



Town of Georgetown

MINUTES

1
2
3 Committee: Planning Board
4 Date: May 25, 2022
5 Time: 7:00 pm.
6 Location: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
7
8

9 Members present: Harry LaCortiglia, Bruce Fried, Bob Watts, George Comiskey, Joanne Laut.
10 Staff present: Town Planner, John Cashell, Administrative Assistant, Andrea Thibault.
11

12 Minutes transcribed by A. Thibault. Note: Video recordings of all Georgetown Planning Board
13 meetings may be found at www.georgetownma.gov and by choosing the Community TV option.
14

15 The Meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by Harry LaCortiglia.
16

Minutes:

17
18
19 J. Laut: Motion to approve the minutes from May 11, 2022 as cited in our packets.
20 B. Fried: Second.
21 Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.
22

Vouchers:

23
24
25 H. LaCortiglia: Is there a motion to approve the vouchers for H.L. Graham & Associates for
26 technical review of 2 Norino Way \$920.00; and BMO Zoom for May \$104.99; as cited in our packets
27 and on this week's agenda.
28

29 J. Laut: So moved.
30 B. Watts: Second.
31 Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.
32
33
34

Public Hearing: 2 Norino Way/Humboldt East

35
36
37 Jill Mann, Attorney for the applicant.
38 Jayme Fishman, applicant.
39 John Mason, Odor Consultant for the applicant.
40 Kyle Baker, Odor Consultant for the applicant.
41 TJ Melvin, Civil Engineer; Millennium Engineering, for the applicant.
42 Mike Lannan, Odor and noise peer review for the town.
43 Chris Gonzales, Architect for the applicant.
44

45 J. Mann: We received the final comment letter from Mr. Graham. We addressed all of the concerns.
46 The civil and stormwater has been signed off by Mr. Graham. We sent another artist's rendering to

47 depict the approach to Norino Way toward the building and past the driveway. You will see Norino
48 in front, and then the driveway. As noted by Mr. Watts, he requested trees along Norino also. This is
49 the fulfillment of that request you can see in the drawings.

50
51 H. LaCortiglia: This is an important view.

52
53 G. Comiskey: Does that rendering really capture the slope looking up from Norino Way? It is quite a
54 steep slope, and it looks level in the drawing here.

55
56 TJ Melvin: On the right side, above the retaining wall there is a small green patch where you can see
57 the grade change. The depth of the angle coming up Norino and turning, it is hard to get a real sense
58 of the grade, but it does go up. There is definitely an elevation change.

59
60 J. Mann: Mike Lannan is here as the Odor Control expert and Chemical Engineer for the town.

61
62 We have been working together with Mr. Lannan to create an odor and noise control concept plan
63 that will mitigate noise, odor and provide a facility that will benefit the community in terms of
64 financial components and will allow this industrial property to be a business that is exceptionally quiet
65 and passive.

66
67 Mr. Lannan looked at initial floor plan and he asked what type of rooms have what type of pressure?
68 Containment takes place through pressure. Is there an air lock so that the pressure stays in the room?

69
70 We addressed Mr. Lannan's comments, and provided additional floor plans. There were detailed
71 conversations about the methodology for housing the mechanicals. Mr. Lannan will discuss that.

72
73 I thank Mr. Lannan for being very professional and communicative.

74
75 M. Lannan: So, originally you were focused on the outside of the building and things associated with
76 that, and there was no real final floor plan, nor is there now.

77
78 But there is enough presented that we have confidence that there will be the proper containment with
79 the areas being positive and negative that they proposed - which is the first step.

80
81 We look at containment, ventilation, control and dispersion as the four steps. So, we are through step
82 one. We have talked quite a bit about step two - ventilation.

83
84 There is a mechanical room that is allocated for this stuff. In order to properly treat the air, it is not as
85 much the air that is going outside, but also it is the mechanicals keeping the air at the right
86 temperature and humidity going around in circles, and that requires quite a lot of space.

87
88 Right now, it looks like there is not enough space. They have a space up in the pitched roof that they
89 are looking at. Some of the recycling systems could go there- fans and maybe some humidification.

90
91 But also, there is the issue about what are you doing about the actual odor control. We need to figure
92 out how all the pieces will fit together.

93
94 How will air get from contained areas get to the fans, then to the odor controls, then to the outdoors?

95
96 Regarding noise, they have decided to locate everything inside the building. I believe a noise study can
97 come as a condition if everything is located inside. This can be done after the design.

98
99 Where are the acoustic levers and how do you direct those is a question that I have.

100
101 C. Comiskey: You are saying there will be no roof fans?

102
103 M. Lannan: There has to be discharge. One of the concerns I brought up today is that this stuff has
104 to take up a lot of space. Getting rid of heat is important.

105
106 You need to have radiators or evaporators. They are usually located outside, but they will locate all of
107 the mechanicals inside.

108
109 It doesn't appear that they have enough space right now with the mechanical room and the area above
110 the ceiling but they are going to work that out and come up with a plan, even if they have to encroach
111 on the grow rooms.

112
113 So, I think we can work that out with some basic information. Size of typical units, something that
114 fits in the space and does the job.

115
116 Then we can get past the site suitability and then they can do the formal design. We have already
117 talked about the conditions to be sure that the town is covered.

118
119 G. Comiskey: Would Mr. Lannan be amenable to reviewing conditions and adding conditions, and if
120 this project is approved, at some stage, can we keep you on as a consultant for inspections? We want
121 to get this right the first time.

122
123 M. Lannan: I need text from the applicant for how this is going to fit together. That is how I can get
124 to conditions that are protective of the town.

125
126 We will end up with some conditions that detail what will be done in the design, as well as how does
127 this meet the noise criteria? That will be calculations after the fact.

128
129 I can review that, and make sure it is fine at the time. Yes, I would do a final field inspection, I've
130 done them for other towns.

131
132 H. LaCortiglia: George was referring to actually going to the facility and confirming that the plan is
133 what you are seeing in place.

134
135 M. Lannan: Yes, I would do a final field inspection, I've done them for other towns. Franklin and
136 Millis are close to being done. The applicant decided to do everything at the very end, so the
137 conditions were very broad-based and they had to accept it the way it was with my comments.

138
139 Attleboro is providing everything up front. This one is Georgetown is a hybrid. Applicants approach
140 it differently, and we can protect the town either way.

142 J. Mann: We are revising the plans; we have a footprint and we need to work within it. You have to
143 plug in the numbers in order to get the right size for the mechanical and grow rooms.

144
145 M. Lannan: Everything has to be in balance. The hybrid approach in this case, is more of a feasibility
146 study. Is your plan feasible is what I am looking for ---and will comment on.

147
148 H. LaCortiglia: I will be looking to you, and to the team, and ask you, does this have a reasonable
149 expectation for working appropriately?

150
151 If you can answer that affirmatively, and we have the paperwork to go with it, and the conditions
152 written out that are agreeable to both parties, then I think it is a win.

153
154 Do you have a timeframe to deliver your opinion on this? Is there a date expectation for that?

155
156 M. Lannan: Once they give me the plans, we'll turn it around. I'd defer to Ms. Mann.

157
158 G. Comiskey: Have you talked with any of the abutters that have concerns? Have any of them
159 reached out to you.

160
161 M. Lannan: No, but I am not positive.

162
163 H. LaCortiglia: It sounds to me as though stormwater and site plan are all set -- and we are
164 progressing. Maybe the next time we meet, we will have odor and noise wrapped up, and a plan, and
165 assurances from you?

166
167 Sumul Shah, 4 LongHill Road: It seems like information is pending. At what point is there a
168 complete package, so that we in the neighborhood can look at these documents and prepare
169 commentary?

170
171 J. Mann: The final pieces that Mr. Lannan is speaking about, we will be delivering as soon as possible.
172 I would think probably a couple of weeks.

173
174 C. Gonzales: Essentially, we will be looking for the size of the equipment, so we can get that into our
175 design. It is undersized at the moment as has been mentioned.

176
177 We need to find the balance with the grow spaces. We can get this out a couple of days after we get
178 the mechanical equipment specs.

179
180 J. Mann: Sound like it will be a couple of weeks before we deliver this.

181
182 Mr. Shah: Will there be another hearing to present this, after that information is uploaded to the town
183 website?

184
185 H. LaCortiglia: Yes. We have more design to do. There will be another continuance. There are four
186 permits here. There are a number of things left to do. And, we have to make sure that all of those
187 permits, and decisions and conditions are ready before it comes up for a vote.

188
189 There will be another meeting after the information is posted on the town website.

190
191 M. Lannan: Another part of your question can be answered with, at the point where the conditions
192 are presented – the public will be able to see that, and before it is voted upon.

193
194 S. Shah: Sounds like all the documentation – the drawings and mechanical design will come in the
195 next few weeks, then Mr. Lannan will comment. It will all be in the public information. That is when
196 we, as a community can provide comments.

197
198 M. Lannan: There are two levels of permitting. (1) Site Suitability; (2) Feasibility. There won't be final
199 plans at this point. There will be conditions.

200
201 The applicant does not get full funding until after the permit, then there will be conditions. We will
202 review that again at the point of final plans. A lot of the conditions will be required prior to an
203 occupancy permit. There will be enough in there to show whether or not their ideas are feasible.

204
205 S. Shah: We have been at this since August last year, and every couple of weeks the design changes. I
206 haven't kept up with every design iteration. Rather than review every iteration, I would like to get to
207 the final plan.

208
209 H. LaCortiglia: The site plan is staying the same. Ms. Mann can certainly send the latest full plan set
210 with site plan and landscaping, with all of the drawings, with all the stormwater, fire hydrants etc. This
211 is a comprehensive plan.

212
213 The details for odor control will be separate. But, that will most likely be in a far more schematic way.
214 As we move further along, we will be looking at conditions, and wording.

215
216 These things do take a while, they are very technical.

217
218 M. Lannan: It is evolving into something that is more feasible and more contained. I'd rather have
219 the abuttor concerns now, and I will take a look at them.

220
221 H. LaCortiglia: Do we need a Form H for this?

222
223 J. Mann: With a special permit, you don't have that issue. After the hearing closes, you have 65 days.

224
225 J. Cashell: It seems like we are much further away than we were led to believe. We need a more
226 definite timeframe for when this Board wants to continue this hearing for.

227
228 J. Mann: I can promise to get the revised plans to Mike Lannan in the next seven business days.

229
230 G. Comiskey: Did I hear that the final revised plans for the stormwater have been done?

231
232 J. Mann: Yes, they have been done. I promise to send the final stormwater with the changes that Larry
233 has asked for, I'll send the final plan set. And, I will copy Harry on that.

234
235 H. LaCortiglia: I will hear a motion to continue the hearing for 2 Norino Way to June 22, 2022.

236
237 G. Comiskey: So moved.

J. Laut: Second.
Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.

Planning Office:

1. 51 West Main St and 66 Parish Rd Affordable Housing Component.

J. Colantoni: We will be following what the Planning Board approved for 51 W. Main St., 4% of gross revenue of every townhouse sale goes to the Georgetown Affordable Housing Trust.

We are not asking for any changes, that is exactly the way it was approved.

The framing is 99% done, some plumbing is started. Things are moving forward; it is coming together.

For 66 Parish Road, it was approved with one unit of affordable housing. What we are proposing is a footprint of the one single family home, but it will be a two-unit townhouse.

Each will be two bedrooms. It will be indiscernible from the other nine single family units.

There will be a lottery for these affordable units. There will be a condo fund for these units where the outside will be taken care of with the condo funds.

The other nine houses are single units, so they are in charge of their own siding, roof, common area, septic system etc. with their condo fees. We want to set up the affordable buyers that all this will be taken care of.

The AHT will purchase the unit for \$215,000.00 maximum figure no matter what the market value is. There will be two lotteries. It is a win-win. The people that buy these units will be set up for success in a really nice neighborhood.

J. Laut: Will one of the lottery units go to a Georgetown resident?

J. Colantoni: I don't know the state rules, but whatever the state will allow, we will do that and I think that would be fantastic.

H. LaCortiglia: What about the additional lot to the westerns side of 66 Thurlow?

J. Colantoni: There is additional affordable housing trust money there. The Greek Orthodox Church owns the lot, right next to where our driveway road goes into our ten units.

They were given this land through a will, for the purpose of creating some money for the Church, for the Church to sell it, or use it in some way.

We would like to try to utilize this land, to purchase this, so that we could build another unit.

We could try to do a major modification and try to get two or three units, but we are not trying to be greedy or make it complicated, but we want to keep this simple—only to add one unit.

We would like to make this an ANR merger to our special permit lot. We'd build a single house on this lot only, with its own septic system and water. That unit will be self-sufficient.

There is no conservation land involved on this lot. With this proposal, we aren't changing any approved drainage, septic system etc. So, that is our idea.

Now, with the AHT, adding another unit, going from ten to eleven - we'd still have to do only one affordable unit that we'd have to do anyway. But we'd give \$33,000.00 additional to the AHT based on the formula. The formula comes to 1.1.

From the 1.1 – the 1 is the affordable unit, and the .1 is the \$33,000.00. We think this is an outstanding solution.

If the Planning Board likes the concept, then we will put together the ANR merger etc. to get the formal vote. I just wanted to be sure that you liked the concept.

H. LaCortiglia: With the ANR plan, there is no need for frontage because it merges it with 66 Parish Road. You need to do an ANR plan anyway to separate the parcel that is the open space.

J. Colantoni: This land lot was much bigger; much was taken away with the building of Route 95 in the 1950's and also in the 1970's even more was taken away. That is why the lot is the size that it is.

{Planning Board majority agrees with the concept.}

G. Comiskey: I am in favor of the duplex and getting two affordable housing units. I am not sure about redoing a special permit to add another lot. I think it is certainly a precedent.

The reason you would modify would be if there was a flaw in the previous Board's decision, or if it provided a real benefit to the town.

I think building another McMansion off a previous OSRD that was well thought out and well done, I am not that in favor of. I am favor of the first part with the duplex.

The other thing I questions is that the owner is under a Godzilla Trust. Is that correct? I didn't see your name on the LLC.

J. Colantoni: Yes, our LLC is called Godzilla LLC. My partner is the manager on that LLC.

G. Comiskey: Usually, we have a confirmation or a note from the owner saying that you can represent them on this. You are speaking for the owner when we have no confirmation that is the case.

J. Colantoni: It is no problem if you want something from the owner. If you need that formal piece of paper, it is no problem whatsoever.

One of the reasons we wanted to do it this way it because it was simple. Otherwise, this lot may come before the Board for a common driveway and that will block out the affordable housing \$33,000.00 because it would be a separate project.

No guarantees that anything gets approved, I just wanted to explain that.

J. Cashell: There is more to it, as George alluded to. This was an exploratory presentation tonight on the concept to see if the Board would like it. From this point, we would need an ANR, actually a lot merger plan.

That is an application in and of itself. It seems the Board is willing to accept this as a minor modification.

This single-family house become part of 66 Parish Road. and needs to be merged into it. The superseding agreement is the Board's original 66 Parish Rd. OSRD Special Permit Notice of Decision.

The amended document needs to be written. It has to be word smithed properly. When the ANR plan is ready, and the documentation is submitted recognizes in writing that it is now part of this development.

G. Comiskey: I'd like to recognize Jay Ogden here, as a town official.

J. Ogden: I would prefer not to join the meeting as a town official, but as a resident. I did want to point out that the Greek Orthodox Church lot is actually zoned industrial. It is a strange anomaly and a hurdle that would need to be overcome.

Maybe the lot existed prior to the industrial zone, and maybe it is grandfathered for residential use?

H. LaCortiglia: Thank you for pointing that out.

J. Colantoni: On the assessor's card, it is residential and has been forever.

Comiskey: We had something similar on Tenney St.

H. LaCortiglia: What counts is what town meeting voted for or didn't vote for. There are a couple of parcels behind town owned land on National Ave showing as industrial that are residential.

G. Comiskey: I am in favor of the first duplex proposal. I think he wants a separate vote.

H. LaCortiglia: I'll accept a motion to consider the duplex to be a minor modification, an insignificant change for 66 Parish Road OSRD.

G. Comiskey: So moved.

B. Fried: Second.

Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.

J. Cashell: Now, it is just a matter of drafting up the language for this and to present to the Board at the next available meeting. This is not another fire drill, and he is continuing along with his project.

We are on the path for the deadline of the affordable housing component to be finalized in order to meet the 5th occupancy permit.

J. Colantoni: We are starting the second unit. We hope by the end of June to be working on the third unit. We want six to seven units completed by the end of the year.

J. Cashell: You get the green light from the Board this evening. This will not delay your project in any manner. This minor modification document, we have time to do this.

Your attorneys would draw it up, and I would like to run by Town Counsel, once your draft is ready. Then I will bring it back to the Board.

H. LaCortiglia: If the designated industrial lot is something that we need to take care of, we can go to fall town meeting as a citizen's petition.

J. Cashell: This lot was severed with the building of Route 95. The original land mass of this lot, at one point, it included the Route 95 right of way.

Is it industrial, or was the change only for the western side? We will look into it.

This particular lot has paper street frontage technically. It is an ancient roadway and looks like it had gravel base construction. It was never improved upon because once Route 95 came in, there was no reason for it. It is not land locked.

G. Comiskey: In the 2006 zoning map it shows as industrial.

2. 494 North Street Bond.

J. Cashell: The roadway is up to binder grade. Tailor Enterprises provided an estimate for the remaining work. Dave Varga signed off and doubled the amount to establish the surety. The applicant is amendable and agrees and ready to establish a surety in accordance with Planning Board action this evening.

Luis Valdez: This is correct.

J. Laut: I move to establish a bond amount of \$38,090.00 as recommended by David Varga; and that said bond remain in place for a period of 1-year after the completion of the subject ROW, i.e., Road "A".

B. Fried: Second.

Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.

427 **3. 2007 Master Plan Status.**

428
429 J. Cashell: Last year, the state had grant money available for Master Plans, but they have not yet
430 addressed it for this year. There is no update for this year for the funding yet. I am still searching for
431 funding and working with MVPC.

432
433 As the summer goes along, we will find some funding, or go outside for funding. The last time the
434 town did this, the private business sector came up with quite a bit of the funding.

435
436 Comiskey: We certainly need to update our zoning maps.

437
438 H. LaCortiglia: Yes.

439
440
441 **4. Planning Board's summer schedule.**

442
443 *{Planning Board agrees for July 27; and August 10 and 24.}*

444
445 B. Fried: Motion for a July 27, 2022 meeting.

446
447 B. Watts: Second.

448 Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.

449
450 . J. Cashell: There is serious talk about extending the zoom meetings by the legislature.

451
452
453 **5. 91 Tenney St.**

454
455 J. Cashell: Deb Colbert submitted today an application for 91 Tenney St.

456
457 D. Colbert: I really appreciate all the work that you do with this Board. The problem with July 27, is
458 that you will require a peer reviewer at that meeting and it will be continued.

459
460 I would prefer to open the hearing on June 22 to establish the peer review, and then continue to July
461 22.

462
463 J. Cashell: Thad Berry, professional engineer has agreed to be the Board's peer reviewer on a
464 permanent basis if necessary. He is the owner of ASB Engineering in Topsfield. He has designed
465 projects in town, he is very familiar with our zoning and site plan review requirements.

466
467 He has agreed to start his review for 93 Tenney, and if the Board is willing – and they do need to be
468 looked at jointly—he would also look at 91 Tenney.

469
470 He would then be ready to submit his peer review for the July 27 meeting. This is a unique situation.
471 Conservation Commission is calling for a unified review. I think it makes sense for Site Plan to be
472 done in the same manner.

473
474 Do you agree Deb?

475
476 D. Colbert: Yes, I agree with what you just said. I would highly appreciate the peer reviewer's
477 comments from Thad Berry in time for us to make response comments for the July 27 meeting.
478
479 J. Cashell: Are you amendable to Form H being voted on in regard to the application for Tenney
480 Street?
481
482 D. Colbert: Yes.
483
484
485 H. LaCortiglia: Is there a motion to approve the Form H extension for September 30, 2022?
486
487 B. Watts: So moved.
488 J. Laut: Second.
489 Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.
490
491
492 J. Cashell: We need a motion to establish an M-account (escrow account) prior to any review taking
493 place, and to begin the peer reviews for both 91 and 93 Tenney St, Site Plan projects, upon receipt of
494 escrow funds - with the establishment of an M-account (escrow) at \$3,000.00 each.
495
496
497 J. Laut: So moved.
498 B. Fried: Second.
499 Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.
500
501
502 D. Colbert: I am happy, and I appreciate all your efforts. I would appreciate the peer review
503 comments back by July 1. Thank you all very much.
504
505 *{Planning Board discusses 40B project at West Street.}*
506
507 B. Fried: Motion to adjourn.
508 B. Watts: Second.
509 Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.
510
511
512 Meeting adjourned at 9:06pm.