

PLANNING BOARD
JANUARY 9, 2006

Present: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, Keith R. Diggans, Elissa G. Franco, and George N. Lester

Meeting convened at approximately 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Browne.

BOILING SPRINGS AVENUE

The Board received a letter from Maria and Edward Love asking that the trees designated to be removed for a parking space not be removed thus eliminating the parking space.

VOTED unanimously to modify the Boiling Springs Avenue subdivision approval such as to eliminate the designated 12' by 20' parking space in front of 7 Boiling Springs Avenue.

ANR – ROCKY LANE

VOTED unanimously to endorse an ANR plan for 43 Rocky Lane dated November 7, 2005, drawn by Merrikin Engineering, LLP, Millis, MA. Plan is a subdivision of lots 3 & 4 showing parcel A (not a building lot) to be released from lot 4A and combined with lot 3A. Parcel B is also not a building lot and is released from lot 3A. At this time Parcel B is not combined with any other lot.

COLE DRIVE/PLAIN STREET/HIGH STREET

Upon request of Richard Merrikin of Merrikin Engineering, LLP, regarding possible future development at this location, Chairman Browne explained that the Board, in keeping with its recent policy, would need to see a no-waiver subdivision plan before it could consider granting waivers.

MEDFIELD STATE HOSPITAL UPDATE

Chairman Browne reported that he met with Town Administrator Michael Sullivan and Assistant Town Administrator Kristine Trierweiler to discuss the status of negotiations between the Board of Selectmen and the state's DCAM. He reported

1. that there is draft legislation expected this week with the intent of passage by the legislature by the end of this month. The MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) with the State is not finished and there is still no good map showing proposals.
2. that the 37 acres of agricultural land would remain such and have only passive recreation. Changes would require an executive order.
3. that the Town's involvement with the water tower is uncertain at this time.

Mr. Browne also said that newly passed legislation, 40S, might be another option for the Town, although it remains uncertain if the Town would qualify. Under 40S the Town would receive funds from the State to offset expenses by the Town for impact on such areas as education.

Mr. Browne will talk with the Board's consultant, Mark Bobwroski and ask him to look into what benefits, if any, might be available to the Town through 40S, and whether it would be a

PLANNING BOARD
JANUARY 9, 2006

good choice. He will also talk with the author of the legislation to see if the Town would qualify.

Various Board members expressed concerns about issues raised by Judith Barrett on her review of the DCAM plan: 1. marketability of the units, especially the rental units. 2. Phasing in of the units. 3. Maintaining the affordability factor in perpetuity.

While the Board recognized that the overlay zoning would not address the FAR, it would regulate the property through number of bedrooms and unit sizes.

Mrs. Franco pointed out the difference in profit between what the DCAM report suggests and what the Board's consultant, Mrs. Barrett, suggested – one million dollars vs. seven hundred thousand.

Board members are concerned about adequately educating the public regarding the proposed development and the necessary zoning changes.

Mr. Browne will talk with Mark Bobrowski regarding developments.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:15 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MARCH 22, 2006

Present: Planning Board members: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, Elissa G. Franco and George N. Lester; absent: Keith Diggans;
Board of Selectmen: Osler L. Peterson and Ann B. Thompson; absent: Paul B. Rhuda

Also Present: Town Administrator Michael J. Sullivan; Town Counsel Mark G. Cerel
DCAM: Commissioner David Perini and Marybeth Clancy; Drew Leff , consultant for DCAM; Mark Bobrowski, consultant for the Town; Don Schmidt from DHCD; Representative Richard Ross

Also Present: members of the local community

The joint meeting of the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board was convened at approximately 7:40 p.m. by Planning Board Chairman Stephen J. Browne

Don Schmidt, – DHCD – over view – housing production program – implemented by DHCD

- high residential development – MSH would qualify as a site
- mandatory density – minimum – 8 units/acre for single family
12 units/acre for townhouses
20 units per acre for multifamily
- plan approval process
- design standards
- process
 - o submit to DHCD – letter of eligibility – zoning regulations
 - o municipality must adopt the 40R district – town meeting
 - o review by DHCD for any amendments
 - o final letter of approval
- two types of payments
 - o density payments – underlying zoning as of right # units
 - o those under 40R # - for 400+ there is \$300,000 one time only – construction must begin within 3 years
 - o \$3,000 for every new unit – one time only
- 40 S – look at number of students that could be there and the revenue – if not making the cost then state will make up the difference – annual payment
- legislature would have to change
- density fund is paid out of the trust fund – more concern there

Mark Bobrowski – relate difference with 40b

Don Schmidt – 40R – requires that 20% must be affordable

- Must be LIP eligible
- Will be counted the same way as if they are a straight 40b
- If 25% are affordable rental then all will count
- Zoning Bylaw must state 25%

Mark Cerel – under 40R – developer is not limited on profit

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MARCH 22, 2006

Don Schmidt – correct

Mark Bobrowski – if applicant submits 40b then will not count for money

Don Schmidt – if CP has been issued prior to an application for 40R approval, then it is not eligible for money

If CP issued after the application for 40R then will count all

Steve Browne – no one could put in CP after approved at TM

Mark Bobrowski – 40b units would count – 40r can't count – could be a delay

Don Schmidt – units will be counted upon the issuing of a building permit

Steve Browne – if the Town is going to pursue a 40R – then they should begin

Mark Bobrowski – someone needs to

Michael Sullivan– 40R district – specify type of ownership

Don Schmidt – no cannot – if there is a side agreement then ok

Steve Browne – anticipating a MOU with the state and developer which would specify what we want –

Don Schmidt – Bylaw cannot get into ownership issues

Marybeth Clancy – legislation and MOU all go back to the reuse plan that developed – have a very diverse plan – all the agreements and legislation go back to the approved agreements and the kinds of housings that we want – safeguarded

Steve Browne – back to exactly what? Safe guards – some must be safeguarded by the agreement

David Perini – Revenue deficit payment – chpt 40S – payments start when?

Don Schmidt – this project would start in 2008

Mark Bobrowski – read info regarding 40R – income including excise tax etc. would count in determining deficit to be made up by the state.

David Perini – does the whole project need to be built out?

Don Schmidt – no – once an occupancy permit has been obtained a list is established and sent to DHCD and the payment would begin the next year.

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MARCH 22, 2006

David Perini – different areas within the project

Don Schmidt– It is the Town's responsibility to create the list - DHCD must certify the list – Dept of Revenue is implementing guidelines – latest seen municipality must have addresses by August of each year.

Pete Peterson – 40S would be revenue positive for the town

David Perini – good to hear

Steve Browne – insurance policy for the town – many people believe the numbers will be higher – 40S not generate payments

Pete Peterson – town had Judy Barrett do a review

Mark Cerel – Franklin had a 40b come in with impact higher – would have a fall back position

Tom Carragliano, 124 Philip Street, – not prorated?

Don Schmidt – correct

Mike Sullivan – are revenues only applied to students – or are other town services considered?

Don Schmidt- 48% education cost then 40S

Marybeth Clancy – who monitors the figure? – is there an accounting system for getting aid? – what if the revenue is less than 48%?

Don Schmidt – real estate taxes and motor vehicle excise taxed are considered

Marybeth Clancy – are the funds restricted?

Don Schmidt – it is restricted for education – must ask DOR what accountability will be

Marybeth Clancy – expense of the town for an accounting system - \$3000 is unrestricted

John Harney – has the minimum density been applied to the Medfield plan?

Mark Bobrowski – Don has seen it just tonight – question is whether this fits

Marybeth Clancy – density review very primitive – more needed to be done

Drew Leff – new plan – shows what would look like if added the extra units

Steve Browne – exercise is to see if we can make 40r work if we chose

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MARCH 22, 2006

Mark Bobrowski - single family homes would not be part of the 40r nor would the public rights of way. How much is included will depend on how creative we can cut out

Mark Bobrowski - how wide the road - misconception of taking the gross area not correct - instead net out the open space (less the hills etc.)

Don Schmidt - department (DHCD) will have sample zoning coming soon - will look at other possibilities - reasonably proposed rights of way could be subtracted

Mark Bobrowski - could draw the districts around the parking areas

Mark Cerel - note that there is some reference to historic districts - this is a historic district

Don Schmidt - that has nothing to do with the density

Ann Thompson - Hospital Farm District

Don Schmidt - historic stay in place but do not effect the density - mixed use is not required - can create a 40r district - can create sub-districts within a 40R district - would subtract it from the developable land

Mark Bobrowski - if put the commercial under the residential then will it count toward the numbers

David Perini - that is not contemplated here - proposal is to develop the area - could take out the

Don Schmidt - land area that is dedicated to housing is counted

Steve Browne - if want to add on open space it creates a problem?

Don Schmidt - statute says can subtract ROW - can dedicate 10% open space - if more open space, then the land would count.

Mark Bobrowski - just put the open space outside the 40 r -

Drew Leff - could do that

Don Schmidt - could create a sub district

Mark Bobrowski - Can the assisted living units count as affordable units?

Drew Leff - concept plan to test density - historic buildings could be replaced - along the boulevard would not be like existing

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MARCH 22, 2006

Mark Cerel – definition of developable land - that is where come back to the historic district – would have an argument to exclude the quadrangle

Don Schmidt – do not know – have to back off

Steve Browne – issue of assisted living – can we accomplish both before (plan A & B) – 440 units

Drew Leff – have allowed that a developer could include assisted living so long as the developer could include enough to meet 40b requirements

Marybeth Clancy – in assisted living need to see how the developer sets up

Steve Browne – The Development Agreement and MOU would include that information

Don Schmidt – word “bed” is a problem – rather individual small apartment – 25% must be affordable

Mark Bobrowski – A/B question – what if can do – but successful bidder want townhouses put in?

Don Schmidt – will create a sub district – assisted living & multi family – calculate the incentive payment based on the highest – cannot have a side agreement

Mark Bobrowski – when accountable? – sub-district by sub-district or district as a whole?

Don Schmidt – so long as the overall district provides – one sub-district could be less

Mark Cerel – has anyone adopted 40R yet?

Don Schmidt – have 4 applications – have drafted approval to Norwood – doing same for Chelsea – close on Plymouth - am still working on another town

Drew Leff – would look at the less dense units ??

Don – for determining the 1st payment if regulations allow – will calculate on what the highest amount would be – market will drive whether multifamily or assisted living – would treat the assisted living as trying to meet the multi family – Assisted living will count as 40R – will need to check with department to know if will count toward the 40b

Tom Carragliano – various plans – what is the average time?

Don Schmidt – work with a community with the process – Norwood – been couple of months; Plymouth – fine tuning the zoning

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MARCH 22, 2006

Mark Bobrowski – have 9 projects – worked the zoning out – question of filling in a gap – gap is the design standard, which must be very specific

Mark Cerel – is AG's office setup to review these regulations?

Don Schmidt – It seems comfortable with DHCD review – coordination is very good between the two agencies

Mark Bobrowski – design standard and density must be done to calculate

Mark Cerel – on the ground?

Mark Bobrowski – mostly just the plans – someone (engineer) must step up to do this

Don Schmidt – priority development fund – up to \$50,000 grants might be available - have done the initial meeting tonight – investigate

David Perini – DCAM is prepared to step up and get done soon – example of what happened at Taunton (fire) – same setup there – want to get this moving along – concern get done as quickly as possible

MB – was told could not hire an engineer out of that fund

Mike – quick calculations need to get it down to 22.5 acres

Steve – looks like can do

Mike – can you exclude parking?

Don – no

MB – parking next to the 40R would not count – map tight to the building foundation

Don – could create with zero lot line

Mike – dev with zero lot line, historic etc.

Steve – have dev that can do – attractive to a developer – get a better developer – bigger units

MB – working in Dartmouth – already a LIP – same project – here will not –

Pete – 20% affordable for 30 eyars

Don – 30 years is minimum – could put in

Pete – concerns in future – things run with the land

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MARCH 22, 2006

MBC – any of the covenant restrictions

Pete – how do we go forward now – who will help us pay for the engineer – will DCAM pay

MB – explained to DCAM process

Perrini – had Judith Neitch – she is coming back

MB – work with them all the time

Steve – redo the financial so can see

Drew – will do that

MC – concern statute of whether statute is providing

Steve – take what we know at this time and then refine

Pete – if the 40R districts don't work out then could do

MC – looks close enough

Wright – before spend money – do we need something from the selectmen to

Ann – continue to investigate so can learn more about

Steve – no one is saying this is the answer but want more information

MC – issues – no assurance the legislature will continue the fund – 40r also takes away some of the local control – cannot get out without DHCD approval

Ann – definitely need to know more

Steve – if plan nee

Don – commencement of construction does not start until receive payment – once adopted, need approval of the department to rescind – DHCD role will determine how much money needs to be returned

Steve – what if we decide in 3 years do not want

Don – give back portion

MC –

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MARCH 22, 2006

MB – other key player would be a urban designer to know what be built

MC – some structures remaining

MB – write up design standard

MBC – just received a letter from Mass Histroid will be consulthing – those design guidelines will – will make more strict – factor to consider – Mass Hist looke at preserving all buildings are opening the property open to this – need to consider

MC – arch features were significant to have get designation – design consistent with what is there

Wright – have you made many modifications to what submitted

Don – have been pretty flexible – position is a key element of a 40r – need to be creative

MC – issue one of expense –

MB – here rezoning the property – must go forward -need specific

John H – would be nice to have Mass Hist come out

MBC – we make every possible – question – Historic District has sign plan approval – would they keep

Don – community designates who – can only be one body

MBC – concern that local Mass Hist would

MC – could create one group

Drew – nothing to allow

Mike – can you resend by tm vote hist dist

No one knows

Steve – issue is how to deal with this

Ross – 14 mo in legislature – learned that things change quickly – concern that everything can change – need to move forward if have a plan want done – concern if there is an administration change then may not see – would like to see advancement

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MARCH 22, 2006

MBC – included int the legist – convey to the dev and then the town – can reconveinie another meeting to discuss

Leo S – the restriction is portion out of 37

Tom – if historic building is unsafe then dev not

Pete – issue of water towner

MBC – made change to land and tower – hospital well is included
Adjourned at 9:30 pm.

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 15, 2006

Present: Wright C. Dickinson, Elissa G. Franco, Keith R. Diggans, George N. Lester
Absent: Stephen Browne

Board of Selectmen: Ann B. Thompson, Paul B. Rhuda. Osler L. Peterson

Also present: Town Administrator Michael J. Sullivan, Assistant TA Kristine Trierweiler, Leo Surrette and Frank Garrison; John Harney

8 pm – Convened by WD

MOU –

Kristine – draft MOU for January 19th – Mark B. thought we should have a development agreement – DCAM does not want a development agreement – they would like to see it soon

Wright – DCAM seems to be holding MOU so can move

Kristine – development agreement – brief conversation with MB – seemed reluctant

Paul – have agreed to deal with the state – execute MOU and move forward – don't need a development agreement

Mike – does it have anything to do with his contract

Elissa – been talking about dev. Agree since day one so probably not part of his – orig deve

Wright - thought MOU and then go out state gets – make sure MOU mentions dev agreement

Pete – would like to see all the documents at once – not clear what is the issue

Wright – road block

Kristine – they think we are the road block

Paul – MOU – met with state they agreed, met in Lydia's office, Perrini asked if any other surprises and we said no – wanted to get MOU out

Kristine – only listed is the reuse plan and legislation

Wright – have we given anything back

Kristine – don't want to submit MOU unless we know if we are

Pete – what is problem with MB

Paul – if he wants as an attorney to say goes together – additional fees – need to get MOU

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 15, 2006

Pete – concern for a dev agreement

Elissa – will still be tied to our zoning

Pete – development agree would tie town

Ann – what would you do, Elissa

Elissa – thought deve agreement would say how it would get developed – not having seen – sure important – but not sure MOU is not the end of the line – MOU is binding in what it says – says the town agrees to proceed and state agrees

Paul – if do RFP and deve agreement comes later then have to talk

Elissa – could agree to but could change

Keith – dev agreement – time for what needed – similar

Paul – asked MB – with the restrictions of 40R re density – how do if have ot keep the existing buildings – if get too invented concern – did not get an answer

Elissa – wasn't suppose

Paul – don't know if it will work – no plan laid out

Wright – new plan – only added two more big units (50 in each) – revised plan that Drew was suppose to meet on – was suppose to meet in Drew's office – MB blew it off since problem with agreement

Kristine – DCAM does not care what we have

Wright – sense they are frustrated with MB

Pete – what is the problem

Elissa – he is trying to say that this is a different proposal

Pete – thought we were going to redo his contract

Wright – asked for him to give us some sort of proposal – does not answer the questions

Paul – frustrated when on the board when MB redid the Bylaw

George – proposed a lot of stuff

PLANNING BOARD

MAY 15, 2006

Wright – need to know if we are going to use him and how are we going to pay him – still do not have a proposal – Keith has question

Mike – keeps getting more complicated - \$350 per hour – then pay from the money town would be received – then the grant

Wright – talking about the PDF – have form but not

Kristine – he will not fill out the grant – not something can put together over night – max is \$40,000 – need to be sure all encompassing

Wright – if in agree – what is the best way to nail down

Paul – if do MOU and get state on – have agreement – state will have to do RFP – don't we have something that will get DCAM to pick up

Wright – have agreed to do engineering DCAM – state was willing to use Drew to move it along and have the consultant – also hearing DCAM reluctant to have Drew do if not what MB might come up with

Paul – hire him on a review process

Wright – it goes counter to all of the other meetings

Pete – have lost the time

Elissa – need expertise

Pete – who is the point person

Wright – was hired

Paul – from his letter it appears it is over

Wright – not much substance in 7 overlays

Elissa

Kristine – time line – if in by end of this month – only meet monthly – meet end of June – could possibly not have the money by end of August

Mike – discussion with Mary Beth – cannot restrict the number of bedrooms – would have to open it up to 3-4 bedrooms

Kristine – will talk with MB

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 15, 2006

Pete – always been plan –

Kritine – not when change to 40R

Pete – MB said could design

George – need an answer to the question – may have done more work – may take creative thinking

Paul – question to him was the real advantage over 40b – said get reimbursed – then no if tax roll – never answered – advantage give up a lot of control

Pete – might get a better project

Paul - be careful when state hand out “carrots” – there are changes

Wright – meetings with MB – upfront money – not looking at that – he was making out the money – just got some feed back on the \$350K – don’t count on the Trust Fund is from the sale of surplus – already \$2.8M committed – different from heard

Mike – not allowed to resind 40r

Wright – MB and Steve B have been in favor – want to hear from this group

Leo – in fact could do – if we cannot limit to 2 br then how does that effect our plan

Paul – not inconvenienced that get better deve because can make more money – if they can put more money in their projcthey weill – what ever they will do – make a lot more money with a 40b - you put stuff in their – getting a return – build a good dev and it will say

Wright – concern for the phasing and time monitoring of the roll out so can take advantage of the low income

Paul – build 440 and get market to take – looking at 6-8 years with the infra structure –

Wright – are you getting the protection – it is committed and laid out

Keith – not allow us to do a full 7 years – if economy does not support and do not meet those schedules lose- concern for the balance

Paul – very light on the affordable – still be hit with more 40b’s

Elissa – read from the 40R application requirements – not sure the zoning is going to allow you to restrict – not as big a say on what can be deve there

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 15, 2006

Paul – like 40b because have MOU – RFP will state – goe through the process with the 40b – get a chance to say no – stuck with the 40r then stuck with it

Kristine – part feels trying to force this project – won't know

Elissa – no one is willing to say can do – saying must spend the money to find out – don't know what the other costs are – don't really know

Kristine – could submit 4 times to DHCD and still say now

Mike – agreement with MB and see if we like it (fixed amount money)

Paul – concern

Wright – if he had shown up at the meeting might have had more answers

Kristine – angry that did not meet – about

Elissa – after meeting with DHCD

Kristine – he cancelled half hour – need to ask him the number of hours

Mike – does not have an end product

Wright – he has not done one – he has talked much about

Paul. – 40b has been around and people understand – 40b is laid out and approved and do as go along – scared if rescind 40R

Mike – concern that anything need permission from the state

John – came in as a wild card – would have had to resulted in doing to what seemed to be a straight forward path now much more complicated – new elections

Paul – would like to get it sealed before Thanksgiving

Elissa – think the 40R sounded good at first

Wright – could have the dev file for 40b

Kristine – 40r is new – it is not where the town own the land – problem when between the various state agencys

Wright – should this project be the solution to our low income housing?

Paul – was going to get credit for 198 – need – not nec the end all to getting at the 10

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 15, 2006

5 cap still expect a couple more 40b's come in – once a plan in place then holds more credibility with Mass Housing – they have to fight the housing advocates – asked MB whatever happened for the 2 for 1 – it never made it to the legislation – concern for the funding portion – example of section 8 housing – concern they stop the funding

Wright – there will always be the specter thT RTHWEY MIGHt not – they are heading to DCAM frustration

Mike – dev and overlay that the town would like – then can have more control – trust the town more than DHCD

John – what would the state say

Wright – they want to hear what are we doing – 40r or what – want to know before they have drew do any more – have done the overlay

Paul – get DCAM back now by doing MOU

Kristine – tracks the reuse plan and legislation – need to get the 60 days referenced that have to have zoning in place – 440 reuse plan as well as the legislation

Mike – dev would have the option of lower number of units if can get credit for beds

Kristine – MOU – Jan. 19th

Elissa – remember

Pete – still makes sense to do the 40 r – has some benefits – talked aobut boing the 40r and 40b which the dev needed to apply for immediately – dev

John – does it extend the project

Pete – need to be speaking with one voice – Mike and Kristine – can't have everyone – need to get Bob back on board at any cours

Wright – who is going to renegotiate

Mike – would be willing to go back and talk with MB but need to know what talk aobut

Wright – have overlay alreadyt in - amendment to do 40r

George – how would have to

Keith – needs to tell us how much of this covenant – how much for proposal – how much for acting as lawyer – how much for design – can we get him in one more time and ask then he can

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 15, 2006

leave and we can make a decision – have no idea – what makes more sense – would like to have the answers

Paul – the MOU must be done so state knows moving in the right direction

Leo – if MB cannot guarantee control of 40r eg bedrooms

Pete – what he said about density – by design specifications it would limit to what is there in the existing buildings – through his design specs it would limit it – sq. ft. of buildings

Leo – need guarantee

George – MOU

Ann – is everyone comfortable

Kristine – will incorporate changes and get draft

Elissa – what happens with the tm

Mike – need to get passed by July 31st or will go to the next January

Elissa – concern if the process of deciding takes long

Wright – revolving hurdles that get in the way of getting something done

Kristine – legislation will go forward without MOU

Wright – MOU final draft for all parties to do one final review

Kristine – out by the end of this week and one week for everyone to get

Wright – have MOU in by June 1st

Wright – next – if the answer of not change view

Ann – changes her view

Kristine – will call Don Schmidt

Mike – get in writing

Wright – hearing from MB is an issue and Mark B not

Mike – need to ask Mary Beth

PLANNING BOARD

MAY 15, 2006

Kristine – have had no issues just a death in family

Mike – DCAM wants it passed

Pete – back to which zoning – currently going with both

Mike – must decide

Pete – if do 40r will requ the deve to do 40b

Mike – can do an overlay zone and include

Wright – need to continue to have meetings so we can move forward – next meeting June 5th – could meet next week

Kristine – can send a memo to everyone before the June 5th

Wright – MOU this week by Kristine – coment next week

Kristine do PDF grant by next week

Reestablish line of comm. With Maty] that we ahd this meetin

Mike talk with Mike b – renegotiation a fee and time line for 40r and consultant cost – and confirm if he needs to confirm

KRISTIN will talk with Don Schmidt about #bedrooms and funds

MassHistorical meeting letter – should we need to do that on the 5th

Kristine – new director at Mass hist

Wright – better served with a meeting like tonight on the 5th – separate from Mass Historic

Kristine – Mass Historic will tell us when the meeting will be – DCAM will send a letter in res to

Mike – try to have a meeting from Mass His – out here – would help if go through

Wright – any other things

Keith was everyone here at the 40r DHCD

Except Paul

Elissa – thought all went out understanding but then additional questions came up

Pete – need to keep the process moving – can we deal without violating

Kristine – can send project memos out just do not reply to all

Meeting June 5, 2006

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 15, 2006

Adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD
JUNE 26, 2006

Present:

Joint meeting with Board of Selectmen

Both meetings convened at approximately 7:30 p.m.

Steve – Mark B would not have report by tonight but will e-mail from Greece

Wright - would like to wrap up and send back to Kristine and Selectmen

Steve – have issue about strategy – housing inventory – no need to change the MOA

Elissa – Mark C – why something missing

Wright – 3a and item 10 he needs to add the appropriate word

Steve – maybe 10 should be by Mark B.

Wright – item 7 should be 6 – ok with Mark C comment

Steve – on 3a the language is taken directly from the legislation – we used the same so there would be no confusion with the legislation

Wright – housekeeping on the MOA can be done – question are we waiting for Mark B to weigh in – says he will respond next week

Paul – how close are we getting to the 30th

Mike – talked with Lydia and Kris talked with Marybeth – they have been having discussions and DCAM has been giving them proposals – meeting tomorrow to see if can find an acceptable proposal (Perini, Marybeth, and Nordstran) – 3 mental health advocates pushing – experience that from the last 2 hospital sales money did not translate into housing and they want to besure this does – want to be assured that the money will go to the DMH – especially housing – issue between DCAM and DMH

Paul

Kris – Chairman of the Rules committee

Wright – doing MOA based on the legislation as we know it

Mike – think will get done by the 30th if reach an agreement tomorrow – was possible to get done

Wright – assuming they are on track – is there a time sensitive factor for MOA

Kris – DCAM wants

PLANNING BOARD

JUNE 26, 2006

Paul – if they do not pass the legislation then the deal is off – that puts pressure on them

Ann – cemetery – 800 graves there – cemetery committee with rep DMH – consenses that there will be a clause that buyer will have responsibility – Bertha felt should refrain from anything

Steve – current legislation requires a trust fund from the buyer –

Paul - not sure who will administer the trust fund. Talked with Ken F. and said could maintain on a perpetual basis – town should accept it – give us the trust fund.

Ann – explained how people were buried there

Steve – town probably cares more about it than any developer

Wright – deve gets control but probably willing to give to the town – is there anything in the MOA

Elissa – no in the development agreement

Ann – does not need to be in the MOA

Paul – should be willing if funding is adequate

Mike – asked for copy of the legislation

Kris – hope to have a draft of the legislation by the end of the week

Elissa – if legislation changes then should not be stuck

Ann – please e-mail to all members of the boards

Kris – with DCAM's approval

Wright – take it to the next step – we have done what we can – will have Mark's B comments next week

Steve – he understands our current plan

Wright – did he have any comment

Steve – he understood the logic – he is happy with that

Ann – what is our time frame

PLANNING BOARD
JUNE 26, 2006

Wright – do Kristine, Mark and Mark to fine tune it and send – will comment on MB's comments – the following week set up the appointment

Elissa – cannot commit to a meeting until legislation

Wright – MOA and legislation are big pieces – then have the info to set up

Steve – comment about a way to meet affordable housing strategy – have all concentrated on 40b
Now – apply based on acreage – if have 1.5% - calculate how much land that can be developed

Weymouth decision

Could check that – not

General Minimum Land Area

Wright – would not effect the 440 count

Steve – not suggest negotiate with DCAM

Paul – not change our game plan

Elissa – a parell issue

Paul – stick to our game plan – Steve saying could get out from under

Wright – one flaw in our plan is to get MB to meet with MC

Paul – just need his comments

Kristine will coordinate

Wright – based on MB comment MOA would be done by July 14th

Issue of the Historical Commission to discuss – at working session saying wanted to get town boards

Paul – need to bring them in for a “heart to heart” talk

Ann – water and sewer, school, historic

Paul – need to get historic

Wright – get Historic and water and sewer –

7:30 pm on July 10th

Selectmen's meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m

PLANNING BOARD

JUNE 26, 2006

COLE DRIVE EXTENSION SUBDIVISION

8:15 p.m. Chairman Dickinson read the legal notice as it appeared in the Medfield Press and explained the Board's procedure for the public hearing.

Richard Merrikin of Merrikin Engineering, LLP, presented the subdivision on behalf of the applicant, Greg Coras, who was also present. The land is a portion of property located at 115 High Street. The total parcel is 14 acres total. However the applicant is purchasing only 7 of the acres. The proposal is to extend Cole Drive approximately 200+ feet. The remaining land would stay with the owners. The land is wooded, hilly, flows in westerly direction. It abuts Town Of Medfield land and a Boston Edison easement. Cole Drive is part of the previously approved Kettle Pond Subdivision built several years ago. In preparing the subdivision, they brought in different discussion plans for the Planning Board to look at. The plan presented this evening seemed to be the most agreeable to the Planning Board and the Applicant. Cole Drive has an existing turn around. They propose to extend Cole Drive 210 feet, but are requesting waivers not to build the additional road. Mr. Merrikin stated that the turnaround is adequate for fire and emergency vehicles. He proposes 3 driveways off end of Cole Drive, one to each lot. There is an area of wetlands on lot 2. There are wetlands along the river. The river area is under the rivers act. There would be a catch basin in the center driveway and an infiltration (underground) system. PB policy to entertain waivers only if show can build the road without waivers – have prepared a “full compliance plan” – this would be a road that continues through the property and eventually comes out on Plain Street – this meets the regulations – this would be a full construction way – that would be how to do if not able to do with waivers – would have 3 lots at a minimum, plus additional lots. Will give board the plan. There are wetland issues there – can cross wetlands if that is the only way to develop the property. That sets up the development proposing - Intention is to create minimal disturbance – will need septic systems – not to clear cut the area – construct houses like they did in Kettle Pond (same developer) – benefit is that it is still a dead end – no additional connection of Plain St. – leave buffer zone in a natural state – In waivers, one request is dead end street issue which is measured from Plain – the existing is 700+ - did exceed then – pushing 210 ft more with caveat that no further development

Wright – Earth Tech comments

Rick - #1 – just proposing house services – not proposing connection – will not add hydrant unless FC wants

#2 – agree – capecod berm along the roadside would be helpful to direct water to catch basin

#3 – construction entrance detail – will add

#4 – will add to the plan

#5 – will add drainage to the plan – was included with the filign on a sep sheet

#6 – monuments – do you want bounds? They will be in someone's lawn – will add if necessary

#7 – will add

#8 – will reference plans as such – they are there – will not be filing for the road but only the two house lots with ConCom

PLANNING BOARD

JUNE 26, 2006

#9 – design of the driveway – took the middle driveway and designed more like a road – could come up steeper and make 75 feet like 10 feet – first 10 feet is steeper and rest is flatter -
#10 - probably an 1.5" service

Drainage:

#1 – and #2 Proposed that every roof has an infiltration system – designed for a 2" rain storm (1/4 of the 100 year storm) – will explain

#3 will remedy mistake and give to the board

#4 – outlet pipe – have an overflow pipe and will show

#5 – will show the specific design

#6 – maintenance is easier – drainage system is all on lot 2 and will be the perview of lot 2 and will have the BOH requirements rather than a Hom OwnAss

#7 – will do

Stormwater Management

This project is too small to require.

Could make the catch basin ???? to be in full compliance – will discuss with Bill Domey (BOH) to discuss – maybe overkill

Had discussed the town could aquire some of lot 2 – are amenable

George – wetland area - ? vernal pool

Rick – not a certified vernal pool – have had it looked at – given the right set of circumstances down the road it could be – not at this time – owner and ConCom could request that it be certified – have to deal with it today – isolated wetland until proven otherwise – ConCom has looked at but not taken any action – depends on the critters (frogs and salamanders)

Wright – overall parcel is 14 – are you in control

Rick – have P&S with the 7 – have permission to go through if necessary – owners would get more lots is go through but would prefer not.

Wright – is there any need for permission for Cole Drive

Elissa – no limits in previsou dec?

Rick – none – presented at that time – will meet with the fire dep

Wright – waiver plan is driveways and extensions

Rick – will meet with him – driveways length – longest is 350 feet – other 120 feet and couple of hundred feet – enough frontage for three driveways – could do one but would get away from common ownership

PLANNING BOARD

JUNE 26, 2006

Wright – each house is responsible for own driveway

Elissa – were the driveways factored in and are they different if common

Rick – yes, Walpole – if you own it you maintain it – they know up front when they buy it

Wright – how accurate is the location of the houses

Rick – close – need to show grades for ConCom – will give that - will have sf

Greg – 4000 to 5000 sqft - 2 story houses

Rick – idea is when get building permit give the calculations to the BI – pointed out houses on the abutting lots – Glower has a detention basin on so – left Cole is 60- 80 feet back – have filed with the BH – would expect to hear in 2-3 weeks – temp cul would remain as is – people have landscaped around – would still be the end of the road

Wright – any trails

Rick – not at this time – town owns land near Boston Edison easement

Steve – talked of giving some land to the town

Rick – mentioned to Leslee – need figure how to get across the wetland – owners are not interested in giving to the town but the applicant is with regard to his land

Wright – will that prevent a cut through road in the future

Rick – would

Steve – require no further connection to other streets – no through streets – no further development

Rick – lot sizes 43,000 (2) and 144,000 which will be carved up – small drainage going back inot Cole – no net increase from the permitet – that is only place – can address run off

Wright – general ask nonwaiver – do we need to insure that nonwaiver is a nonwaiver plan – looks like it is do able

Rick – not easily answered

Elissa – only need to look at the requirements of our regulations

Rick – problem is asking him to comment on a preliminary plan – will be able to state

PLANNING BOARD

JUNE 26, 2006

Wright – the question is more a far reaching procedure – something that we should talk with Earth Tech

George – does this meet the dimensional requirement of a street – as a professional engineer could

Rick – 10 years ago could do x amount of ground work – as time goes on things change

Wright – might want to consider – need to know what the general cost is

Norma – suggest Wright talk with Chris

Steve – in order to do the nonwaiver plan – green area is coapplicant

Rick – would end up

Steve – wouldn't want the owner of the green land – need to obtain - concern the no waiver parts should be in perpetuity –

Rick – no waiver extend to the non purchased

George – forcing them to show all the lots that could be built on no waiver

Steve – saying must keep all the land of the road – don't get road then build a new in the road

Rick – will think about it – should have an easement over that portion – can they use it as an anr lot – intent is that they would like to do a couple of form a lots

Steve – may affect the location

Rick – will look at

Elissa – have viewed where there have an easement but do not get that easement

Rick – do not know what the ramifications are

Wright – have Mark C weigh in on it

Rick – if donate land to the Town would have

Steve – issue of building the three is based on this no waiver – concern that it be used later

Elissa – need to think about for a while

Wright – questions from audience

PLANNING BOARD
JUNE 26, 2006

Cathy – 22 Cole Drive – concern for the overflow going onto Cole – concern for drainage

Rick – asking for waivers – try to meet what we can of the regulations – grade req thus designed the driveway that way – could do it differently –

Wright – or could put a catch basin at the end of the driveway – he might present new information at another hearing

Cathy – neighborhood does not want this subdivision – why could not bring in from Plain St

Rick – does not meet the regulations for a street – must meet the regulations for a street – did present that as an option – would need to require obtaining land from neighbors - not wide enough unless ownership – do not have the ability – left 40 ftl when 40 ft. was allowed

Cathy – who will be responsible for clean up

Rick – builder owns the road – builder kept – nothing says he has to seek

Wright – submit a construction management plan

Cathy – does that go under the same – what is the paving issues that occur

Rick – road is owned by Mr. Coras – unless the town is trying to accept at town meeting

Wright – if he wants to get the road accepted – he will have to make good

Rick – he is going to be selling 3 houses so no need to beat up the street – son is in the business right now alw

Jack - 18 Cole Drive – street longer than

Steve – cannot do without a waiver

Rick – the PB at that time approved

Norma – pla also saw the

Cathy – Cole drive could connect to Plain St – why

George – the rule is on a nonthrough street – explained how figured

Rick – 983

PLANNING BOARD

JUNE 26, 2006

George – can waive that requirement if in the public interest – can only do if he has the capacity to build a plan

Jack Lynch – what is involved in getting the two streets accepted by the town?

George – usually it is the developer?

Norma – will ask town counsel if developer owns the road can the abutters seek acceptance to the

Clowly – is it the intention that Cole to town

There is a bond on it so that it stays in good condition.

Will the water run off to the existing pond

Rick – no – they look very good

Wright – further

Fluynn – 13 Plain Street – separate septic with leeching fields – will fields be away from the abutter

Rick – will be in front yards toward brook

Wright – to August 14th at 8:15 pm. So moved and voted.

PLANNING BOARD
SEPTEMBER 25, 2006

Present: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, Keith R. Diggans, Elissa G. Franco, and George N. Lester

8:00 p.m. meeting convened by Chairman Dickinson

Laura Einbinder, Lilac Lane

8:15 p.m. **Continued Cole Drive Definitive Subdivision hearing**

Rick Merrikin explained concern by BOH over a stormceptor unit. They will use one that is approved by MA. They added a "no clear" zone to the plan. Will work with neighbors over where trees need to be added. Added a planting strip between the driveways to keep them separate. Updated the waiver list and discussed the waiver justification letter. 16% of the whole piece (30% of the Coras property) is given to the Town

George: Concerned about driveways

Rick: brought driveways out; works without a homeowners association. There is no common water or sewer. All the drainage is on the middle lot

George: Cole dr is not accepted rd

Rick: It is in acceptable condition. Greg will seek to get it accepted once developed. He wanted control over the roads. If a common drive then everyone must maintain

Wright – it will be a plowing thing that will mess it up.

George – concern

Rick – gets more complicated for only 25 feet of land – have to share the driveway and needs to get

Elissa – the differences here is that we are off the end of a culdesac – not much traffic – makes the subdivision plan a lot cleaner – will work out better in the land – not coming off a busy street

George – impression after last meeting when someone raised the suggestion

Wright – abutters were fine with it when they were here last

Rick – Greg talked with the neighbor regarding the drives

Wright – both driveways did move up

Rick – the new people would want privacy

PLANNING BOARD
SEPTEMBER 25, 2006

Wright – don't want

Elissa – just that the driveways will not get any closer to the property line

Rick – did not want to specify # of trees but will work out the specifics

Wright – any more new information; any questions from the board (none)

Steve – town was trying to buy this property and is now receiving a \$250,000.

George – even though the town meeting did not vote the 2/3 (but did vote a majority) to acquire the land – so land

Voted to close the public hearing

Elissa - Move to approve the plan as submitted by applic including the revisions and waivers as submitted today, note that basis for the waivers are in a memo submitted by Merrikin = condition that the driveway on 3 will not be built any closer than shown on the subdivison plan - standard conditions – bounds on the corners at Plain Street

Second – Steve

So voted.

Concluded at 8:40 pm

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m

8:30 p.m. **Continued Kingsbury Club Site Plan review**

No discussion was held

Voted to continue the public hearing, at the applicant's request, to October 16, 2006 at 8:15 p.m.

ANR PLAN (WHEELWRIGHT ROAD/ADAMS STREET)

Voted to endorse ANR plan

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Present: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, Keith R. Diggans, Elissa G. Franco, and George N. Lester

Mr. Browne recused himself from the public hearing for Quarry Road, but participated in other action.

Other business

Signed covenant for Cole Drive Extension

Voted to release 3 lots at Hammant Farm

Voted to reduce surety at Boiling Springs Subdivision to \$50,000

QUARRY ROAD

Richard Gillogly – couple of changes to the plans since last meeting

Paul Cutler – reviewed Earth Tech list – still working on the drainage with the BOH – permeability tests on basin

Scott – question Earth Tech sending review to them

Paul – still working on the drainage – hinge around the permeability test

Scott – will submit to Bill Domey who has told them what wants – 2 parts – drainage plus other items addressed

Paul – listed the waivers that were requested – added locus map and tree plan – added the house numbers – profile added dig safe note – sewer tie in added – comment on K values added – special plan just for the tree plantings – shows the actual drainage as off today – 2” storm from Thanksgiving was still dry – added bench marks and temporary stone drive for construction – added the test holes that were done – added a siltation barrier

Scott – all of the technical “stuff” – they will have to confirm –

Paul – sewer manholes – house keeping

Wright – when all done for BOH then send to Earth Tech

Keith – question road

Paul - added 100 foot waiver

Rich – asking for waiver –but could move basin

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Scott – infiltration basin – road – sidewalk on other side

Rich – documentation for extending

Scott – 1989 – PB asked them to do a master plan showing build out – reviewed the plan – at that point there was a discussion of connection to FLL – and not done – build out of Quarry Rd on that plan shows 11 (?) lots in the proposed subdivision

Rich – 1994 – preliminary plan WCH – showed 14 lots in this area - pb approval no
All filings with MEPA showed the division of this land beyond 500 feet – provided access to all of the area

Scott – definitive showing further dev

Rich – total is still below the original number of lots – less than the 96

George – comment on condition #15 of the definitive approval

Rich – read out loud – not proposing to connect to another subdivision – if go through then it would be a street – not adding additional land – not sure this precludes

Wright – read the condition for the sake of those present – comment for the public safety for concerns

Mike Sullivan – 35 Nebo – Town Administrator – in response to request for info PB – met with public safety and public works – conclusion that should be a third means of egress – one not served by 109 – access for fire and ambulance – also egress from there – not good to depend on 109 – recent incident of robbery and train traffic – time differential if needed to access this area – access road through the north part of time – avoids the congestion to north street – general plowing operations – if planned original would have been better sewer – have concluded and rec a third means

Bill K – was here 14 years ago – message is public safety – incident could increase response time – triples the distance – and quadruples the response time – issues on 109 during snow storms – trees down – road block – poles down – public safety – should be a link to these areas

Bob Meaney – declare an interest – myself and sister have 23 acres of land in the neighborhood – part of the neighborhood – concur with the others that a connection would be helpful but also east end must come up to brook and north to come over and in – built up over the last decade – to get from one part to other would be helpful from a patrol – long route around to get to the house – questions regarding increased traffic and safety – obvious will increase – yes more chance of incident – but overall best – no other road – would feel more comfortable if could get there

Elissa – question of FC – knock down gate

Bill – sketch off the Eric rd – not a year around maintained – it is a utility easement

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Scott – proposed easement is the end of the existing Quarry Road – was following the old path that was out there - traced on the plan – 30 feet wide easement with narrower road

Wright – Erik Rd is not built

Scott – passible road right now

Wright – building permits

Rich – could not get a CO until the road is built

Elissa – buffer – not own a small strip on the plan

George – approved Erik Rd plan – wraps around

Mark – culdesac does not go end of property line

Rich – have an easement

Wright – proposed that have an easement – could you still negotiate through (FC)

Bill – not sure

Scott – could relocate – could be straight shot

George – what view if not a roadway but finished enough to allow trucks - Westwood example – what is your concern

Bill – have apparatus 40 ft. long 40 tons

Wright – have breakout gate at 30 acres

Bill – has been there and grown up

George – town could have the capacity to maintain – incorporated into subdiv

Bill – will it be plowed in the winter – there are many links

Wright – break out gate with some access better than none

Bill – guess

Wright – if something maintained with a gate could work as an option

Bill – could be but not give answer now

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Mike – does it maintain – make sense – chief's idea of operation – had issue at TM – opposition of connecting – tm voted to allow – people now like it – they do not have to go all the way around – will get some traffic but not as much as think

Bob – prefer a real road so patrol vehicles can get through – emergencies aside would make it more likely for coverage – general flow of traffic

Wright – opening up allow a second robber to get out

Bill – happen all over town

Bob – crime in culdesac on google – goes both way – early 80's thought safer – don't want to go to extremes – get stuck in the culdesac – go into someones house – otherwise go

Wright – connect – traffic controls

Mike – a lot of turns people get confused so do not use it

Bob – speed bumps – don't like – tried in Wes – raised cross blocks slow traffic down - ?sus – can put up no through traffic – no left turn during commute – could be done as mitigation for people traveling through

Wright – other road improve if connector done

Mike – would always looking to extending sidewalks – major improvement – rest of infrastructure can handle – would need to look

Wright – response time – define improvement

Bill – did the mileage – 1.3 – over Nebo etc. 3.3 miles – narrow and windy

Wright – discussion of alternate locations for police and fire dept now

Mike – always discuss it – number of places are limited – was town pl and bld – one site is current town garage – further away – better access to major highway – probably rebuild town garage at location – not suitable sites in the center

George – problem with the sewer – recall had an easement for sewer through to Erik but for tech reasons chose not to

Scott – not an issue – went to a forced main system – each house has own unit – works great – self maintaining – orig idea to go gravity out Erik Rd – because of wetland crossing etc. with Erik changed route

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

George – 10 years ago was opportunity to go through – was Morse option – why advocate for this now – town decided that did not want cut thoug

Mike – any neigh opposes a through street – if everyone lived on a cul then not get any where – see at a point becomes more necessary egress to the point – traffic increases on 109 and industry on 109 – possibility block – just tied up in traffic – tiemes are changing - Ken met with and supports connectin esp – plowing and road maintenance – problems with neigh on cul – complaints get more snow – he supports

Wright – ever been an incident where someone has gotten hurt along the way when rushing to by emergency vehicles?

Mike – can't think of one

Bob – not going back to 70;s – cul neigh incr traffic ? more dangerous – more young children are struck by vehicles backing up than traffic on roadways

Wright – wnyon in favor of a cut through?

Mark Cerel – questions or issues for the Board for Mark

Elissa – there are issues with regard to length if not

Mark – if deve has phys ability to do cut throu – by default must grant – concer with mr gill

Scott – 28 roads that come up with granted to

Elissa – adding 880 more makes Quarry Road closer to 1700 feet

Paul – 180 feet from Minuteman

Mark – way back

Elissa – what did you concur

Mark – does not address a public way but another subdivision

George – would you (Mark)

Mark –bowing to neigh concern did not ErikRd – Woodcliff – was addressed at a time – attempt to contrao the Erik Rd sub and the right to construct on that property on the original plan

Rich – would have been conce to additional land

Mark – Musto got bogged down before erik rod – prel plan showed cut through – pb decided the dec – attempt to pull back

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Elliss – said cannot say no to a cut through and no to cul – why either or

Mark – because if def can show in compliance with sub dontr law – issue when dev requ waivers
- major waiver is length of culdesac – int this case the deve has land that would allow him to connect

Elissa – does this give a nonwaier plan – s

Mark – nonwaiver on point of length of culdesac – pb decide not want a through road – then grant waiver

Elissa – wehre do you measure

Mark – interpresti – nearest through cross street – which is outside that sub – not just crossing – issue safety as personnel

Elissa – police and fire did not address how fit down – reach houses on longer culdesac

Bill – length of the culdes a is not major issue – how they lay out the circle – loop the water supply – dead end main not good

Mark – hsit culd were temp turn arounds to provide accc to back dev – carry to the property – turn ro so firetrucks turn round – then became a desireable way to build – was concern if something happened on so limited the leng of nonthroug rod

Keith – typicall some public good if granted – hammered out a deal – see a document not cut through – some limitations on – previous agreement – was there a discussion that said will bet this much done –

Mrk – not actively involved in the WCH – focus was on Erik Rd and not dev – series of pl felt devlon ER too dense – focus by time off and TC to prevent ER from dense dev – prevent wetland area – Mr. Musto was claiming have an agreement to go through and into wch – that pb approved the prel plan but not the plan – approved pull back – instead he added land – pb said no and ended in ligation and court approved

Rich – was a deal 10 years ago that would not connect – agreed not to connect - approve for a rather long dead end street – was clear that would extend qrd

Elissa – 1995 – clarify – where does roadway a start – final plan the streets are already named
- provison says shall not exceed

Rich – guess that 8—was the plan approved

George – next point that there was a deal

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Keith – concern about the size and access – trying to understand - ? # houses

Mark – there were open space and trails given to the town

George – took that out of the definitive plan – where understanding

Rich – showed it on the plan –

George – wehre says will come back

Rich – the decision that would come back

Mark – even if condition – nothing prevents them from coming back – board not legally bound by actions of prev pla bd short of any covenant

John Posivak – 14 Partridge rd – admitted prior agreement – no connections between deve - devl is substutiing road for deve – all are dev – prior agee no connec - dev sell little – serves no purpose for fire or police – burgulars know way out – new chief wants to intordu more burglary

Wright – make point – avoid attacks

John P – offers no great advantage

Ken – points – speed – roadways through Pine Needle winding – emergency veh get there at best other way – poikc chief see emer can see can't get there – probably of being on the scene is the same as being aways – there is traffic on 109 in the opposte dire – when emer parts – snwo slip and lid – noer st and 109 clear – emerg veh - open up that way more probable for injury – traffic flow would increase – compromise safety - contradictory

6 Boyden Road – at older – state was involved in the 2nd part of deve – paths were protedct – nego number of houses – lot of hopus – always ana gre with no connection – former plocie – could put in a fire road

Bill - never was an agree

Mary Martin – Ped – everyone great – love home clud – Had a contract and tier of this being reviesed – respectful of the intent of the board – kids at risk – environment of uncertainty – troublec because made a promise – revise – be faithful to orig understanding – can't build – now need new cut through

102 – Merr Currie – live Green St – becomes one lane – snow banks – vehicle accident speeding into tree – play gorun at end of street – cars speed up and down street – extra traffic

92 Green St – second what said – Feb bred missed front porch – specific quest – heard public safety and convenience – know what is good for themselves – collection of antidotal information – would like to see traffic flows and traffic volumes

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Wright – traffic flows will be part of this hearing but they are waiting

92 Gree – will be subst increase – will roads handle - public safety – everyday basis ways heavy vs emergency – cost for traffic control measures – inhere cost

Kate Meead e – 10 Minute man rod- traffic studies after

Wright – will look at what is in the best interest of the town – will get the inrotma

Kate – filled with lots of kids ridign bikes – traffic flows out to 109 – risk of getting hit by cars not worth

Brian Mc Ken 22 Minm – concur with said – add pultry level of facts – distance and increased response time – close to the center of town – how compare to outer area of town – are they less safe

Bill – probably take as long to get to Indian Hill if get afrou – again if something happens to close the road down – quicker way is 109 when road conditions blocked – alternate route is 3 times the length

Henry Lap – 4 FLL – access been blocked at time of emergency –

Bill – a couple of times – you are waiting for the help depends

Want more datea

Peter Herbert at 18 Part – also agree – willing to bear the risk of extended emergen time vs not having accident – Scott reasonable – would say pave

Scott – will pave it if you want – whaevgf you want

Peter – could put in do not enter signs and not allow public access

??? – concerns about emergency ven – not roads

Bill – the one proposed is not accept – Erik Rd is only proposed

Wright – there will be discussion about emergency

??? - bould allow patrol vehic

Mike – poep will go thorough – must have control – studies always think others speed through – actually turns out people in the neighborhood – the most speeders

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

Jakc Syvlia – 26 Minm – public safety – getting to the point of balance – majority of speeders – there the most – hwo many speeding tickets – fraction of the people doing it – increased traffic will add

Joan Rose – 23 Ped – coing poujt to make a left turn any time of day – can wait 4-5 min – cars back up with a cut through – more accidents – Treen st – snow – barely get two cars – sheet of ice at Boyden –

Warren Mead – 10 MMrd – drive 109 – 128 West woo center blocked – gets bad in the morning – cut trough very busy – this will be our neighborhood – talk with Westwood – go to cornere of V B and Quarry and count dogs and kids – packed

Mike – live on Nebo St – kids all the way down main street – 3000 kids – have the situation everywhere in the town – 20000 cars every day

War M – did you collect the data

Mike – that info is available from schools

Bob – knjow westwood issue – used to be traffic officer who fed traffic out – widely used road – not something that devge

??? – not Harford

Ph=il bo –Ped – whole neighbor hood nightmare – may resolve some issues but creating new ones – look back in records – wasn't erik rd – it was cut through to fl

Don Scarry – 15 ffl – agree with ken neeland – 10 years ago kid driving fast got stopped by hedgest – will increase the chances of happeing again – Ped and Morse people appreciate with what doing

Bill Piert – 33 Cypress – lived there 33 years – why jeopardize safety of liltle kids – safety

Wright –j ust tyring to hear all sides

11 part rd – much talk about increase traffic – new gps systems will increase tar

Bill – 25 cy;ress tr – process

Wright – will take the information in – hear all the sides – getting feed back – reviewe the record – engineering aspects – consideration of waivers – plus BOH - final dec

Norma – several months

Stephen Browne – do not believe pd dec in pas is change – agreed not about erik rd – it was about any cut through –was a deal – no cut through –long culd – binding then and today – intent

PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2006

of the deve – Colwell homes website – in 2000 final pahse – 39 homes – says the intention of the developer as to the public

Scott – Mr. browne is a direct abutter who filed suit against

Mr. Browne – we – trustees of res –and town – Mr. coolwe was tyrin to block trail s – not to stop dev – mr. col built

2 vine boro rd – intersection of Hattersvil oand vinebrook – the law says you should stop – at least slow down

Wright – will continue the hearing to another date

George – in themiddle of process of BOH review – that must be rview

Contine to Janu at 8:15 p.m

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm