

Minutes Meeting of June 9, 2004 –Oak Ridge, Squannacook Hills, SVE

Members Present: Stuart Schulman, Shaun Sullivan(Oak Ridge), Chase Duffy, Mark Mulligan, Jay Prager, Cindy Maxwell

Chairman reconvened the Oak Ridge 40B hearing.

Atty. Deschenes was present as agent for the Oak Ridge hearing, noting that there are some major changes. He said that additional land has been obtained to move the entranceway southeasterly into Littleton. He said that the remainder of the project has not changed in any way. He noted that the northerly entrance piece is no longer being used and the house will not be razed. He said that they will have a 50 feet no disturb within the wetland and minimal disturbance within 100 feet of the wetland. He said that there might be a little grading and a bit of the 350-foot sidewalk in the actual buffer zone. He said that there will be no storm water runoff into the wetland and noted that relocation of the driveway also provides better site distance for the entrance/egress. He said that there is no need to use the land to the northwest now and noted that they have in excess of 500 ft. of site line to the north and will continue to have significant site line to the south. He noted that two major issues have been resolved and stressed that there are no other changes from what already has been presented.

Mrs. Duffy asked whether the C.on. Comm. is happy with the detention basins being in the buffer.

Atty. Deschenes said that he is not sure whether they are happy but noted that the Con. Comm. said that this is a much better plan.

Discussion ensued regarding the potential proximity to the discharge pond.

Sandy Brock, JNEI, said that she looked at her old comments and updated them. She said that the previous area was 28.866 and is now 28.855, with a little more land being in Littleton.

Atty. Deschenes said that the land is under binding contract.

Ms. Brock said that moving the roadway has eliminated two retaining walls by the entrance and noted that the grading is now steeper. She said that it is closer to 10% and that that is the maximum steepness allowed for a local road. She said that the ric-rac walls need addressing and noted that there is now more room for the retention basin. She said that the density of the site hasn't changed and noted that a sidewalk has been added, as well as a waiting area for the school bus. She said that trees have been shown, along with snow storage, etc. She said that she needs some more info re: drainage and stressed that the tss removal is important. She said that there is an outstanding resource area and that they need to look at deeper rainfall. She said that there is a four bay retention basin: water comes and has an opportunity to settle out before going into the main retention basin.

Discussion ensued regarding drainage and wetland issues. She said that they have more impervious coverage and thus there is more flow into the wetland. She said that this flow is slightly redirected and thus there are the retention basins, etc. She said that water will be there for some part of a week after a storm in the retention basin.

Discussion ensued regarding where to get drinking water and how to build the drive ie whether to Groton or Littleton specs.

Atty. Deschenes said that they are going in to see the Littleton PB re: the driveway.

Josh Degen, PB, thinks the applicant should go back to Mass Housing because the driveway is different.

Atty. Deschenes said that he has drafted a letter to Mass Housing.

Atty. Bobrowski asked whether he has spoken on the phone to MH.

Atty. Deschenes said that he has not.

Atty. Bobrowski said that Mass Housing will likely give MattBob another letter of approval.

Ms. Brock felt that it is a State curb cut permit that is required.

Mrs. Collette said that it is not a common drive but should be a subdivision road, as under ZBA purview. She also asked whether a curb cut application would trigger a MEPA review.

Atty. Deschenes said that he does not think so just for a curb cut.

Atty. Bobrowski said that the ZBA could request the highest road construction standards.

The Chairman said that he wants it to be as safe as possible.

Mr. Tierney said that he wants to keep the roadway within Groton road specs.

Ms. Brock said that the grading is close to but does not meet the subdivision regs., which require 3% for 30ft. She said that they have 4% for 50 ft. and have 44 units with a single access.

Mrs. Collette said that a lane up to 10 is the lowest under the regulations.

Atty. Bobrowski said that he wants evidence from the applicant that police and fire safety and responses can be coordinated across towns.

Ms. Brock said that these issues, along with septic issues, need to be addressed.

Discussion ensued regarding the amount of ledge. Mr. Field said that there are big nuggets but no solid ledge.

The Chairman noted appreciation of the fast service provided by JNEI but also expressed a little nervousness about this speed and the completeness of the review.

Mr. Degen asked whether the Littleton PB will review site lines.

The Chairman noted that he thinks this a good idea.

Atty. Deschenes said that they got this additional access because of Con. Comm. and site line issues, and said that he will provide this information to the Littleton PB.

Atty. Bobrowski said that he wants the Board to readvertised and noted that the applicant should represent. He said that the Board also needs to send to Littleton abutting towns for the PB.

Mr. Degen asked whether the 40b process should go through Littleton.

Atty. Bobrowski said that this is not necessary unless they ask for it.

Discussion ensued regarding how to notify the Littleton ZBA.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the grading of 10%.

Ms. Brock said that the grade goes from 4% to 10% and back to 4%. She described how to figure the scale and noted that this is the smallest roadway allowed under 10%.

Ms. McEvoy asked whether salt would need to be used for a steep road and thus would flow into the vernal pool.

Ms. Brock said that 10% is not that steep.

The Chairman said that he wants feedback from the Fire and Police Chiefs.

Mr. Degen said that the applicant said he would construct to subdivision standards that require an 8% maximum grade.

Atty. Deschenes said that they will not build the road to full subdivision standards. He said that they will meet private drive standards and will meet public safety standards for public or private

road requirements.

Atty. Bobrowski said that although not technically a subdivision, the road standards should be used. He said that that is a fair sampling of what to expect.

The Chairman noted the need for at least one more meeting.

Ms. McEvoy said that she wants a clear delineation with 707 1D. She said that there are 5 different subparcels and she wants to know who owns what.

Atty. Deschenes said that this is part of the public record. He said that they will have documentation that they own all parcels.

Ms. Lathrop asked how much time the Board needs to review plans.

Atty. Deschenes asked what the purpose of this question is other than to obstruct. He said that the Board can take all time it wants to review any plans.

Discussion ensued. Of note: the traffic plan will be submitted in advance.

Atty. Deschenes said that the 14-acre vernal pool delineated here is the biggest ever. He said that they have moved the roadway to get away from the vernal pool jurisdiction area.

Mr. Viera, Stonehedge Way, noted that there is a retention basin within 100 ft of the wetland area.

Ms. McEvoy said that it is her understanding that vernal pools and associated species are very important. She said that she believes that the water level in and out of the pool cannot be changed in any way.

Ms. Brock said that she disagrees with that.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the impact of heated water ie from runoff on very hot days.

Ms. Brock said that the runoff is treated several times before it reenters the vernal pool. She noted that the basins need regular maintenance.

Mr. Degen asked whether the Board will hold a hearing without a site eligibility letter.

Atty. Bobrowski said that the applicant has 60 days to cure and noted that the ZBA should not close the public hearing without a letter.

Mrs. Collette said that she wants an earth removal review.

Atty. Deschenes asked what more can they do related to earth removal.

Mrs. Collette said that wants a meeting with the applicant as courtesy call.

The hearing was continued to TUESDAY, July 13, 2004 at 8:00 pm. A motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously.

The Chairman reconvened the Squannacook Hills 40B hearing.

Atty. Deschenes said that traffic could not be discussed because there is a mistake in the traffic report. He said that the other plans what the board received at the last meeting.

The Chairman read the BOH and abutter letters into the record. Of note: Hooper wants a stockade fence and trees, and also runoff handled and police chief notification.

Sandy Brock, JNEI, said that she has a lot of questions regarding drainage. She said that there are 6.7 units per acre and noted the very steep grade. She said that the slope should go to 3% of 30 feet to meet subdivision regs. She said that part of the roadway is steeper than the allowed 10%. She noted 3 to 1 slopes going into the retention basins and stressed that there is no level area at the top. She questioned whether the access to the rear of the buildings is safe for fire protection. She noted that regarding the septic plan, having two bedrooms per unit on a very steep slope could be tricky. She said that the placement of vents is key because when the system is pushed, it can smell. She also noted that it is very tight for a fire truck turnaround and even for firefighters to access the rear of the building. She said that there is a 22-foot wide roadway with limited parking. She said there needs to be a definition of the buffer area. She noted that the existing 12-inch culvert could be replaced but said that she has other drainage questions. She said that further soil testing is needed, along with some infiltration issues. She stressed that this is a very dense development.

Wes Blair, abutter, noted a lot of problems on-site. He stressed that there is water on both sides of culvert much of the time. He said that septic system- water runs down hill and noted that there is a public drinking water supply across the street.

Ms. Brock said that because the site is so steep special grates, etc. are needed, as well as a stepped pressure dosed system. She said that although difficult and not straight-forward, it is doable.

Discussion ensued regarding the traffic analysis.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the site is located in a secondary water resource district. Of note: the site is located in zone 3 but water runs into zone 2, which is okay.

Of note: the Fire Chief needs to comment on this project.

Wes Blair asked what is happening to the row of trees at the rear of the site.

Ms. Brock said that she thinks the trees will stay.

Mr. Prager noted that at the site walk the applicant said they will stay.

Atty. Bobrowski said that no building permit issues until a landscaping plan has been provided, after the Comp. Perm. has been granted.

The hearing was continued to 7/21/04 at 8:00 pm. A motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously.

The SVE was reconvened so that a 5-member board could be present.

Rob Hitchcock, SVE, said that this permit is for the children's extended care center. He said that they are only here because of lack of the appropriate 50 feet setback on the three streets with frontage. He said that they are going through the PB site plan review process, having met with them x3 and with the neighbors at least twice. He said that they are trying to address their issues regarding traffic and screening. He said that they will be accessing through West St. and are limiting rear access to emergency vehicles so there will be no headlight traffic. He said that they have agreed to plant substantial evergreen buffers, reduce the light poles to 16ft from 21 ft. and to work a lighting schedule out to reduce any impact on abutters. He said that they are keeping and/or adding 90 trees. He said that there will be clearing to the property line and will have an additional storm water discharge plan. He said that this is all under PB review. He said that they are adding 11,000 sq. ft. to a 14,000 sq. ft. building. He said that there are currently 71 patient beds, no and no increase is slated for at least 3 years, when 12 beds will be added for a total of 83. He said that this project is being proposed because everything is not up to code and the residents cannot be displaced during construction because of the level of care. He said that once the new building is constructed, new residents and employees will be added. He said that education and care will improve for the residents.

The Board discussed Special Permit Issues. The only notable issue is sewer related to growth and will be dealt with when expanding. There is 19% impervious cover with the addition and 25% is allowed. Traffic flow is bettered because of the increased parking during shift changes and the creation of more off-street parking.

The Board moved to grant a special permit for an addition to allow the expansion of a non-conforming use with that condition that PB site plan review be included.

Of note: the expansion is occurring because there is not enough space. Additional programs are not being added, but space for programs already in existence is being increased. Currently there are

four to a room when there should be two, etc. There is a strict admittance program outlined by the State.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 pm.