GROTON PLANNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 9, 2006
MINUTES

Chairman Clements called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM in the Town Hall

Members present:  Clements, Barringer, Degen, Eliot, Lewis, and Wilson

Members absent:  Perkins

EARTH REMOVAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE - STORMWATER BY-LAW

The Board met with Earth Removal Advisory Committee (ERAC) Members Michael McElroy, Robert Hanninen and Edward Perkins to discuss the proposed Stormwater By-law. Mark Archambault of the Nashua River Watershed Association was present.

Chairman Clements, who is the Planning Board’s representative on ERAC, explained the proposed provisions that will replace the existing Erosion and Sediment Control By-law adopted in 1998. The change to the by-law is required by the Clean Water Act, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), Phase II requirements. The new by-law will provide oversight of Operation and Maintenance requirements. If the proposed by-law is adopted at the Annual Town Meeting, the ERAC will work with the Planning Board, Conservation Commission, and Board of Health on regulations to implement the by-law. Consistency in stormwater regulations will be an important part of the process.

Member Degen suggested that anything with a slope greater than 3-4% should trigger an application. He suggested adding a definition of the 100-year storm to the by-law. He also recommended that the exemptions section be changed to permit the addition of up to 500 cubic yards of soil material as part of normal landscaping. The ERAC agreed to consider the suggested changes.

Member Lewis said the word, “minimize” should be replaced in the purposes section. Planning Administrator Michelle Collette suggested replacing “minimize” with “prevent” in this section. The Board and ERAC agreed.

MILL RUN PLAZA UNIT 497E
(Member Wilson stepped down and did not participate.)

The Board received a memorandum dated February 3, 2006 from Building Commissioner Michael Tusino requesting the Board’s interpretation of Condition #3 on occupancy permits and its applicability to Unit 497E at Mill Run Plaza. Unit owners Roger and Lisa Goscombe were present.

Member Degen said when he made the motion to hold all temporary and final occupancy permits on January 26, 2006, he did not intend to include this unit because parking spaces had been allocated when the building permit was granted.

The motion was made by Lewis to recommend that the Building Inspector grant an occupancy permit for Mill Run Plaza Unit 497E, based upon the building permit issued on September 21, 2005. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

MILL RUN ENGINEERING SERVICES
(Member Wilson stepped down and did not participate.)

The Board received proposals from engineering firms Fay, Spoffard & Thorndike (FST), Horsley & Witten, and Woodard & Curran to evaluate the drainage problems associated with Mill Run Plaza.

Board members expressed a preference for FST because the work would be done in a timely manner by a professional hydrogeologist. FST is familiar with the site because it reviewed the traffic study, and FST’s proposal was the most complete.

The motion was made by Degen to hire FST to perform a hydorgeological analysis of the Mill Run Plaza drainage problems and impact on abutters at a cost not to exceed $6000. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.
PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS

Parking Requirements – The Board discussed the draft list of possible amendments to 218-23 Off-Street Parking including:

218-23B Add a new category for “take out restaurants” with one space for every 180 square feet of gross floor area, but not less than five parking spaces.

218-23C(1) Change on-street parking credit so it applies only on Main Street from the Pleasant Street intersection to the Lowell Road-Broadmeadow Road intersection. Reduce number of on-street spaces from ten to five.

218-23C(1) Add a new provision stating that access to dumpsters shall not be blocked by parking spaces.

218-23C(5) Backing. Parking areas with six or more spaces shall be so designed that no vehicle will be required to back into a public way to exit from a parking space.

Member Barringer suggested requiring more than one access point on a public way for parking lots with more than a certain (to be determined) number of parking spaces.

Site Plan Review – The Board reviewed the draft recommendations to the Site Plan Review by-law including:

Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>Up to 1000 SF or 5 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>1000 to 5000 SF or 6 to 40 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>5000 SF or 40 parking spaces or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review

Level I is by-right, administrative process. Levels II & III will require a special permit.

Plantings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>Five percent as required in today’s by-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>Ten percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>Fifteen percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drainage (Levels II & III)

“Site plans shall be designed to allow no net increase in the rate or volume of stormwater runoff from the two-, ten-, twenty-five or 100-year storm event across the boundaries of the site unless provisions have been made to tie into public storm drains with the approval of the appropriate authority. The Planning Board has determined that all reasonable provisions have been made to minimize any changes to runoff from the site. Compliance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations and guidelines including, but not limited to, the Department of Environmental Protection Stormwater Management Policy, as it may be amended, shall be demonstrated.

“Storm drains, culverts, swales, detention basins and related facilities shall be designed to permit the unimpeded flow of all natural watercourses, to ensure adequate drainage at all low points along streets, to control erosion and to intercept stormwater runoff along streets at intervals reasonably related to the extent and grade of the area being drained. The peak rate of runoff at the boundaries of the development shall not be increased from the predevelopment rate during the two-, ten-, twenty-five or one-hundred-year storm event, unless an increase is authorized by the Planning Board, following consultation with the Conservation Commission and consideration of the ability of receiving wetlands or water bodies to absorb the increase and the consequences of providing detention capacity.

“The United States Soil Conservation Service (USSCS) TR20 or TR55 Methodology, where applicable, shall
be used to determine no net increase in the off-site rate of runoff for detention and infiltration systems. Adequate physical access for maintenance purposes shall be provided to detention and infiltration facilities. Water velocities in pipes and paved gutters shall be between two and 10 feet per second and not more than five feet per second on unpaved surfaces.

“Soil logs must be submitted with the application for site plan approval. The testing should be done in accordance with Title Five, 310 CMR 15.00, for seasonal high ground water soil mottling and infiltration rates. The testing must be witnessed by the Town’s representative.”

Fees
All levels - Every application for site plan approval shall be accompanied by the fee specified in Chapter 340, Fees.

Levels II & III - The Planning Board shall be authorized to impose reasonable fees for the employment of outside consultants in accordance with the requirements and provisions of MGL c. 44, § 53G.

Submission Requirements

Level I – sketch plan prepared by owner showing requirements (as stated in the by-law).

Level II - plans prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer (as stated in today’s by-law) including:

1. Existing and proposed topography contour lines shall be delineated at two (2) foot intervals.

2. Traffic study, prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer, unless waived by the Planning Board.

3. A landscaping plan shall be prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect that shows the location of plantings around the perimeter of the building, any buffer landscaping between parcels, and landscaping of the parking area.

4. The Planning Board may, at its discretion, require the preparation and submission of a development impact report that may include, but not be limited to analysis of the impacts of the proposed project on the environment (i.e. wetlands, water resources, open space), and infrastructure and services (i.e. roadways, waste water, schools).

5. Locus map showing all land within 500 ft showing (from Lexington’s by-law):

- all dwellings and principal buildings
- the land use of each lot
- lot and right-of-way lines
- existing contours at two-foot intervals
- principal natural features in general
- zoning district boundaries
- recorded easements abutting the tract
- public facilities such as parks, recreation land, conservation land, bike paths, and streets
- The location and size of the Town’s existing water mains, fire hydrants, sanitary sewers, and storm drains.

Level III

- Mandatory traffic study
- Architectural elevations
• Scale model unless waived by the Board
• Environmental impact study

**Other**
Other considerations
*(The Board may need more time to discuss these issues with Dodson Associates as part of the Design Guidelines):*

• Floor area ratio
• Amount of Impervious surface
• Rear of building cannot face the public way
• Trucks cannot be parked to be used as advertising billboards

The Board will proceed with the most straightforward amendments at the 2006 Annual Town Meeting. The more complicated amendments will be discussed with Dodson Associates as part of the design Guidelines Project and presented at a later date.

**Water Resource Protection Districts** – The Board reviewed and approved the latest draft of the proposed amendment to the Water Resource Protection Districts.

**MILL RUN PLAZA SOIL LOGS**
*(Member Wilson left the meeting and did not participate.)*
The Board received a letter dated February 7, 2006 from Bowditch and Dewey indicating that Ryan Development would not do additional soil testing because the soil logs had already been submitted to the Planning Board.

The motion was made by Lewis to request that FST oversee the soil testing on public land in light of the applicant’s refusal to do so. *The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.*

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Collette
Planning Administrator