



Committee: Planning Board  
Date: April 28, 2021  
Time: 7:00 pm.  
Location: Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Members present: Harry LaCortiglia, Bruce Fried, Bob Watts, George Comiskey, Joanne Laut.  
Staff present: Town Planner, John Cashell; Admin Assistant, Andrea Thibault

Minutes transcribed by A. Thibault. Note: Video recordings of all Georgetown Planning Board meetings may be found at [www.georgetownma.gov](http://www.georgetownma.gov) and by choosing the Community TV option.

The Meeting was called to order at 7:04 by Harry LaCortiglia.

**Minutes:**

B. Watts: Motion to approve the meeting minutes of April 14, 2021, subject to comments and changes.  
B. Fried: Second.  
Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.

**Vouchers:**

B. Watts: Motion to accept the vouchers as listed on this on this week's agenda and cited in our packet  
J. Laut: Second.  
Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.

**Public Hearing: G. Mello Disposal.**

Kriste Braun, Traffic Engineer for Ron Muller and Associates.  
Brown, GPI traffic engineer for the applicant.  
Jason Mello, Applicant.  
Nancy McCann, Attorney for the applicant.

The public hearing is opened by H. LaCortiglia.  
Kristen Braun presents the Ron Muller and Associates traffic study review.

*{Planning Board, Town Planner and Applicant's representatives discuss GPI original 2019 traffic study; site plan; truck turning; traffic volume increase per year; accident data; site distance analysis; intersection of E. Main St. and Carleton Dr; trip generations; I95 interchanges; queuing potential on E. Main St; arrival times of larger trucks; peak hours; exclusive left turn lane; peak hours vs. uniform distribution; tonnage numbers were collected during covid—need pre-covid numbers; road degradation.}*

K. Braun: We requested counts for Carleton Drive from GPI. We recommended counts at comparable facilities and tonnage.

B. Fried: We really need the tonnage at those other sites. I would like to see tonnage per trip, and also what 203 E. Main St tonnage is. Are 2-3 core samples of Carleton Dr enough?

H.L. Graham: Core samples- three would be a minimum along the road there. My concern for Carleton Dr was more to do with the pavement in certain areas, patching and potholes. My concern went beyond the core samples.

Rebecca Brown, GPI traffic engineer: Pavement cores were marked out, a geo tech consultant will do this work. They recommend beyond the three. There will be a total of ten pavement cores. The road is 1500 feet long, they will be every 100 foot on alternating sides of the road.

H. LaCortiglia: Is at least one being done in close proximity to rt. 133? Can you confirm?

R. Brown: Yes, one will be about 100 feet from the curb line.

G. Comiskey: Road degradation – Larry did you note that there is no drainage on Carleton Drive, and could that be adding to the wear and tear on the road?

H. L. Graham: Yes, it could be.

G. Comiskey: Could any velocity from the elevated driveway be working under Bridgeport?

H.L. Graham: Yes, there could be impacts from the water also.

K. Brown: Delays exist on Carleton Drive. Although some delay during peak hours, it doesn't necessarily mean it's over capacity. Overall, there will be some delays felt.

H. LaCortiglia: The current level of service is "F". How does it become an "A"? How does that actually happen?

K. Brown: That delay is on Carleton Dr, not on rt. 133.

G. Comiskey: Let's say that queuing becomes worse than expected. Can you recommend a condition that would mitigate that?

K. Brown: Future traffic monitoring would help to predict if that might become an issue. We looked at uniform distribution, we could look to see if there are peaks. Our analysis spread the volume equally throughout the day. I will get back to you on that.

J. Cashell: Carleton Drive is in disrepair. It represents the era it was built, 1970's maybe early 1980's. It is 1500 ft, a dead end. It is probably at total capacity build out.

G. Comiskey: Have you looked at historical data for how traffic levels were reached to get to a level "F"? With level of service on I-95 ramps at a level "F", with projection do you see a problem with the ramps, and if so, are you required to do a 20-year study?

95  
96 K. Brown: These ramps are already an existing problem.

97  
98 G. Comiskey: Current tonnage at the existing facility—does that include residential vehicles: Cars  
99 towing trailers, pickup trucks?

100  
101 R. Brown: Yes. Those are included in data we collected with residential vehicles.

102  
103 G. Comiskey: Residential vehicles are accounting for 3 tons per day?

104  
105 R. Brown: Yes.

106  
107 G. Comiskey: Each vehicle has 20 pounds average?

108  
109 R. Brown: Yes.

110  
111 Jason Mello: The average homeowner brings 1-2 bags approx. 20 pounds and some recyclables.

112  
113 B. Watts: That road needs improvement. Are 30% of the new trips expected to come through the  
114 center of town?

115  
116 R. Brown: Yes.

117  
118 H. LaCortiglia: 100% travels on rt 133. It is the only access to the site. The term increase —this is not  
119 an increase. It is an overall number.

120  
121  
122 Jon Samul, abutor: Presents trailer video to the Planning Board, Town Planner applicant's  
123 representatives and the public.

124  
125 *{Discusses pitch in road; left turns into Carleton Dr; queuing concerns; police are there regularly; with no leaves on trees,*  
126 *you can see around corners, not possible when leaves fill out; trucking needs of other businesses on Carleton Dr; school*  
127 *bus route; businesses on Carleton Dr. are much below capacity; there is not even distribution of trucking throughout the*  
128 *day.}*

129  
130 Theodora Capalto, 111 West St: I see the various Boards like medical specialists, each looking at their  
131 specialty. No one is looking at the whole. I believe the Planning Board is tasked with not looking at a  
132 project in isolation. We already have major traffic concerns in town. What exists already? What is the  
133 town's commitment to existing businesses? We do not want Georgetown to become another  
134 Bethlehem, NH. What will happen to the median home value? No one wants to live in a town with a  
135 large transfer station. Everyone's concerns must be addressed.

136  
137 S. Sadler, 7 Hillside Dr: It is wonderful that you allowed an existing business to speak. Regarding  
138 paying for traffic detail—there were complaints, one of them from me. The applicant, at one point in  
139 time, was outside on rt. 133 directing traffic. We can't have that in town. Let's be clear about how the  
140 offer to pay for traffic detail came about.

Emma Driskill, 3 Spaulding Rd: With the 70 second delay---Do any of the studies look into cars pulling alongside large trucks to scoot around? Potential for accidents? Also, at the CrossFit business there is a daycare and activities for children. Kids are close to the road, running drills, playing soccer.

Tracy Lasquade, 1 True Lane: You present a zero count for packer trucks, I've seen and have on film packer trucks from the current facility. Will your report be updated? We would like to see accurate numbers, and have trust that what you are presenting is accurate.

Kyle McNichola, 107 West St; I am in support of this project. Discusses various points of support.

J. Laut: Motion for site walk on May 8, 9am for 20 Carleton Dr.

B. Watts: Second.

Motion carries 4-0; 1 abstain (George Comiskey) via roll call vote.

J. Laut: Motion to continue this meeting to June 9, 2021.

B. Fried: Second.

Motion carries 4-0; 1 abstain (George Comiskey) via roll call vote.

**ANR:** 42 Charles St.

J. Cashell: We have the surveyor here for this lot line relocation plan. The applicant is buying this smaller parcel.

G. Comiskey: I move to endorse the ANR plan for 42 Charles St.

B. Watts: Second.

Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.

### **Planning Office:**

J. Cashell: Major Development Review Update. The subcommittee is working on the zoning ordinance. I have a draft Public Hearing Notice ready to go to be published on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> for May 26 hearing. We are also working on MS4 compliance with MVPC and Pete Durkee.

Amendments have been drafted. These are in addition to the Major Development Review. These stormwater regulations will not go to town meeting.

Motion to adjourn: B. Fried

B. Watts: J. Laut

Motion carries 5-0; via roll call vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:54pm.