



**TOWN OF EASTON**  
**Planning & Zoning Board**  
136 Elm Street  
North Easton, Massachusetts 02356  
Tel: (508) 230-0630 Fax: (508) 230-0639

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, January 3, 2011**

Present: Christine Santoro, Chair; Gregory Strange; Peter Deschenes; Dan Smith; Wayne Benson, Jr.; Brad Washburn, Planning Director

Absent: Walter Johnson

Christine Santoro called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**Signatures: 108 Washington Street**

- **Site Plan – Used auto sales display parking (#10-32)**

Present: William VanLaarhoven

The Board signed the approved plan dated, October 26, 2010, which they approved at their meeting held on December 20, 2010, with the following conditions:

- Parking spaces shall not be striped.
- Customers cannot move vehicles that are for sale.
- There shall be no parking or loading and unloading of vehicles on Washington Street.
- A throughway must be maintained for fire safety access.
- If business and/or ownership changes, new business/owner would have to seek approval by the Planning & Zoning Board.

Mr. VanLaarhoven took one original plan and the other will be copied and distributed by staff to the Building Department and DPW.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

**409 / 433 Depot Street “Beech Tree Estates”**

**Definitive Subdivision / Open Space Residential Development (#10-24)**

Applicant: Dino Susi; Attorney: Richard Staiti; Engineer: David Crispin, BSC Group

Present: Dino Susi; Attorney Staiti; David Crispin, BSC Group

Brad Washburn reviewed his Staff Report dated January 3, 2011 which included the following:

**The purposes of the OSRD are to:**

- Preserve open space for natural resource protection, recreation, agriculture and forestry;
- Preserve significant natural, historical, and archaeological resources;
- Preserve and foster the Town of Easton’s rural and scenic character;

- Promote development that is in harmony with the natural features and resources; and
- Establish flexible residential development standards and procedures

### **Outstanding Issues**

- This development will require filling of the floodplain (a wetland resource area) to allow for the construction of the roadway. The applicant is proposing to replicate this wetland resource off-site on “Parcel B” which to my understanding is no longer part of this development proposal.
- The proposed layout for the roadway and common driveways does not minimize environmental impacts (e.g., the proposed roadway layout has most of the proposed road in the 50-foot “no-touch” buffer per the local Wetlands bylaw).
- Applicant has not formally addressed affordable housing requirement.

### **Recommendations**

- The Bylaw states that the “maximum number of dwelling units permitted in an OSRD shall be computed by dividing the developable area of the OSRD tract by the minimum lot size required in the underlying zoning”. This calculation would allow up to 5 lots. Given the proposed alteration of wetland resource areas, and to protect more potentially developable open space, I recommend reducing the number of house lots.
- Reduce width of proposed roadway to reduce resource area impacts.
- Extend roadway to house lots to eliminate need for two common driveways
- Address affordable housing requirement.

He also distributed a copy of Woodard & Curran’s a final review report dated January 3, 2011 to the applicant and his representatives. The report included items and recommendations that Woodard & Curran still feel need to be addressed.

Attorney Staiti commented to the Board that the purpose of tonight’s meeting was to submit a plan which clarified the OSRD. Attorney Staiti reviewed a Site Plan dated January 25, 2010. Sheet 1 reflects the proposed development of 5 lots. Sheet two shows the breakout of the amount of Development Area (uplands & wetlands) and Open Space area (uplands & wetlands). To confirm that preservation of open space is 60% of developable parcel.

Brad Washburn, asks Mr. Crispin asks if Parcel B was taken off the table because they were allowed to fill the flood plain via a special permit granted by ZBA.

Christine Santoro asks if Parcel B was required to be shown on the plan (wetland replication area is 2:1 ratio)

Attorney Staiti refers to the Staff Report and refers to the layout of the roadway and driveways, in an effort to narrow the road and reduce impact. He was under the impression a waiver would have to be granted for the driveways, therefore also grant a waiver for the roadway.

Planning & Zoning Board meeting minutes  
January 3, 2011

Attorney Staiti refers to an approved OSRD (Cinnamon Ridge), which he feels is similar to this application. And inquires with the Board as to whether they are moving in the right direction for approval of this application. He refers to the outstanding issues and recommendations from both the Staff Report and Woodard & Curran report. Brad Washburn refers to the filling, needing a retaining wall in the front of the site and the possibility of some preservation of the back of the site.

Christine Santoro clarifies that before getting to an OSRD, the fact remains that getting to the developable area is impact and replication which is required.

David Crispin refers back to the original filing where they submitted as a lane. And Cinnamon Ridge does have a lane, which is 600 feet in length and has 7 dwellings on it. Mr. Crispin asks the Board, what is the meaning of impact of wetlands.

Attorney Staiti hears tonight to minimize the impact on wetlands to go in another direction, which includes narrowing the roadway and driveways, which would require waivers. He reiterates he feels the application as submitted meets the OSRD standards.

Christine Santoro asks for questions from the Board.

Peter Deschenes comments that the roadway was put in then the lots divided to show sufficient frontage and upland on the end of the roadway.

Christine Santoro comments that the plan must be shown that a conventional subdivision could be done, which is what has been required for this an all past OSRD requirements.

Gregory Strange comments that the Board is here to listen and uphold the zoning bylaw and regulations, not solely go on the report of the Planning Director. A condition of approval for any application is questioned as to how the application meets the requirements of bylaw. Looking at the plan as submitted, 3 lots do not have 40,000 s.f. of contiguous uplands. Mr. Strange refers to past approved OSRD's which have saved more uplands than this application (Cinnamon Ridge; Rockland Bay Estates and another on Rte 106). What is the Town of Easton getting that is protected in this application, in terms of Open Space? Mr. Strange does not agree this application meets the purpose of the OSRD bylaw.

Attorney Staiti, acknowledges the affordable housing issue, which needs to be addressed. He feels strongly this application meets that standards of an OSRD per the bylaw.

Daniel Smith comments that he appreciates the fact they are trying to maximum Mr. Susi's investments on this site. However, 5 units is a tough sell on this lot based on what the developable area is. Mr. Smith asks whether the applicant has looked at the development of 3 lots (would it be cost effective for the applicant).

Attorney Staiti comments they would have to take it under advisement and look at, and again voiced concern about the affordable housing aspect.

Planning & Zoning Board meeting minutes  
January 3, 2011

Brad Washburn comments that affordable housing aspect is based on the sales price and varies with the number of units.

Dino Susi comments on the amount of land that is being replicated, the plan indicates 4,750 s.f. of wetland replication and will be creating a 2:1 replication.

Gregory Strange asks if the wetland flags that were indicated on 2/1/08, were for all flags or only a portion. David Crispin comments were for all flags.

Daniel Smith asks about Cinnamon Ridge open space ratio.

Gregory Strange comments that this application develops every square inch of developable area.

Attorney Staiti comments on their review of Cinnamon Ridge and the developable area and open space is comparable to this application.

Christine Santoro comments that Cinnamon Ridge was the first OSRD before the Board (2000) and feels the applicant has not taken the recommendations of the Staff Report received today into consideration.

Attorney Staiti comments that additional time is needed to comment on Staff recommendations

Gregory Strange motioned to continue to January 31, 2010, seconded by Peter Deschenes. Motion passes (5-0-0)

## **BOARD BUSINESS**

Brad Washburn reminded the Board of the subcommittee meeting following the January 18<sup>th</sup> regular meeting.

### **7:30 P.M. ADJOURN**

Christine Santoro motioned to adjourn the meeting, seconded Gregory Strange. Motion passes (5-0-0)

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by Pamela Almeida, Recording Secretary.