



1  
2 Committee: Planning Board  
3 Date: May 22, 2019.  
4 Time: 7:00 pm.  
5 Location: Georgetown Town Hall, 3rd floor conference room.

6  
7 Members present: Harry LaCortiglia, Bob Watts, Joanne Laut, Tillie Evangelista, Bruce Fried.  
8 Staff present: John Cashell, Town Planner.  
9 Bob Watts arrived 7:05pm.  
10 Minutes transcribed by A. Thibault. Note: Video recordings of all Georgetown Planning Board  
11 meetings may be found at [www.georgetownma.gov](http://www.georgetownma.gov) and by choosing the Community TV option.  
12 The Meeting was called to order at 7:02 by T. Evangelista.

13  
14 T. Evangelista: Good evening. Welcome to the Planning Board on May 22, 2019. We have a new  
15 member Bruce Fried, his first time here. Welcome Bruce.

16  
17 **Minutes:**

18 H. LaCortiglia: Motion to approve the draft May 8, 2019 Planning Board meeting minutes as  
19 written.

20 J. Laut: Second.

21 Motion carries 4-0; 1 absent.

22  
23 H. LaCortiglia: Motion to limit the duration of each of these four hearings tonight to no more  
24 than 35 minutes, with an extra 5 minutes if needed.

25 J. Laut: Second.

26 Motion carries 4-0; 1 absent.

27  
28 **Public Hearing:** 554 North Main Street.

29 H. LaCortiglia: Motion to open the hearing for the Special Permit and Subdivision  
30 applications for the property located at 554 North Street known by Assessor's Map 18 Lot 39.

31 J. Laut: Second.

32 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

33  
34 Greg Hockman, Williams and Sparagus, Applicant's Engineer: This is one of the last homes of the  
35 way out of town toward Byfield. The existing house hasn't been occupied for years; it is a bit of an  
36 eyesore. We are proposing a Court. Mr. Dunlevy purchased the property with the hopes of  
37 remodeling the existing house and putting more homes on the property. We identified the  
38 jurisdictional resource areas of the property. The wetland setbacks are 100 feet. We filed an ANRAD  
39 with the Conservation Commission.

40  
41 We cannot rehabilitate the existing structure; it needs to be replaced. One scenario would be a 5-lot  
42 subdivision but the cost for a roadway does not make sense. We have submitted an application for a  
43 Court. The best part of this property is in the back. It is well wooded; it opens up and has a nice  
44 canopy. We are proposing two lots with essentially a glorified common driveway. We are requesting  
45 a few waivers. During the ANRAD process, we learned that the Town would like access from North  
46 Street to proposed trail at the power lines, and we are proposing an access easement.

47  
48 Rich Williams, Williams and Sparagus, Applicant Engineer: This is a similar cross section the Board  
49 has approved prior on Bartlett Court and Jefferson Court – 14 feet of pavement and 3 feet of gravel  
50 on each side. The roadway is graded uphill, and then back down and the whole road pitches off to a  
51 stone trench with low impact development techniques. There is an outlet and another ponded area at  
52 the end of the circle that discharges near the wetland edge. The design provides compliance with MA  
53 Stormwater Management standards. It will be served with public water. Power, cable tv and other  
54 utilities will be underground.

55  
56 We will respond to all of comments from Larry Graham. Regarding lot width we prepared a sketch  
57 showing how we would comply with that.

58  
59  
60 Brandon Ivone, 540 North Street: I am a Captain for the Town of Newbury Fire Department. My  
61 concerns are the road width for safety. There are NFPTA codes, and they need to be followed. The  
62 Georgetown Fire Chief also has expressed the same concerns in his letter. Hydrant placement, road  
63 width, curving, turn radius, fire apparatus turns around at the end.

64  
65 Phillip Cosman, 528 North Street: I have a few concerns. I am also concerned about the fire code.  
66 There are design standards in place for a reason, these waivers hugely effect public interest and public  
67 safety and public access. Four of these waivers affect safety, five of the waivers affect the wetlands,  
68 the water runoff, the collection, impact to wildlife and our downstream neighbors as well. Basically, I  
69 see this as someone is trying to jam a square peg in a round hole. What good are the laws, if the  
70 waivers are given that compromise public safety and public interest. There are rules, and they are  
71 asking for those rules to be ignored. That is not fair. Waivers #4, 5, 6, 7, 8 all are related to the  
72 collection of water, and the control of water flow. #1, 2 and 3 are safety requirements that need to be  
73 looked at and reviewed by the Fire Chief.

74  
75 T. Evangelista: In order for the Board to approve any waivers, it has to be for the public good.

76  
77 Paul Marcionda, Marcionda and Associates: I prepared a summary to be submitted to you. Lot 1, as  
78 shown on the plans does not meet the lot width or the lot depth requirements per Les Godin, the  
79 building inspector's comments in his memo. Waiver 365-36. A, the offset of Streets. Barry Way  
80 comes into North Street as somewhat of a skewed angle and across from Webb Road. This is a safety  
81 concern. If the road entrance were moved, you wouldn't need the waiver and it would better meet the  
82 requirements *{further reads his summary}*. I haven't had time to review the drainage and stormwater  
83 calculations. I know that Larry Graham had a number of drainage comments. Lastly, this project with  
84 require an EPA notice of intent and a permit. This is not Conservation Commission.

85  
86 Frank DeLuna, Smolak and Vaughn: I represent Salvatore Vendoi at 8 Pearson Street. If you take a  
87 look at the standards, in order to give a waiver, there is a two-prong test. That waiver has to be in the  
88 public interest, and it cannot be inconsistent with the intent of the subdivision control law. We  
89 haven't heard any rationale as to why any of these waivers are necessary. This land probably can be  
90 developed as a 2-lot subdivision without any of the waivers. If they can't meet the two-prong test,  
91 then this Board should not allow any waivers.

92  
93 With respect to the parking easement for access to the Town owned land, the Conservation  
94 Commission has been notified by Greenbelt, who sold the land to the Town, that the proposed

95 easement is inappropriate. There is access to the Town owned land by a parking area that was  
96 designated in the restriction. The proposed easement is heavily wooded, has stone walls as well as  
97 some wetlands and would be an inappropriate access to Town property. If that is what they are  
98 considering as public purpose, it is really not. I will stand with my memorandum that is in your file. I  
99 will provide that written recommendation from Greenbelt. It was in the form of an email this  
100 morning.

101  
102

103 Shirley Robbins, 564 North Street: I am concerned about that way. I and my neighbors have had 911  
104 calls. There is no way that one fire truck, one police are and two ambulances can get up there, and  
105 out.

106  
107 Fred Bodenrider, 560 North Street: I am concerned that the driveway is too close to my property line  
108 and I am concerned about drainage. I would like to see the original home come down. It has been an  
109 eyesore for many years. I am concerned about parking for access to conservation. The only people  
110 that use that back property are hunters. I have been there over 20 years. The current trails are more  
111 so off of Wells Avenue. There is a lot of swamp, you can only go back a short way and there is no  
112 trail. Its maybe a 500-yard walk before the swamp. The only way to access is by Wells Ave. I am  
113 concerned about turnarounds. I would like to see the front lot developed. There is a lot of water  
114 back there, and I am very concerned about the drainage coming out to North Street. There is a vernal  
115 pool right on the site, as part of Lot A. This was determined before, when there were going to put 45  
116 houses back there.

117

118 G. Hockmuth: For all intents and purposes, we are treating this as a vernal pool.

119

120 H. LaCortiglia: Motion to continue the Public Hearing until June 26, 2019.

121 B. Watts: Second.

122 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

123

124

125 **Public Hearing:** 4 Carleton Drive.

126 H. LaCortiglia: Motion to accept the application for the Site Plan approval for 4 Carleton  
127 Drive, Map 15; Lot 44.

128 J. Laut: Second.

129 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

130

131 B. Watts: Motion to open the public hearing for same.

132 J. Laut: Second.

133 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

134

135 Rich Williams, Williams and Sparagus, Attorney for the Applicant: We are here to obtain Site Plan  
136 approval for an accessory building at 4 Carleton Drive.

137

138 *{Planning Board, Town Planner and applicant discuss construction of a fabric (Quonset but) building on the property*  
139 *roughly 81x120; approved from Zoning Board of Appeals for accessory building use; located out of 100 foot buffer*  
140 *zone; drainage is two stone infiltration trenches where runoff will flow; pervious pavement; shipping containers are the*  
141 *support system; no foundation; storage for wood pallets and sheet metal material; no electricity or other power to the unit;*  
142 *will be used just for storage of materials that are currently outside; warehouse space for raw materials; alleviates*

143 *congestion and helps with snow removal; 50,000 sq. foot building on site; 376,000 sq. foot lot; vacuum sweep cleaning;*  
144 *parking; outlet pipes; construction control; no new lighting; residential abutters buffer and screening; plantings; noise;*  
145 *ZBA conditions. }*

146

147 The Planning Board agreed that the Town Planner would draft a decision of approval and provide  
148 same at the next meeting for the Board's consideration.

149

150 H. LaCortiglia: Motion to continue the public hearing to June 12, 2019.

151 B. Watts: Second.

152 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

153

154 H. LaCortiglia: Motion for a 5-minute break.

155 J. Laut: Second.

156 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous

157

158 **Public Hearing:** 51 West Main Street.

159 H. LaCortiglia: Motion to re- open the public hearing for 51 West Main Street.

160 J. Laut: Second.

161 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

162

163 John Colantoni, Applicant: This is the old Sadler's property. We started this project back in 2017 before  
164 we owned it. We purchased this in 2018 and we have received unanimous support letters from the  
165 Historical and Economic Committees. The Zoning Board of Appeals  
166 1.7-acre lot with 7 residential units. The front of the lot we will be restoring the main building closest to  
167 the street, and adding the town house addition. Each unit will roughly be 2,000 sq. feet of living space.  
168 We are not asking for any waivers.

169

170 *{Planning Board, Town Planner and Applicant discuss septic; parking; entrance and exits; commercial building possibilities*  
171 *of restaurant, office or retail; curb cuts; fencing; drainage design landscape border at waterline; traffic analysis; left turn on*  
172 *West Main Street; traffic safety; project scale;*

173

174 Raquel Valcourt, 14 North Street: My husband and I have several concerns. This is not a project that is  
175 well outside the 100-foot buffer zone of any of the wetlands or the vernal pools. They have not gone  
176 before the Conservation Commission to get what they need. Two of the townhouses are substantial in  
177 the 100 foot. This plan is a little aggressive. Since Sadler's has closed down, I we have had a huge rodent  
178 problem. If you were to tear down a significant portion of that, we will have a big problem. How will  
179 vermin or rodents be addressed from any demolition? I am concerned about traffic illuminating my  
180 backyard; overflow parking; not enough proposed screening; stormwater changing the water table and  
181 runoff downhill to my septic area; construction noise. I am opposed to this project as submitted.

182

183 H. LaCortiglia: For the record, we are receiving a letter from Stuart and Patricia Krumtic, 55 West Main  
184 Street.

185

186 Stuart Krumtic, 55 West Main Street: We are for development, if it's done right in a reasonable way. Our  
187 biggest concern is the proposed driveway. The area is very narrow, and it would be inches from our  
188 property. Noise from 14+ residents' cars and visitors, and privacy. There is a 6-foot privacy fence  
189 proposed. My letter also includes pictures. This privacy fence is a safety issue, a driver, a walker, or  
190 someone with a stroller could not see someone coming the other direction. A major risk to public safety.  
191 We did have Chief Cudmore come out, I believe he submitted a letter with his concerns. I will now speak  
192 for 5 abutters to detail our concerns. We feel this project is excessive, especially the townhomes 3 stories  
193 blocking sunlight. We have concerns about the traffic. We urge you to scrutinize that study; speed limit  
194 issues on West Main St; drainage and septic. We request that the Planning Board does not approve the  
195 project as proposed, and request a reduction in scope so that there are fewer residential units.

196  
197 Barbara Angelopolous, 11 Prospect Street: My concern is also the traffic pattern. I live on a cut through  
198 street. My concern is that when they look out their proposed driveways, and see all the traffic, they are  
199 going to take the Prospect Street cut through past the Perley School.

200

201 H. LaCortiglia: Motion to continue the public hearing to June 26, 2019.

202 B. Fried: Second.

203 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

204

205

206 B. Fried: I would like to recuse myself for being an abutter for the next project.

207

208 **Public Hearing:** 103A Lakeridge Ave.

209 H. LaCortiglia: Motion open the public hearing for 103A Lakeridge Ave 1-lot subdivision  
210 plan.

211 B. Watts: Second.

212 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

213

214 George Zambourous, Atlantic Engineering, Project Engineer for the Applicants Mary and David  
215 Swenson: The existing site does not have a lot number because it doesn't front on a roadway. The lot is  
216 separated from Lakeridge Drive from the Massachusetts Electric property.

217

218 T. Evangelista: Do you have the easement?

219

220 G. Zambourous: No, we don't have that yet. We have applied for it. We submitted a draft to the power  
221 company. We sent it to National Grid last September 2018, asking for their comments. We didn't want  
222 them to approve the easement because their approval would be less than the town standards.

223

224 T. Evangelista Can you have copy of what you sent? And, what they are telling you so that we can back  
225 up what you say?

226

227 G. Zambourous: Yes. This is only for a single lot that can never get expanded. We are at an impasse with  
228 National Grid until we meet with the Planning Board. We didn't want to get the easement granted until  
229 we knew if the Planning Board would allow a waiver or not.

230  
231 J. Cashell: Technically, the power company has frontage on Lakeridge. So, this property is effectively land  
232 locked. It has no access and no frontage on any roadway. How did this parcel become landlocked? Do  
233 you know what year that was? This was formally a railroad right of way. We have the Court and Lane  
234 provision. The whole idea here is that they are trying to create access to this privately-owned land, and  
235 this is the only way they can do it. Somehow it was landlocked, and it shouldn't have happened that way.

236  
237 T. Evangelista: I think he ought to withdraw without prejudice until he has the easement.

238  
239 G. Zambourous: You can grant approval subject to us getting the easement. So, you want us to get us the  
240 easement first? I would like to respectfully request a continuance.

241  
242 T. Evangelista: I would like to hear from the abutters first.

243  
244 Joanne Testaverdi, 11 Lakeridge Drive: We have lived on Lakeridge Drive for 40 years. We have 14  
245 houses now on Lakeridge and one empty lot with a lack of frontage. We have a bioenvironmental  
246 concern of the health hazards of the electric fields. We have 10 people on Lakeridge Drive with cancer or  
247 a birth defect. Nine terminal cancer cases. Right now, 64% of the houses on our street have had cancer.  
248 This is a very high percentage on a quiet street. Why would you expose more people to the situation we  
249 have been exposed to? This is a health issue. Maybe we need to think about the electrical system on  
250 Lakeridge Drive.

251  
252 Dan Rowe, 16 Lakeridge Drive: As Joanne mentioned, we always thought it was an unbuildable lot. I see  
253 the drainage and waterflow waivers. My house has been flooded twice to the depth of 18 inches in my  
254 basement. There is a lot of hydraulic activity under my house and under my pool. Adding another house,  
255 I feel will put my house at risk. The driveway for that house will run right along my property line. There  
256 is major flooding with every rainstorm. There is a drainage problem on the street somewhere. If you put  
257 a driveway out of 103A, by changing the hydraulics will funnel more water to the neighbor's homes. We  
258 already have a drainage problem on that street. Nine waivers are requested. Given the water problem in  
259 that neighborhood, the waivers are a poor idea.

260  
261 Salvatore A. Testaverdi, 11 Lakeridge Drive: This lot has been rejected twice in the past. I am hoping that  
262 the Board will look into the reasons for rejection. The last time, Carl Tibbs actually paved the road in  
263 order for him to get it approved, but the Town reneged on it. I hope that we, the neighbors can look at  
264 the files. I think this property was developed about 60 years ago. This is where he did his tree farming.  
265 That lot is a loam area, where he de-rocked his loam. I would like to know specifically why the Town  
266 would approve this when it has been rejected twice before. I have \$2,500.00 worth of damage from the  
267 last flooding. I am frightened that we will be unindicted with water from more impervious materials on  
268 that lot and the drainage. We should have at least two more drains. I am requested that the DEP conduct  
269 an MS4 Stormwater Study of this area. Not only would it clarify that this property shouldn't be built but

270 it will help us to maintain our street. I would like to see additional street lighting. I am concerned about  
271 the footage for the frontage was calculated. I am very concerned about the Stormwater Management  
272 Study and I will seek a legal opinion.

273

274 H. LaCortiglia: Where do the catch basins feed?

275

276 G. Zambourous: Down the property line and out to Rock Pond.

277

278 Paul Muscovitch, 15 Lakeridge Drive: I am concerned about water runoff. There are two drains where  
279 the water runs right past and into my driveway. I get about 8-10 inches in my driveway that flows into my  
280 side yard and my basement floods. It flooded 3-4 times last year. I pumped for 3.5 months straight. The  
281 topsoil has dissipated quite a lot in the last few years where I can now see roots from the trees. I don't see  
282 how putting another foundation will do anything but make the flooding worse. I am concerned about  
283 more water runoff and stormwater.

284

285 John Kay, 18 Lakeridge Drive: I have similar issues. I have noticed that the house on West Main, the  
286 corner of Lakeridge Drive that the runoff and soils in the whole back of the yard is mushy. The runoff  
287 goes down the street toward the pond. Now our yards flood.

288

289

290 Salvatore A. Testaverdi, 11 Lakeridge Drive: We have, at times, a 10-foot elevation of Rock Pond. This  
291 has to be studied. The pipe more than likely is inadequate, and adding to it will just cause more  
292 detriment.

293

294 J. Laut: Motion to continue the public hearing to July 10, 2019.

295 H. LaCortiglia: Second.

296 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

297

298 **Planning Office:**

299

300 H. LaCortiglia: Bruce is brand new, and was wondering what to study. The only problem is that we need  
301 a clean copy. How far away are we from having a bound copy of our subdivision rules and regulations up  
302 to date. I will pull every town meeting since 2011, where we added or changed something.

303

304 B. Watts: Motion to adjourn.

305 J. Laut: Second.

306 Motion carries 5-0; unanimous.

307

308 The meeting was adjourned at 10:30pm.

309