### PLANNING BOARD May 9, 2017 Memorial Hall

Members Present: John Michalak, William Ritter, Tina Stratis, Robert Ricker, Otto Lies, Scott

Carlson

Not Present: Jeff Head

Staff Present: Pam Harding, Director, Liz Fotos, Town Recorder

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

# STREET ACCEPTANCE RECOMMENDATIONS// STONEY BROOK ESTATES// Phase I-V Joel Scott Drive, Teresa Drive, Candlewood Lane

- P. Harding stated that there was a punch list that C. Blair had been working on and one of the items on the list was regarding one of the detention ponds to be fenced however it was on the bottom of a hill (detention pond 2) and off a steep slope. She stated that if they fenced this pond it would be more maintenance prohibitive. She stated that the fence could restrict access. She stated that right now the pond was holding water however he excavated sediment out of the bottom and was required to bring it to design elevation so she thinks the water should start to infiltrate quicker.
- J. Michalak asked if the standing water was why they wanted the fence.
- P. Harding replied that was why thy require them.
- J. Michalak asked how long the developer is required to ensure the water was draining. He stated that if it was not infiltrating they would want it fenced.
- P. Harding replied the water should infiltrate within 72 hours of a storm. She stated that Sunday was the last rain event so they were monitoring it to make sure that it discharged as it was supposed to.
- J. Michalak asked what would happen if it didn't.
- P. Harding replied the developer would need to see what was going on.
- R. Ricker asked about the list and if it included items from the DPW and Water/ Sewer.
- P. Harding replied that she spoke with I. McCauley, Senior Civil Engineer, DPW and that they indicated that they were repairing mortar but it was not extensive.
- P. Harding stated that they were not ready to make a recommendation to Town Meeting however she wanted the Boards opinion regarding the fence. She suggested the Board drive though and look at the field; it was very large and isolated from the homes. She stated the other two that were closer were being fenced.
- W. Ritter asked how deep the standing water was before the soil came out.

P. Harding replied about two feet. She stated that there was much less than that today, but they were also in there with the excavator. She stated the two feet was in there for a long time holding water for significantly longer than it was supposed to.

- J. Michalak asked how old the basin was.
- P. Harding replied it was built around 2010/2012 and it was also used during construction which also clogged the ponds.
- J. Michalak asked if it was not cleaned throughout.
- P. Harding replied they installed a forebay that was not in the design and the water seemed to be clearer not as much silt. She stated they also have the top coat on the pavement which makes a difference and they have mowed.
- W. Ritter stayed that he was okay with eliminating the fence provided they have a recommendation from the Town Planner/ Engineering that there will not be a standing water issue.
- P. Harding stated they were unable to do that currently as there was too much water in there.
- R. Ricker asked if it was dredged today (5.9.17). P. Harding replied yesterday (5.8.17).
- P. Harding stated they just wanted a general idea on the Boards feelings about the fence.
- S. Carlson asked if when this was done it went into an HOA.
- P. Harding replied if the roads were accepted; she said the Town could accept all or a portion of the roads.
- S. Carlson stated that at that point it would be the association to take care of. P. Harding confirmed this.
- T. Stratis asked if everything was settled with the abutter and the easement.
- P Harding replied that it was taken care of and the drainage pipe was in and working well. She stated they monitored it after a few heavy rain events and the channelized flow was gone.
- T. Stratis asked if the abutter was happy.
- P. Harding replied he was and was ready for the construction to be over. She stated that the company that did the work did a nice job.
- W. Ritter asked if the other items on the punch list should be ready for Town Meeting.
- C. Blair replied he did get the list and there was some grouting/ mortar and cementing they were working on. He stated the pump station was completed and the easement was mostly seeded. He stated that they should be done with the punch list shortly.

J. Michalak stated that the Board would meet the Monday of Town Meeting prior to Town Meeting to take a vote on the matter.

Motion by W. Ricker, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO NOT RECOMMNED STREET ACCEPTANCE TO TOWN MEETING FOR STONEY BROOK ESTATES (JOEL SCOTT/ TERESA DRIVE/ CANDLEWOOD LANE) UNLESS ALL ITEMS FROM DPW LETTER DATED MAY 3, 2017 ARE ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED TO THE SATISFACTION OF DPW AND THE TOWN PLANNER.

#### **BULLARD ESTATES- Preservation Lane**

- P. Harding stated that there was punch list in the Boards packet and nothing had been addressed by the developer yet. She stated they had been on site today (5.9.17) and there was no sign of work being done.
- J. Michalak stated that the punch list looked extensive for them not to be doing work. P. Harding agreed.
- W. Ritter asked if all the lots were currently built.
- P. Harding stated that they were done, the top coat was done but there were drainage issues because it has not been maintained.
- J. Michalak asked if this was an HOA. He stated that if it was not in great shape now and it was turned over to an HOA in this manner then it would be on them to clean it up and repair it and that could be a burden.
- P. Harding replied that was why the punch list was required.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO NOT MOVE FORWARD WITH STREET ACCEPTANCE DUE TO THE NUMBER OF OUTSTANDING ITEMS DETAILED ON A LETTER DATED MAY 4, 2017. UNLESS SATISFIED BY DPW THE BOARD DOES NOT RECOMMEND FAVORABLE ACCEPTANCE OF BULLARD ESTATES/PRESERVATION LANE.

#### ST. MARY'S DRIVE- Extension - cul de sac

P. Harding stated that the only outstanding item that remained was looming and seeding of the drainage easement. She stated that the developer did indicate that this was completed and the Town needs to review in a few days to ensure that it had stabilized. She stated all other items on the punch list were addressed.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO RECOMMEND ST. MARYS DRIVE EXT FOR STREET ACCEPTANCE TO TOWN MEETING PROVIDED THE DEVELOPER SHOWS TO THE SATISFACTION OF DPW THAT THE LOOM AND SEEDING HAS BEEN COMPLETED.

#### REVIEW OF TOWN MEETING WARRANT ARTICLES

- P. Harding stated the Planning Board items were Warrant Article 23, 24, and 25 and the Citizen Petition was Warrant Article 33.
- T. Stratis asked if they were able to add anything to the Article. She stated she thought the Board wished to add the number of permits.
- J. Michalak stated that it is a Citizen Petition and they were not able to add anything. He stated anything added would need to be done on Town Meeting Floor.
- P. Harding stated that the Board made a recommendation against this article because he recommended the wrong Special Permit Authority. She stated that was the vote the Board took.
- W. Ritter stated that the Planning Board was required to have a vote and required to make a recommendation pro/con or tie. He stated that after the motion is read, they will ask what the Planning Boards vote on the matter is and J. Michalak will say that the Board recommended against this because the wrong Special Permit Authority was named.
- R. Ricker stated that the petitioner would need to make any changes.
- W. Ritter stated that after that point, the conversation would move forward and that P. Harding would be present to assist or answer questions if needed.

#### Street Acceptance:

- W. Ritter stated that with regards to street acceptance if it was ready it would pass. He stated that they would tell Town Meeting that the Planning Board had a meeting and recommended approval on x, y, z, baring which streets were ready for acceptance.
- W. Ritter asked if the Board of Selectmen had the report on the Streets. P. Harding replied that J. Woodsmall, Director of DPW usually provided them with one.
- W. Ritter stated that he does not think the marijuana bylaw would be controversial. He stated that J. Michalak would just tell Town Meeting the Planning Boards recommendation. He asked if they had Chief Armstrong's acceptance.
- P. Harding stated that J. Michalak would read the motions and they would create a few sentences regarding each item.

#### ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS RECOMMENDATION

### Variance- Holden Storage 789 Wachusett Street -To expand and operate a fitness facility

- P. Harding stated this was the storage facility and they wanted to take over two storage bays to do a cross fit studio.
- R. Ricker asked if the building was already built.

P. Harding stated it was sent though site plan and they were in one of the units they wanted to expand it.

- R. Ricker stated that he did not believe it had Planning significance.
- W. Ritter asked if there were any complaints. P. Harding replied there were not.

Motion by S. Carlson, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED THAT THERE WAS NO PLANNING SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE- HOLDEN STORAGE 789 WACHUSETT STREET // TO EXPAND AND OPERATE A FITNESS FACILITY

## Variance- 35 Winthorp Lane- Todd and Deena Turcotte- relief for sideyard setback of an addition

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by W. Ritter, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED THAT THERE WAS NO PLANNING SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE= 35 WINTHORP LANE, TODD AND DEENA TURCOTTE RELIEF FOR SIDEYARD SETBACK.

## Variance 38 Preservation Lane- Robert and Megan Case- rear yard setback relief for construction of a pool

S. Carlson stated this was a ZBA issue, not a Planning issue.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by W. Ritter, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED THAT THERE WAS NO PLANNING SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE- 28 PRESERVATION LANE/ ROBERT AND MEGAN CASE, REAR YARD SETBACK RELIEF FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A POOL.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE MARCH 28, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED.

#### OTHER BUSIENSS

- R. Ricker asked if C. Blair had come up with additional funds for the 53G Acct for Greenwood Estates.
- P. Harding replied she had not yet asked for additional funds. She stated that she did not even have revised plans at this time.
  - S. Carlson stated that there were two bills coming back regarding zoning changes.
- W. Ritter stated this was hard to pass because city law makers wanted more details and suburban law makers wanted less.
  - P. Harding stated that for the Boards information, White Oak has filed for a permanent drawdown on Eagle Lake. She stated they were issued an order to repair the Dam and they

filed to reduce the water level and do a few minor repairs and to keep the water at the reduce rate. She stated that the ultimate goal was to remove the dame and restore it to a stream or river but that is costly.

- W. Ritter asked how low they were trying to draw it down.
- P. Harding replied it would reduce the lake by about half. She stated that the City had diverted a few tributaries and it had greatly reduced the water quality and dramatically reduced the lake.
- W. Ritter stated that there were three owners to this.
- P. Harding stated that Heath Properties was at the Conservation meeting, Sundin says they don't own it and White Oak held an information hearing of about 60 people at the May Conservation Commission meeting.
- R. Ricker asked how that impacted the Jefferson Mill Project.
- P. Harding replied they were part owners and supported the removal.
- R. Ricker asked how the abutters felt about it
- P. Harding replied they were pretty upset expect for Main Street people who would come out of the flood zone.
  - P. Harding stated that CMRPC was going to begin the DLTA Project Expansion on the Jefferson Mill Area.

Motion by T. Stratis, seconded by W. Ritter, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE MAY 9, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MEETING AT 7:49PM.

APPROVED:	