casual and wondered how the rest of the Board felt.

S. Carlson stated that he agreed somewhat and feels that some of what O. Lies says is valid.

W. Ritter stated that he thinks that if it is just the applicant, engineering staff and the Board it was going to be more informal. He stated that as a matter of course a room full of people would need to be more under control. He stated he felt as though tonight was normal meeting behavior.

R. Ricker stated that he thinks O. Lies has a point on some things. He stated that this bothered him less than the hearing before when the public meeting portion was closed and then members of the public still spoke. He stated it was not anyone's fault but if the hearing is closed then it was time for the Board to discuss not time for public comment.

O. Lies stated that he thinks that some things they should expect such as the applicant speaking in front of the Board and not from a lounging position. He stated that the applicant should speak when recognized but the banter back and forth was awful.

W. Ritter stated he did not remember it being an issue.

J. Michalak stated that it was all good points.

W. Ritter asked about the dairy building on Salisbury Street.

P. Harding stated that it was falling down and they were replacing it with something smaller.

Motion by T. Stratis, seconded by S. Carlson, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 28, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MEETING AT 8:59PM.

The November 28, 2017 minutes were approved on January 23, 2018

APPROVED: _____