

MEETING MINUTES
GEORGETOWN PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, September 12th, 2012
Memorial Town Hall – 3rd Floor
7:00p.m.

Present: Mr. Harry LaCortiglia; Ms. Tillie Evangelista; Mr. Bob Watts; Mr. Tim Howard (Arrived at 7:40); Mr. Howard Snyder, Town Planner.

Absent: Mr. Christopher Rich.

Meeting Opens at 7:09pm.

1 **Approval of Minutes:**

2 **1. Minutes of August 22th, 2012.**

3 Mr. Snyder- All comments received have been added to the minutes. You now have
4 updated copies in front of you. Please check any items you may be concerned about.

5

6 Mr. Watts Motion to accept the minutes of August 22nd, 2012.

7 Ms. Evangelista-Second.

8 Motion Carries: 3-0 Unam.

9

10 **Correspondence:**

11 **1. Letters:**

12 a) Town of Newbury: Site Plan Application on Newburyport Turnpike.

13 Mr. LaCortiglia- **I** see that we have a Site Plan application for town of Newburyport
14 does it affect any properties in Georgetown?

15

16 Mr. Snyder- No this site is close to the Route 1 railroad bridge near Newburyport so
17 it is pretty far away.

18

19 Mr. Watts- One question do we notified other towns of our changes?

20

21 Mr. LaCortiglia- By law we have to.

22

23 b) H.L Graham Associates: Site Plan Review of 38 East Main Street.

24

25 Mr. LaCortiglia- Lets hold off on this till the continued public hearing.

26

27 c) Official Town Map: Request for modification to add street.

28 Mr. LaCortiglia- Ok, let's go to the official town map and we have a communication
29 letter. Cynthia please come forward. {Cynthia Batman introduces herself. }

30

31 Mr. Snyder- Planning Board received a letter and some supporting documentation in
32 regards to Jewett Street from Cynthia Bateman of 67 Jewett Street. Her letter states a
33 concern of official town map from 1984 noted two streets and the recently adopted
34 town map did not show those two streets. On the 1984 map they are referred as Hazen

35 Court and Rogers Way. Her documents include copies of the Jewett Street alignment
36 and a 1974 quick claim deed and copies of the 1984 map. Also included are MIMAP
37 plans of the six properties noted in her letter. We can look at those during discussion.
38

39 Mr. LaCortiglia- Cynthia, without actually reading your letter as I believe all have
40 read it, the roads you are talking about were shown in some form on the 1984 map.
41

42 Mrs. Bateman- Yes.
43

44 Mr. LaCortiglia- At this point we are not showing it on the new version of the
45 official town map which was accepted at the last town meeting. Mr. Snyder can
46 explain a little bit more as he has had communication with the Merrimack Valley
47 Planning Commission and they are the ones who do all the mapping for the town.
48

49 Mr. Snyder- In summary, the official town map dated 1984 was a documents given
50 to MVPC when they started digitizing all the different assessors maps. What they
51 received was plainmetric survey plans from 1968 and 1999. The work I am still
52 doing is to find out if there are any records in our office about how the digitization
53 worked and when the official town map was brought over and if there is any
54 description about what was excluded as things were updated.
55

56 Mrs. Bateman- When Merrimack Valley originally did digitize the maps, what they
57 did was take plans in the assessor's office which originated in 1965 and they were
58 updated annually from 1965. I would assume that Hazen Court and Rogers Way
59 were just on their maps when they were first digitized.
60

61 Mr. LaCortiglia- I have a copy of those 1965 maps.
62

63 Mrs. Bateman- They are also on microfilm and from then it was reproduced annually
64 until it was digitized.
65

66 Mr. LaCortiglia- Does anyone know when they were first digitized?
67

68 Mr. Snyder- In 1999, this is when they started.
69

70 Mr. LaCortiglia- The maps were then updated annually,
71

72 Mrs. Bateman- Yes and what they used is the set of plans which are in the basement
73 if you wanted to go back.
74

75 Ms. Evangelista- I think one of the old ones. I believe that Cynthia was assessor at
76 the time.
77

78 Mrs. Bateman- Yes. I had nothing to do with the official town map. I did call Larry
79 Ogden to see if he could shed any light on the matter. He said it wasn't something
80 that they even discussed. He did say that some of the roadways were left off of it that
81 shouldn't have been.
82

83 Mr. LaCortiglia- We know there were a number of errors.
84
85 Mrs. Bateman – I thought it was just was an oversight.
86
87 Ms. Evangelista- Why is this an issue right now?
88
89 Mrs. Bateman- Why it is an issue is because if you had gotten an official town map,
90 everything should be on it right? And there are six dwellings in town that don't show
91 that they are on any street because the street isn't there.
92
93 Ms. Evangelista- Will you gain anything by making it Jewett Street?
94
95 Mrs. Bateman- I don't care what you call it. I just want to see an official town road.
96 All of the deeds are Jewett Street nothing pertaining to Hazen Court.
97
98 Ms. Evangelista- Do you think that's the reason why they didn't put it on the map?
99
100 Mr. Snyder- I think that the reason Hazen Court and Rogers Way were not put on the
101 official town map is because those names never approved at town meeting. It is still
102 Jewett Street but it needs to be decided as to what happened when the highway went
103 that caused the alignment to change. What happened after the highway was put in –
104 was the land given up by the county or was it given up by the town? Any attempt to
105 regain it? I think it will be found that it is still a Town accepted street.
106
107 Mrs. Bateman- Jewett Street is on both sides of the highway.
108
109 Mr. LaCortiglia- I wish we had a picture so that people can see what's going on.
110
111 Ms. Evangelista - I think we would have to find out about accepted streets.
112
113 Mr. Snyder- What happened to that section of Jewett Street after the highway was
114 constructed?
115
116 Mr. LaCortiglia- Then the highway was widened.
117
118 Mrs. Bateman – Correct, in 1951 and 1972.
119
120 Ms. Evangelista- Can you present the documents to show that it was done?
121
122 Mrs. Bateman- I was in the assessor's office today and Rose has a big rollout of the
123 highway. If you want more you could go to the DPW as they would have to have all
124 the information regarding the highway.
125
126 Mr. LaCortiglia- The problem is that there is another section of Jewett Street
127 intersecting Jewett Street.
128
129 Mr. Snyder- All are in agreement that Jewett Street was split, it is what happened
130 after that requires clarification so that the proof would be there. We are all in

131 agreement that Hazen Court and Rogers Way are not accepted street names. We
132 would need to have a meeting to rename it or to determine if it is legally able to still
133 be called Jewett Street and that way it could be put on the official town map.
134
135 Mr. Watts- What is the core question?
136
137 Mr. LaCortiglia- We know it used to be Jewett Street. What happened after that?
138 Did state DOT highway take that land and thereby causing it to be state land?
139
140 Mrs. Bateman- No, they didn't do anything. All they did was take the land for the
141 highway and the other side was left the way it was.
142
143 Mr. LaCortiglia- The other side is county land.
144
145 Mr. LaCortiglia- Was the county layout changed?
146
147 Mrs. Bateman- Yes.
148
149 Mr. LaCortiglia- We've discovered a third error on the town map. I hope you can
150 offer us some time to find the documents for this?
151
152 Mrs. Bateman- I think you will need to go to the state for the documentation.
153
154 Ms. Evangelista- When you purchased your land for your house, did you buy it from
155 Mr. Hazen?
156
157 Mrs. Bateman- My son bought it from Mr. Hazen.
158
159 Ms. Evangelista- They either called themselves a road or a lane. They didn't call
160 them courts.
161
162 Mr. LaCortiglia- Fascinating, both historically and legally.
163
164 Mr. Watts- It is very interesting.
165
166 Mr. LaCortiglia- We need to know how to represent these sections on the town map.
167 I know that you asked to be out on the October meeting.
168
169 Mrs. Bateman – Yes, if you have sufficient information. What brought this situation
170 to my attention is my grandson who is interested in building a house.
171
172 Mr. LaCortiglia- Is that a M.G.L. Chapter 61 parcel?
173
174 Mrs. Bateman- Yes it would be.
175
176 Mr. Snyder- Either an ANR or subdivision would be the same process of
177 determining the character of that way. If still county road you would need to get a
178 curb cut in order for driveway access onto a county road.

179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226

Mrs. Bateman- We just have had a driveway as of 22 years ago.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Thank you very much. Mr. Snyder will be in touch with you.

2. Vouchers:

a) **BSC Group: Harmony Lane Site Inspection.**

Mr. Snyder- Invoice for site inspection of Harmony Lane by BSC Group from June 13 and June 20^{III}.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Any questions? What is the status of the M account?

Mr. Snyder- There is ample money to pay this bill but it will put it below the \$2000 limit. A letter will be sent requesting an additional deposit of funds.

{Mr. Howard arrived at 7:40PM. }

Mr. Watts- **Motion** to pay the voucher for BSC Group in the amount of \$512.

Ms. Evangelista - Second.

Motion Carries: 3- 0 Unam. (One abstention).

Old Business:

1. Site Plan Approval: Bank of America- Public Hearing continued.

{Mr. Abella, of Gensler and Mr. Pontoon with Stonefield Engineering introduce themselves}.

Mr. Snyder- Mr. Abella, and Mr. Pontoon have come back to continue the public hearing for 38 East Main Street.

Mr. LaCortiglia- The public hearing is continued from August 8^{III}.

Mr. Snyder – The technical review engineer issued a report regarding review of the applicant's submittal. I suggest that we go through the report, item by item, as an outline to the applicant's testimony tonight.

Mr. LaCortiglia- The records will show that Larry Graham did the review that was requested by the board at the last meeting and we have that review dated September 6th, 2012.

Mr. Ponton- We did receive the review letter from Larry Graham and also fire department comments. Intention of the project and the bank's goal is to bring this site up to ADA compliance. Let me start with the fire department letter.

Mr. Snyder- The letter from the fire department was supplied August 8^{III}.

Mr. Ponton- Two minor items; they would like a box with access keys on site on the outside of the building and they have also asked for a code for the master box so that it goes straight to the Fire Department.

227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273

Mr. LaCortiglia- Sounds like a no-brainer.

Mr. Ponton- Absolutely. Yes, the bank has decided to do those. The letter from Mr. Graham has a number of observations. Item BI requires site plan approval.

Mr. Snyder- The report notes the proposed building addition might trigger site plan review. I believe that it will not as the addition is under 500 square feet. Do you agree with that?

Mr. Ponton- Yes. Item E(l)(a) states sheets they are on which is C1 and C4- no discussion required.

{Item}E(l)(d). Noted and accepted.

{Item}E.(l)(e) Wetlands, Buffer Zones, Floodplain Locations- Not applicable to this application-requires no discussion.

{Item}E.(l)(f) Easements- Site plan makes no reference to any easements. However, we note that the fence perhaps belonging to the schoolhouse encroaches on the banks property. It might be appropriate for the bank to grant a temporary use easement. This item is open for discussion but the bank at this time is not prepared to grant any easement for the fence to the property owner.

Ms. Evangelista - Do you have that in writing?

Mr. Ponton- I do not have that in writing.

Ms. Evangelista- I think we should have this on file, on paper in case.

Mr. Ponton- Yes, we can issue something from the bank. Item E.(!)(g) Building and Impervious Area Coverage. A Table of Lane Use and Zoning found on Sheet C4 shows existing and proposed building and impervious area coverage. The existing combined coverage of building and impervious area is 18,845 square feet. The proposed combined area coverage is 18,403 square feet; a 442 square foot (20/0±) reduction. These figures differ from the 6/06/2012 Engineer's Statement by Stonefield suggesting a 5% reduction. Mr. Graham notes a discrepancy from one of our reports and he is correct and on our latest plans that has been corrected – overall reduction of 3.7% at present.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Now we are matching.

Mr. Ponton- What we did was we updated our plans based on our discussion since Mr. Graham submitted his letter. Any decisions made will be implemented.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Then you will be revising the documents?

274 Mr. Ponton- Yes. There will be a final revision implementing anything from this
275 letter that we decide on tonight.

276 {Item}E(1)(h) Streets- Found on Sheets C1-C5. Now depicted as
277 requested.

278
279 {Item}E.(1)(i) Lot Lines- Found on Sheets C2-C5. Although not
280 required under this section nor any other section of the Bylaw, it would be
281 perhaps helpful to the Board to have abutters names (at least last names) shown
282 on the Site Plan for all immediately abutting properties. We agree and will add
283 that to the next revision.

284
285 {Item}E(1)G) Zoning Lines- The property is located in the RA-
286 Central Residential District as are all abutting properties. Noted.

287
288 {Item}E.(1)(k) Existing and Proposed Contour Lines- Sheet C5,
289 Grading Plan, shows existing and proposed contours and spot grades. We have
290 recommended some revisions to proposed grading which will be found elsewhere
291 in this report. We will get to this later on.

292
293 {Item}E.(1)(!)Landscape Plan- Sheet C4 shows proposed plantings
294 (some 41 each junipers) and L. The Planning Board should determine if this sole
295 area of plantings is adequate. We note on Sheet C6 a call-out for several trees
296 located between the curb and sidewalk, these are town trees, to be pruned from
297 the ground up 8'. The Highway Department should approve this. Importantly,
298 who is to perform and maintain this pruning effort? Notes 6 on Sheet C4 relate to
299 existing plantings is not correct and should be revised. I had a lengthy discussion
300 with Mr. Graham about this.

301
302 Mr. LaCortiglia- When I drove by there this evening I only saw one tree.

303
304 Mr. Ponton- The bank is willing to maintain that tree and make sure that the site
305 distance is clear.

306
307 Mr. Snyder- I can coordinate between the highway and the applicant.

308
309 Mr. LaCortiglia- Now you will be revising sheet C4?

310
311 Mr. Ponton- We will revise the note to state who will maintain that.
312 {Item}(1)(m) Utilities- Notes 7 on Sheet C4 and other plan sheets do not
313 indicate or propose the need for changes to water, electrical or communication
314 services. The existing septic system is not shown on the plan but is probably
315 associated with the two manholes easterly of the bank building. The Board of
316 Health should review the proposed Site Plan work and report back to the Planning
317 Board since changes to the existing cover over the apparent system location are
318 proposed. The Site Plan, on Sheets C1 and C4 request a waiver from strict
319 compliance with this requirement.

320
321 Mr. LaCortiglia- We already asked for it correct?

322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369

Mr. Ponton- We contacted the health department and they have no record as to where the septic is on site. We have a gut feeling as to where it is based on our experience. We can propose ground radar to find it and to ensure that septic system is safe. It is an existing facility with no proposed increase to the septic use.

Mr. LaCortiglia-Do you have a drawing?

Mr. Ponton-Not at this time.

Ms. Evangelista- What did the Board of Health recommend for you to do? Are they going to inspect it?

Mr. Ponton- We can ask them to do that.

Mr. Snyder-I spoke to the applicant about this and we both thought that the ground penetrating radar is good idea. When determined, the information can be given to David Varga to be documented and returned to the Board of Health so they have on record where the septic is.

Mr. LaCortiglia-Ifthey can't show it would we have to have a waiver? What if the waiver is not granted? You need to show it first.

Mr. Ponton-I think we are also requesting waivers for the other utilities. This is something that will be done.

Ms. Evangelista - Don't want to waive it. It is hard for me to fathom that there are no records of it.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Great deal of concern is we don't know if there is cross flow between the dry well and that is a concern to me.

Mr. Snyder- We can find a resolution? Can you do the ground penetrating radar sooner rather than later?

Mr. Ponton-Sure.

Mr. LaCortiglia-According to Larry it states the Board of Health get something in writing back from them stating what they think. To review it as is as we don't know the location.

Ms. Evangelista- How far down in the ground does the radar go?

Mr. Ponton- 12 to 13 feet.

Ms. Evangelista- Ifthere is a tank there will you see the bottom and top?

Mr. Ponton- Will see the top of it.

370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417

Ms. Evangelista-My concern is that it is right next to a childcare. Hope they are not all tied together.

Mr. Watts-Does the bank ever have it pumped out?

Mr. Ponton-I lifted the cover and smelled enough to see that they are definitely related to the septic.

Mr. LaCortiglia- If there was any pumping I am sure that the Board of Health would have that on record.

Mr. Snyder-The Board of Health should review and report back.

Mr. LaCortiglia-The requested waiver will be on the front page right? Are you requesting septic only or for the remaining utilities?

Mr. Ponton-That has not been decided yet. Item E(l)(m,n,o) Drainage and subsurface conditions. The dry well does not pipe in or out, it is a dead end system.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Can we see the plans that show the specifications as Larry is looking for this information?

Mr. Ponton-I spoke with Larry. We would be happy to do so. The goal is to collect water to infiltrate into the ground and reduce the amount of site runoff.

Mr. Snyder-I would suggest that as we go through this report, the issues being raised and the responses made be written into a response letter.

Mr. Ponton- Yes, we will formally respond.

Mr. LaCortiglia-Larry is asking to be on site when you access the structure.

Mr. Ponton-Sure. I would love to meet him. Next item is the surface drainage. From the high point of the drive-thru Jane runs off northwesterly and onto the abutter's property (Parcel 11A-118). The building on this property appears to be in a state of neglect and disrepair. In fact a cellar window in this structure is missing and the site drainage is running toward if not into this window and northerly along the base of the cellar wall. This of course is a very undesirable condition. To correct this condition we recommend two courses of action. The first would be to lift the pavement along the northwesterly edge to force water to the aforementioned drywell. A lift of up to 3" to 6" may be needed. Secondly, we recommend a bituminous berm/curb be extended from the northerly end of the existing concrete curb (not shown on the plan) to the northwesterly corner of the paved parking area to meet with the westerly end of the existing asphalt curb. This will correct drainage running onto the adjacent property.

418 Mr. LaCortiglia- Could you show me where Larry is talking about?
419
420 Mr. Ponton- Yes, here it is. It is a request to continue the curb to the rear. We
421 agreed to set the curb from here to here since the dry well has an overflow that
422 would then send it the rear.
423
424 Mr. Snyder- Then that would be documented on the drawings as well.
425
426 Mr. Ponton- Drainage along the easterly side of the property is not problematic
427 as that property is bermed up slightly above the pavements edge keeping the
428 bank's runoff on-site. However, as runoff approaches the drywell the existing
429 pavement grades allow it to bypass the drywell grate to the east. Accordingly, we
430 recommend the dry well grate be reset (3"-6" lower) and the pavement grades be
431 reworked to correct this bypass and direct all surface drainage to the grate. We
432 will respond and make sure we do all that Larry wants to see.
433
434 Ms. Evangelista- Does that go for all these things?
435
436 Mr. Ponton- Yes, for the whole letter. The 06/06/2012 Engineer's Statement by
437 Stonefield includes pre- and post- improvement calculations for both peak
438 discharge and total volume. As expected with a decrease in impervious surface
439 coverage, post conditions are less than existing conditions for both calculations.
440 These calculations will change, however, with the increase in contributing area.
441 Assuming the Board concurs with our recommended changes, the calculations
442 should be resubmitted for the record with the new contributing areas. These small
443 additions to the contributing drainage areas also underline the importance of a
444 complete assessment of the dry well.
445
446 {Item}E(1)(o) Buildings, Dumpsters, etc.- During our site visit we noted
447 a small dumpster off in the northwesterly portion of the paved parking area. A
448 concrete pad for this unit is recommended. Also, if it is the type of unit open to
449 the weather, either a closed unit is recommended or a fenced enclosure to
450 minimize paper/trash blow out. There is a 1-1/2 ton handcart on site – Larry wants
451 dumpster in an enclosed area- we will request the bank to locate it closer to the
452 building.
453
454 Mr. LaCortiglia- Yes. Enclosed and locked so kids can't play around it.
455
456 Mr. Snyder- How often is it picked up?
457
458 Mr. Ponton- Once a week pick up.
459
460 Mr. LaCortiglia- Larry is recommending a concrete pad.
461
462 Mr. Ponton- No issue with a concrete pad and we can enclose it with fencing.
463 The existing and proposed building addition is shown on the appropriate sheets.
464 Next item is E(1)(p) Architectural- Elevation views, facade treatment,
465 renderings, etc. are shown on Sheet A09.00. The Board should review this sheet

466 and the details thereon for acceptance/approval.
467
468 Mr. LaCortiglia-Has this been revised A09.00?
469
470 Mr. Abella- Yes, the elevations were revised. We can look at this later.
471
472 Ms. Evangelista- Do we have that sheet A09.00?
473
474 Mr. Abella- We should probably state that recommendations from the Board
475 from the last meeting that we decided to address some of the changes prior to
476 Larry's recommendations. Those other changes are coming with the addition of
477 today's outcome.
478
479 Mr. Ponton-From last meeting, changes were made on windows and other items.
480
481 Mr. LaCortiglia-Ok. Are we will be able to look at that tonight?
482
483 Mr. Ponton- Yes. Item E(l)(q) Parking, etc. – Sheet C4 provides a Parking
484 Requirements table which indicates a and (s) requirement for 18 spaces. The plan
485 details 19 spaces which includes a van and K. accessible handicapped space.
486 There is no specified loading space nor is one needed. The plans indicate a
487 striped turnaround area between parking spaces 5 and 6. We suggest that a more
488 appropriate position for this turnaround space would be where parking space 4 is
489 now shown. This would shorten the back-up distance for someone stopped at or
490 near the beginning of the drive-thru lane who needs to reverse direction.
491 Definitely good comment with Larry in regards to placement.
492
493 {Item}E.(l)(r) Zoning and Setbacks- The Table of Land Use and
494 Zoning on Sheet C4 clearly shows as does the plan, that all minimal zoning and
495 setback requirements are clearly met save the existing non-conforming fi-ont
496 setback of 11.1'. The Site Plan, Sheet C1 requests or variance for this existing
497 non-conforming condition. Existed not-confirming situation. We will request to
498 intensify the existing non-conformity.
499
500 Mr. Snyder- You have been to the zoning board and clarified two things with
501 approval; use and setback?
502
503 Mr. Abella- We have been to the Zoning Board and it has been approved.
504
505 Mr. Snyder- I believe that had been distributed to the board.
506
507 Mr. Ponton-E(l)(t) Fire Lane- The Fire Department should confirm the
508 Applicant's contention that the existing/proposed drive aisles are of adequate
509 width and geometrically configured to permit fire equipment access. The Site
510 Plan, Sheets C1 and C4 request a waiver for this specific requirement. As
511 previously stated we went thru the fire letter.
512
513 Ms. Evangelista - We are getting a letter from the fire department or do we have it

514 already?
515
516 Mr. Ponton- We already have it and we will comply with all requested.
517
518 Mr. Snyder- My concern is the fire department has reviewed the first submittal
519 and would you say that nothing has changed?
520
521 Mr. Ponton- Nothing has changes geometrically. The only thing is that we want
522 to add is the striping.
523
524 Mr. Snyder- So, the fire department does not state any concern about width in
525 the letter. Will the board accept the fire department letter as completion of the
526 review?
527
528 Mr. LaCortiglia- No geometric .change. Can't see why the fire department will
529 care about the paint on the ground.
530
531 Ms. Evangelista- It says "adequate width," so it is width as well as the geometric.
532
533 Mr. LaCortiglia- Get a letter confirming that it is of adequate width.
534
535 Mr. Snyder- I will coordinate with the fire department and get this information in
536 writing for submittal at the next Planning Board meeting.
537
538 Mr. Ponton- E.(l)(u) Site Amenities. The site plan proposes as site amenities to
539 remove the existing stone landscape wall and reconstruct a wall or
540 "landscape strip" between the walkway and easterly exit drive. If a wall, it will
541 be very low and more like a curbed strip. No special paving or surface treatments
542 are depicted. The plan calls for the existing masonry steps and railing between
543 the curb and sidewalk to be replaced with concrete steps and railing. A similar
544 replacement is called for at the left rear of the building. Of course the focus of
545 this site improvement being to add ADA compliant access to the bank is an/the
546 main amenity itself.
547
548 {Item}As to fencing, we do recommend consideration at the banks option
549 of a fence behind the recommended curb discussed in E(l)(m) & (n) and O.
550 above. This fence would screen the currently unkempt side of the building on
551 Parcel IIA-118 from view by the banks customers.
552
553 Mr. LaCortiglia- That would be the left hand side?
554
555 Mr. Ponton- Right. As opposed to the bank put up a fence to block the unkempt
556 property. The bank may make a request that the town force the neighbors to cut
557 the growth back. I could recommend to the bank to see if they want to put a fence
558 up.
559
560 Mr. Snyder- The bank could also offer to maintain any growth on their property.
561

610 block, right hand side of sheet. These minor edits should be made.

611

612 {Item}E.(l)(y) Sight Distance- Sheet C6 shows sight distances to both
613 both exits to the center of East Main Street. The plan sheet shows sight distances
614 of 200' which is adequate (per AASHTO policy) for the 25 mph posted speed
615 limit on East Main Street (both directions). As previously discussed who will
616 prune and maintain the trees necessary to assure no vegetative obstructions these
617 sight distances.

618

619 {Item}What eye height and object height were these distances based on?
620 3 Y. feet. Sight distances from both exits looking easterly can be impacted by the
621 15 minute parking allowed in front of Nos. 38 and 42 East Main Street. Is there
622 any proposal to change this permitted activity? No.

623

624 Mr. Snyder- At the first hearing a member of the traffic committee stated that the
625 bank lobby for it to go from two hour parking to 15 minutes.

626

627 Mr. Ponton- There will be no lobbying from the bank for this issue to change.

628

629 {Item}Sight distance from the westerly most exit looking westerly can be
630 impacted by the 2 hour (8 AM- 6 PM) parking allowed along the curb line to the
631 west. Is there any proposal to change this permitted activity?

632

633 {Item}The 10' setback from curb line to eye position is appropriate. The
634 Board should note, however, that the vehicle will be blocking the sidewalk. This
635 is unavoidable. Important, however, is the signage that now exists at the easterly
636 exit cautioning exiting traffic to stop for pedestrians as they approach the
637 sidewalk. This signage should be placed at both exits of the reconfigured site. We
638 have no concerns regarding safety.

639

640 Ms. Evangelista - Maybe we should have no parking in the front?

641

642 Mr. Ponton- This is outside our jurisdiction.

643

644 Ms. Evangelista - We could recommend this to the Board of Selectmen.

645

646 Mr. LaCortiglia- We could. Can we have a site view with vehicles and without?

647

648 Mr. Ponton- I do not think it is an unsafe condition. I would suggest that we let
649 Larry make a final decision on it.

650

651 Mr. Watts- I agree with you.

652

653 Ms. Evangelista - I think that seeing he put it down that there is something to it.

654

655 Mr. Ponton – Larry did state that a lot of these were observations and he really
656 only had two or three major concerns.

657

658 Mr. Snyder- I understand what you are saying Ms. Evangelista. Would you like
659 the Planning Board to make the recommendation to change the parking?
660

661 Ms. Evangelista- Yes, I would say that. Maybe having no parking in front is a
662 better way to go.
663

664 Mr. LaCortiglia- Maybe we should refer to the traffic committee.
665

666 Ms. Evangelista - There is no Traffic Committee.
667

668 Mr. Snyder- The applicant is not proposing any change. So to make the change,
669 it has to come from another place. This should not hold up the changes and
670 reviews of this application.
671

672 Ms. Evangelista - I guess you would have to ask the police if there was an issue
673 with the parking.
674

675 Mr. Ponton- Next item. E(l)(z) Waivers- Three waivers (3 on Sheet C4 and 7
676 on Sheet C1) are listed. The two and S. tables showing the listed waivers should
677 be revised and coordinated to agree. We have no issue with the plan scale waiver
678 request. We have commented herein on the utilities and fire lane waiver
679 requests. We have no comment on the requested lighting waiver requests.
680

681 {Item} Exterior Lighting – We have not reviewed the proposed exterior
682 lighting or the requested waivers associated therewith. This is not an area of
683 our expertise and recommends the Board solicit a review from a lighting
684 consultant if required.
685

686 Mr. LaCortiglia- Perhaps we could have a rendering to show the lighting?
687

688 Mr. Ponton- There is a lighting plan. This would show light levels at all levels of
689 the drawing to meet national safety requirements. There is no negative impact to
690 adjacent properties. It would require a waiver for the Georgetown by-laws.
691

692 Mr. Snyder- This was addressed at last meeting. As I recall, the idea was that the
693 waiver would be granted as it was a safety concern.
694

695 Mr. LaCortiglia- We will deal with that at the final meeting.
696

697 Ms. Evangelista - That could be a condition that no lights shine on nearby
698 buildings.
699

700 Mr. Ponton- Miscellaneous items in the review report. As previously mentioned"
701 an existing concrete curb along the westerly side of the westerly exit drive should
702 be shown.
703

704 {Item} The wooded area to the rear of the site should be left undistributed
705 except for general clean-up of unnatural dumped/accumulated debris. We will
clean that and have put in a request to have that area cleaned up.

706
707 · {Item}The location of the septic components should be shown. It will be
708 difficult to remove or mill certain areas of the existing pavement as shown.
709 Probably better to remove all shown to be milled. Also there will be areas where
710 removal is expanded and additional overlay is needed based on our comments
711 herein. See Sheet C3. We came to a common understanding on that as well.
712
713 {Item}The Site Legend indicates a different symbol than the plan for
714 existing fence. We matched those up per his request.
715
716 {Item}In the Parking Requirements table on Sheet C4, the required two-
717 way aisle width is 24' not 22' in accordance with §165-83(K)(2). This is stated
718 two times in the ordinance, we exceed the 24.
719
720 Mr. LaCortiglia- Another good reason not to have a fence. How is snow removal
721 handled for this site?
722
723 Mr. Ponton- Comes into this corner. Snow storage is here.
724 {Item}We note for the Board's information that Section §165-94 Pre-
725 existing Nonconforming Structures or Uses, might apply to this application
726 requiring a Special Permit from the ZBA, as the building (front setback) and use
727 (bank) are non-conforming and are proposed to be altered.
728 {Item}Looking to replace the steps as they are today- came up with
729 different items – it is outside the scope of the application- we designed – sites
730 where we changed patterns there is a lot of trips and falls and law suits as well-
731 another thing it will do - there is a fence and columns some new and some old.
732 Lowering the sidewalk would eliminate the granite columns- 3 steps and the
733 sidewalk- the other side is one step up to the bank.
734
735 Mr. LaCortiglia- A two inch step up?
736
737 Mr. Watts- It looks like it is millstone.
738
739 Mr. LaCortiglia- This one is buried in the sidewalk.
740
741 Mr. Ponton- We would eliminate the steps and then when leaving the bank
742 would have to walk down 4 -5 steps. The grade increase does meet code. The
743 bank based on safety want to replace the steps, if the board strongly suggests
744 making this improvement, I would have to state that I strongly disagree. I do
745 agree that the two inch lip is to be eliminated.
746
747 Mr. Watts- The steps into the bank are uneven- when I was a customer I didn't
748 like to go inside – not good handrails.
749
750 Mr. Ponton- Let me show you the proposal for the front steps.
751
752 Mr. LaCortiglia- Concern this is an ADA upgrade and it looks to me that it might
753 not meet ADA compliance.

754
755 Mr. Ponton- It is compliant.
756
757 Mr. LaCortiglia- I would hope that you could bring it flat; an ADA
758 improvement.
759
760 Mr. Ponton- Who had jurisdiction over the road? Is it the state?
761
762 Mr. Snyder- State -town plows ~~it~~-sidewalk in the town right of way.
763
764 Mr. Ponton- The steps and the sidewalk are not on the banks property.
765
766 Mr. Snyder- If you mill the back you could mill the front too.
767
768 Ms. Evangelista- What are you replacing it with?
769
770 Mr. Ponton- Masonry work with new handrails.
771
772 Mr. LaCortiglia- Can we give them some guidance?
773
774 Ms. Evangelista- Does the state come by and look at it?
775
776 Mr. Ponton- There is no state review.
777
778 Mr. Snyder- The onus is on the designers to meet the code.
779
780 Mr. Howard - The building department will review.
781
782 Mr. Abella- From previous drawings – two windows in front and in back -keep
783 the same vocabulary same look. We kept the front the same but added a 3'd
784 window and sidelights more of a visual enlarged back windows for more light- at
785 night the door would be closed. Second door is locked- created more lights at
786 the new addition keeping the same vocabulary.
787 Mr. Watts - My question was visibility from the street - if someone is in this
788 space here they will not be able to be seen although it is a little safer now.
789
790 Mr. LaCortiglia- Yes it is a little better.
791
792 Ms. Evangelista - What is along the base?
793
794 Mr. Ponton- The stone wall.
795
796 Mr. Abella- Reuse the wall with the same height; mimics the same look
797
798 Mr. Watts - I like the style.
799
800 Mr. Snyder- I think that adding the window meets what the board requested.

801 Engineering standpoint is going to be sent back to the board. It will be up to the
802 board to approve Larry's submission. It is up to the Board to accept the final
803 review with Larry's response.

804
805 Mr. LaCortiglia- We will need time for Larry to respond.

806
807 Mr. Ponton- See you at the next meeting.

808
809 Mr. LaCortiglia- October 10^{ll}? Oct 24 would give you plenty of time.

810
811 Mr. Ponton- Would the board vote with the condition on Larry's approval?

812
813 Mr. LaCortiglia- No.

814
815 Mr. Ponton- The bank is currently scheduling completions.

816
817 Mr. LaCortiglia- Do you want to withdraw?

818
819 Mr. Ponton- Trying to get it on the schedule sooner than later.

820
821 Mr. LaCortiglia- You need to coordinate with Larry and get the results back.

822
823 Mr. Snyder- I think if you come back with all done on the 10^{lll} you will get an
824 agreement as to what the board will decide.

825
826 Mr. Howard – That is assuming that Larry has reviewed it.

827
828 Mr. Snyder- To get that all compressed in two weeks?

829
830 Mr. Ponton- We will shoot for October 10^{lll}.

831
832 Ms. Evangelista- Ask for an extension if you don't meet the timeline.

833
834 Mr. Snyder- We can ask them to apply for an extension if necessary.

835
836 Mr. LaCortiglia -Can you get everything together by the 10^{lll}?

837
838 Mr. Ponton- Can we shoot for the 10^h?

839
840 Mr. Watts- **Motion** to continue the hearing until October 10^{lll}, 2012

841 Mr. Howard- **Second.**

842 **Motion carries: 4-0; Unam..**

843
844 **Planning Office:**

845 1. **Letter to Board of Selectmen.**

846 Mr. Snyder - Purpose of draft letter to get selectmen to funnel all land use thru the
847 planning office for single source coordination- to avoid errors.

848

849 Mr. Watts - Single point of contact more efficient.
850
851 Mr. LaCortiglia- Is everyone happy with the Sept. 12¹_h version of the letter?
852
853 Mr. Snyder- What may happen is they request my presence to explain about it more.
854
855 Mr. LaCortiglia-Should there be any additions or subtractions from it?
856
857 Mr. Watts- I don't know how much is not enough or too much. I do think this is
858 good.
859
860 Mr. Snyder- Can describe in great detail as they request it. Just to show that we
861 have identified a problem.
862
863 Mr. Watts- A solution is a beautiful thing.
864
865 Ms. Evangelista - It seems like a lot of paragraphs.
866
867 Mr. LaCortiglia-I think there is enough.
868
869 Mr. Watts - **Motion** for chairman to sign draft letter to Board of Selectman.
870 Ms. Evangelista-**Second**.
871 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam..**
872
873 **2. M-Accounts:**
874 Mr. LaCortiglia-#26491 -Lot 77 Thurlow. Can you walk us thru it Howard?
875
876 Mr. Snyder- Certificate of vote for the Board to release escrow funds-developer
877 previously requested a Form J be signed and it has been by the board-he has written
878 a formal request for release of the remaining funds. That amount is \$1,107.19.
879
880 Mr. Howard-Motion to release theM account in amount \$1,107.19 plus any
881 interest accrued.
882 Mr. Watts-**Second**.
883 **Motion Carries: 4-0; Unam..**
884
885 **3. Planner On-Line and Pictometry Update.**
886 Mr. Snyder - You received this in your packet and will send you user information
887 and password. It is a little racier version that Google earth- same interface.
888
889 Mr. LaCortiglia-Can you take classes and there is an online guide?
890
891 Mr. Watts- Is this only available to the plauning board?
892
893 Mr. Snyder- The Planning Board paid the fee and is relative to all the land use
894 offices.
895
896 Mr. Watts- Do we or will we have visibility of this at home?

897
898 Ms. Evangelista - You can do it at home.
899
900 Mr. Snyder- Georgetown elected to pay for it this year.
901
902 Ms. Evangelista - It is phenomenal.
903
904 Mr. LaCortiglia- When you use it remotely is the parcel layover there?
905
906 Mr. Snyder- Just like MIMAP. It does have better clarity.
907
908 Mr. LaCortiglia- Have you seen it outside of the building?
909
910 Mr. Snyder-No.
911
912 Ms. Evangelista - I think it is much clearer-I did have a problem with the
913 PlannersWeb website.
914
915 Mr. Snyder- I established the users and the passwords.
916
917 Mr. Watts- I got an email but no password.
918
919 Mr. Snyder-I thought I have created it.
920
921 Ms. Evangelista- They kept asking me for my password.
922
923 Mr. LaCortiglia-Mr. Snyder could you send it back out again?
924
925 Mr. Snyder - You can change your passwords but not user IDs.
926
927 Ms. Evangelista - I thought it would be last name -password is unique to you.
928
929 **4. Town Planner:**
930 Mr. LaCortiglia- Mr. Snyder you will be attending the September 19th conference?
931
932 Mr. Snyder - Yes, there is a meeting in Lawrence with different speakers regarding
933 economic development. Wendy will be in the office.
934
935 Mr. LaCortiglia- Do you need reimbursement?
936
937 Mr. Snyder- It is free but will submit gas and parking monthly.
938
939 Mr. Howard- Motion to adjoin
940 Mr. Watts- Second
941 **Motion carries: 4-0; Unam..**
942
943 **Meeting adjoined** at 9:30PM.