



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

Meeting Minutes
Regular Meeting – Monday, April 13, 2009

Board of Selectmen Meeting Room
Easton Town Offices
136 Elm Street, North Easton, MA 02356

Present: Christine Santoro, Colin Gillis, Walter Johnson, Gregory Strange, John Duggan, new alternate Peter Deschenes, Alice Savage, Acting Director of Planning and Pamela Almeida, Recording Secretary

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

6:30 P.M. BOARD BUSINESS

Chair Report

Christine Santoro introduced the newly appointed alternate member, Peter Deschenes. Mr. Deschenes is filling the term of Alexander Maller, who resigned in December.

Christine Santoro reported that she attended last Monday night's Board of Selectmen meeting for the 40R Shovel Shop discussion. She reported that the Board of Selectmen would support the project if significant changes were submitted. She reports that the Town Administrator, David Colton contacted George Turner, one of the owners and told him the Board of Selectmen would not be interested in the same project but would be interested in something more sensitive to the historical nature of the property

Christine Santoro requests the Board members retain all documents pertinent to any open project in order to help to conserve paper and save staff time in making copies and preparing packets for mailing.

Alice Savage informed the members of an upcoming training session sponsored by the Baystate Roads Program. The topic is Plan Reading and will be held on May 19, 2009 in Taunton. Anyone interested in attending should notify Ms. Savage who will register.

Walter Johnson voiced his concern with the proposed elimination of the Board of Health Inspector and asks who will be looking out for the Town, if this position is eliminated. Ms. Savage explained that she understood the elimination of the Board of Health

Inspector would not reduce the number of inspector's, that the Building Inspector will no longer be a Department Head, but will continue to inspect Board of Health projects.

Approval of Minutes – March 16, 2009 & March 30, 2009

Continued to April 27, 2009 meeting.

**7:00 P.M. SITE PLAN REVIEW - 54 WASHINGTON STREET
DOG KENNEL**

Alice Savage reports that Pilling Engineering representative, Todd Pilling informed her the applicant wished to continue as they have not yet been before the Board of Appeals. The request is to continue to May 11, 2009.

Colin Gillis motions to continue to May 11, 2009, seconded by Walter Johnson. Motion passes 5-0

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - FIELDSTONE ESTATES
DOUGLAS A. KING BUILDERS, INC.**

Present: Azu Etoniru, E.T. Engineering

Mr. Etoniru explained that the public hearing was continued to tonight from the March 30th meeting to have the opportunity to address comments made by Town Counsel. Comments from Woodard and Curran have been addressed on Sheet #5 in regards to the drainage system and treatment prior to discharge. He also addressed the calculation have been submitted. He refers to three recommendations from Woodard & Curran,

1. An easement should be provided on the south side.
2. The water quality aspect for stormwater management because the Town adopted strict stormwater management guidelines for drainage systems. However in discussion with the DPW and review Engineer, the DPW does not have the equipment to maintain the stormceptor. In his opinion a 'glorified septic tank' which has two compartments to it. Basically is provides for additional separation of any runoff of sediments (oil). The Town does not have the vacuum unit to remove the sediment. Therefore, although we comply with the stormwater management regulations, which a letter of confirmation has been received by Woodard & Curran, however in an attempt to address the potential concerns of the DPW, if they were to maintain 3-5 years down the road, would have to hire a contractor or purchase the equipment. And based on the financial concerns of the Town at this time, purchasing the equipment would not be done anytime soon. At the suggestion of Woodard & Curran, that because there is already a sediment format in the detention basin, perhaps lowering the corner of the detention basin by a foot below the outlet pipe which would allow the DPW to maintain.

3. The size of the stone using at the detention basin. Basically there is an upper section of the detention basin (like a speed bump or mound) when water comes in from the pipe it hits the mound and the water seeps through the stone and out, filtering the runoff as well as act as a settling tank. Basically it was an oversight and the size of the stone proposed will not be used.

There was an issue related to the flood plain that the Planning Staff and Conservation Commission that wanted to see where the flood plain line was on the property based on the FEMA maps. The FEMA maps does typically have an elevation, however this area does not have an elevation on the FEMA map, therefore the plan reflects an estimated elevation. That in reality the flood plain is confined to wetlands and stream. The Engineer comments asked for additional data on the February 13th and April 9th reports concur. Other than the fact that we requested certain waivers I believe the project is in a prior meeting, when this was started, was actually a six month plan that we came here in 2007 when Mr. King put forth money and donated more land to the Town at the time there was no vernal pool. Therefore, in regards to the vernal pool in this area and can see there is a 200 foot area around it, consistent with the Conservation Protection Bylaw which is a more stringent than the Wetlands Protection Act.

Ms. Savage distributed a comment letter she drafted this evening regarding a outstanding waiver requests. If the Board wished to close the public hearing tonight it is strongly recommended to indicate to the applicant or representative that the items would not be acceptable. The following issues should be stressed: 1. The K-pipe analysis; the road width, the fire alarm box, the depth of the cover for drain, the curbing, the Environmental Report and the provision satisfactory to the Board that proper projection of the street for access to drains from each property which is not yet subdivided.

Generally the plan, as proposed, does comply with subdivision rules and regulations, one issue is the drainage that the Town is not capable to maintain the system that was initially proposed with a vac truck requirement. The Town does not have a vac truck and will not get one. Instead Woodard & Curran suggested the plan be modified and the modification be reviewed by an Engineer, which the Town does not have, so it is difficult to judge if done properly. I have further suggested additional recommended conditions for approval. Ms. Savage believes the Board has sufficient information to make a decision and recommends the Board close the public hearing and as a condition of approval require that the plan be modified as per the recommendations.

Christine Santoro asks if the Board has any comments at this time.

Gregory Strange asked why the stormceptor required? Azu Etoniru, the DEP Stormwater Management Guidelines, which the Town has adopted, has solids removal. Is the separation of the oil handled? Azu states that the stone core is higher then the bay itself. So when the water comes in and builds out water will seep out and all the floatables will be visible, which make it a lot easier to see if there is a problem. The catch basins will have hoods as well.

Planning & Zoning Board
Meeting Minutes, April 13, 2009

Gregory Strange, if there was a ceptor installed, how often would it need to be vacuumed out. Azu as a first line of defense the catch basins are installed with a 4 foot sump, the stormceptor shouldn't see much sediment. The Town does have clam buckets that are dropped into the catch basins to take these floatables out. However the ceptor requires it to be vacuumed (which the Town does not have).

Gregory Strange asked if this stormceptor design is better. Mr. Etoniru states that if the ability to maintain is available, definitely a better system. Azu reports that there are two units the DEP have approved one being the downstream preventative and the other being the stormceptor. If he had a preference, of an open bottom basin or the ceptor, in terms of environmental management, this will be a preferred system.

Gregory Strange voiced his concern with the fact that this is a subdivision, not a residential compound or an OSRD, and there is a history of the roads in your projects to remain private. Now adding another public road, but looking to reduce the pavement width from 24 to 18 foot. Can't recall a subdivision were we have allowed that. What is to stop the next developer coming before the Board with the same request? If denied, they could bring up that it was approved for this project.

Colin Gillis also concerned with request to waive the road width from 24 to 18 feet. Ms. Savage reports that all the roads in the area are 18 feet.

Ms. Savage states that the Special Permit for the Zoning Bylaw, although require a narrower road width, have always conflicted with the Subdivision Rules & Regulations. She explains that there hasn't been a provision to have a narrow road width related to the Special Permit in the Subdivision Rules & Regulations. What the Zoning is doing is allowing the smaller lot in exchange for a larger lot size, with that they also require a smaller road. The lots that appear comply with the standard zoning that is why it does not need, in my opinion, a Special Permit. As far as setting a precedent, to what comes down, the way that the Board avoids doing that is when you make a Decision, you grant a waiver and be specific as to the reason why. For example, could say "to be consistent with other roads in the neighborhood". Then when another subdivision comes down the road and the other roads in the area are not consistent then it does not apply. They way the Board grants a waiver is to have specific reasons why. I would hope that down the road, the Board would amend its Rules & Regulations so that in the future all of the roads are narrower.

Gregory Strange directs to Mr. Etoniru the issue that the Board is being asked to approve to allow the applicant to save money by putting in 25% less pavement and also by not putting in granite curbing and also by getting rid of the stormceptor.

John Duggan, questions whether the storm septor is something that we will see a lot more of simply because it is the better way of stormwater management and the Town does not have the truck so it is dropped and just put in a basin? What is the point of having the stormwater regulations if the Town does not have the equipment to maintain it? Ms. Savage responds that the basin that is proposed conforms to stormwater regulations. As

far as the Board's responsibility to watch out for the long term costs of the Town, in addition to the maintenance vac truck a stormceptor will also require maintenance and if it breaks will have to go to Stormceptor, Inc. and purchase their brand.

Christine Santoro, questions the language of the deed? Has Town Counsel reviewed? Is the language enforceable? Alice Savage states in the Decision is recommended the Deed be reviewed by Town Counsel.

Walter Johnson asks for the recommendation of the Planner. (Please refer to the Staff Planner report dated April 13, 2009 attached.) Mr. Johnson asks if Mr. King has any objections of the Staff Planner report. Mr. Etoniru answers that he does not see anything out of the ordinary in the report.

John Duggan asked if there is any other information the Town is looking for. Alice Savage reports that the revised basin should be reviewed by Woodard & Curran and the language in the Deed be reviewed by Town Counsel.

Christine Santoro asked if there is enough information to close the public hearing? Colin Gillis suggests closing the public hearing at the next meeting.

Ms. Savage recommends closing the public hearing and schedule the decision to April 27, 2009, pending the receipt of revised plans by noon on April 17, 2009.

Colin Gillis motions to continue the public hearing to April 27, 2009, seconded by John Duggan. Motion passes 5-0.

7:20 P.M. STILLWATER CREEK LANE

Ms. Savage reports that a letter was sent to T&M Realty (Mark Perron and Thomas DeCouto) requesting they attend tonight's meeting regarding completion of the roadway. There has been no response from either Mr. Perron or Mr. DeCouto.

Colin Gillis recommended sending the request again, via returned receipt. The Recording Secretary will mail the letter via certified mail.

**7:30 P.M. SITE PLAN REVIEW - 320 WASHINGTON STREET -
STONEHILL COLLEGE - NEW RESIDENCE HALL**

Present: Roger Goode, Stonehill College; Bill Cone and Loren Belida, SLAM Collaborative; Matt DeStefano, Nitsch Engineering

Roger Goode reported additional information has been put together and would like to present tonight. Matt DeStefano reports that met with David White of Woodard & Curran and Ms. Savage. He reports that everything was addressed in the April 2, 2009 Woodard & Curran letter. They also addressed Conservation Commission concerns, and

removed the foot bridge. Bill Cone of SLAM Collaborative shows the updated lighting plan. In addition, the updated plan reflects the removal of the footbridge. A revised set, which includes a signature block for the Board, is submitted.

Ms. Savage reports that the only outstanding issue was the lights. The only recommendations are the same that are in the Conservation Commission Order of Conditions:

- No earlier and no later than two weeks prior to the commencement of the project, a pre-construction meeting shall be held at the site with all involved parties, including, but not necessarily limited to, the site developer, construction contractor, the applicant's engineer, the Conservation Commission and Planning & Zoning Board's agent engineering consultant.
- Prior to construction of the bio-retention basins and the porous pavement, soil tests, witnessed and overseen by the applicant's engineer, shall be conducted at the locations proposed for these systems to confirm the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation and infiltration rates used in the stormwater design report prior to commencing construction. We recommend the Commission require their engineering consultant to be on-site to witness these test or that the resulting soil logs be submitted to the Board and Commission for review by their consultant, at the applicant's expense.
- Upon completion of the components of the stormwater management system listed below, the applicant's engineer shall provide a report to the Conservation Commission and Planning Board certifying the systems were installed in accordance with the plans. The report shall include certification that excavation of the basins was inspected by the engineer prior to backfilling. An as-built plan, stamped by the engineer should be included with the report. The reports and plans should be reviewed by the boards' engineering consultant. This condition applies to the following components:
 - Bio-retention basins
 - Porous pavement

Gregory Strange asked why the Conservation Commission wanted the bridge removed. Roger Goode stated the submission of the bridge was informal and Conservation Commission felt there were enough bridges on campus, it was thought it was easy for the students to walk from the new building to other buildings on campus and creating a bridge would introduce more trash and debris. He further explains that Conservation Commission informally took a straw poll and it was thought the bridge and not good to move forward with. Alice Savage stated the Land Use Agent felt that if the Planning & Zoning Board felt strongly about approving the bridge, that perhaps Conservation Commission may re-look at the bridge proposal.

Peter Deschenes asked, in regards to the pond, why students were not allowed on the ice. Roger Goode responded for safety reasons.

Gregory Strange motions to send a letter to the Conservation Commission stating that the foot path and foot bridge is excellent planning and request the Commission take another look at the proposal, seconded by John Duggan. Motion passes 4-0-1 (Colin Gillis abstains.)

Alice Savage recommends approval pending recommendations.

Walter Johnson motions to approval pending Staff Planner recommendations, seconded by John Duggan. Motion passes 4-0-1 (Colin Gills abstains)

**REVISIONS TO SITE PLAN REVIEW – 350 WASHINGTON ST
HOUSE OF POSSIBILITIES (08-06)**

Present: Bob Pelaggi, Holmgren; Paula Kavolius & *HOPe*; Dave Kelliher, Auburn Construction.

Bob Pelaggi refers to sheet C-4 from the previously approved plan. The developer realized they wanted to fill the back area in to create a play area for the children. They installed a drain pipe to carry the drainage that is collected in the cavity to drain southerly. They propose to install a 12 inch pipe with a small headwall and a flair end section to create a flat play area and install a handicap ramp to the back play area and patio area. Drainage calculations have been submitted to Woodard & Curran.

Walter Johnson comments that the building is beautiful.

Alice Savage recommends approval of the plan.

Gregory Strange, asked if the pipe will affect the parking that was proposed on the Moreau Hall side of the property? Mr. Pelaggi answers that the drainage is down gradient from the parking area and will not affect Moreau Hall.

Gregory Strange questions the removal of all of the trees in the front of the site, when the project proposed saving as many trees as possible. He asked if there are going to be trees added to replace all the trees that have been removed. Paula Kavolius explained that due to the location of the leaching field, and the fact that the trees located in that area were dead, they were removed. He further explains that trees will be added this weekend.

Walter Johnson motions to approve with revisions; seconded by Gregory Strange. Motions passes 3-0-2 (Colin Gillis and John Duggan abstain)

ADJOURN

Walter Johnson motions to adjourn at 8:15 p.m., seconded by John Duggan. Motion passes 5-0

Planning & Zoning Board
Meeting Minutes, April 13, 2009

Respectfully Submitted by Pamela J. Almeida, Recording Secretary.

Signed by,

Colin Gillis, Clerk

Date



TOWN OF EASTON
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
136 Elm Street; North Easton, Massachusetts 02356
Alice Savage, Staff Planner
Tel: (508) 230-0643 Fax: (508) 230-0639 E-Mail: asavage@easton.ma.us

To: Azu Etoniru, Applicant (by hand)
CC : Doug King, Property Owner (by hand)
Wayne Southworth, DPW, Director (by email)
Planning & Zoning Board (by hand)
File # 09-02

Date: April 13, 2009

**Re: Staff Review of Application #09-02 Fieldstone Estates (off Fairfield Drive)
Application for Definitive Subdivision**

Documents Reviewed:

- Form C: Application for Approval of Definitive Plan, submitted by the Applicant, dated January 5, 2009.
- Certified abutters list, dated November 11, 2008
- Quitclaim Deeds granting 6.7 acres at Lot 3B Wagonwheel Drive to Douglas King; Quitclaim deed granting Lot 314-1 & 313-1 of Fairfield Drive to Douglas A King - Easton, LLC, approximately 4.5 acres.
- "Letter Report—Fieldstone Estates" submitted by Woodard & Curran, dated February 13, 2009
- Letter from applicant's engineer, Azu Etoniru, to the Planning & Zoning Board, dated January 5, 2009, re: Application for a Definitive Subdivision Approval
- Comments from Thomas Stone, dated Feb. 18, 2009
- Letter from applicant's engineer, Azu Etoniru, to the Planning & Zoning Board, dated January 5, 2009, re: Request for Waivers
- Plans entitled, "Definitive Subdivision of Fieldstone Estates," prepared by E.T. Engineering, dated Dec. 17, 2008, sheets 1-3.
- Plans entitled, "Definitive Subdivision of Fieldstone Estates," prepared by E.T. Engineering, dated Dec. 17, 2008, amended through March 30, 2009, sheets 4-9
- Staff report from Acting Director of Planning & Community Development, Alice Savage, dated February 20, 2009
- Letter from applicant's engineer, Azu Etoniru, to the Planning & Zoning Board, dated March 16, 2009, including attachments, re: Revised Plan(s)
- Letter from applicant's engineer, Azu Etoniru, to the Planning & Zoning Board, dated March 30, 2009, re: Environmental Impact Report

Planning & Zoning Board
Meeting Minutes, April 13, 2009

- Letter from applicant's engineer, Azu Etoniru, to the Planning & Zoning Board, dated April 3, 2009, including attachments, re: Revised Plan(s) bearing a latest date of March 30, 2009
- Letter from applicant, Doug King, to the Planning & Zoning Board, dated March 30, 2009, re: Fieldstone Estates, Easton
- Letter from Fire Chief Thomas Stone to the Planning & Zoning Board dated March 27, 2009
- Sketch plan showing alternate sidewalk arrangements (undated)
- Certification pursuant to the Mullin Rules, for John Duggan, dated March 16, 2009
- Draft letter report from Woodard & Curran, dated April 9, 2009

Staff Planner Comments

Under the statute, the Planning & Zoning Board has 135 days to act on an application for a Definitive Subdivision where no preliminary plan has been filed. The 135 days will expire for this application on **May 30, 2009**.

Missing Information

- Town Counsel Review of Deed Restriction for Roof Drains
- Final Report from Woodard & Curran

Waiver Requests

Staff recommends granting the following waivers, which the applicant has submitted:

1. *SRR §5.1.2, K-Pipe Analysis*. The Water Operations manager has met with the applicant, and has no objections to the plan as proposed. Water was installed to serve the site as part of the Quarry Lane project.
2. *Road width*. The developer is seeking a waiver on the road width requirements from the required 24' to 18'. **Staff strongly recommends granting this waiver, as a way to save the Town from long term maintenance and construction costs associated with pavement, plowing, and de-icing of the roadway, as well as to encourage lower-speed vehicular travel.** The Director of Public Works and the Fire Chief have submitted comments in support of this request. See "Additional Staff Comments," for greater detail.
3. *§7.6, Fire Alarm Box*. The area is well served by existing fire alarm boxes.
4. *Plate 4A, depth of cover for drain*. Woodard & Curran did not object to the proposed design, and therefore staff assumes that there are no engineering concerns associated with the proposed request.
5. *SRR §6.3.11, curbing*. The Board discussed this request, and noted that the adjoining streets have Cape Cod berms. The Board should require curbing as shown on the plan.

The applicants has also submitted a request to waive *SRR §5.1.2, Appendix B, Environmental Report*. The applicant has submitted a revised waiver request, which

includes additional information regarding the environmental impacts of the project. **Staff recommends that the Board reviews this letter, and indicate by a straw poll prior to closing the hearing whether the submitted information will be acceptable to the Board.**

Compliance

Subdivision Rules & Regulations

Except as noted above (Waiver Requests) and below, the Plan appears to be in compliance with the Subdivision Rules & Regulations:

1. The plan does not depict an easement for continuation of the roadway for future development. Staff recommends that the applicant consider providing an easement towards the north, where further development may be possible, noting that the provision of such an easement is a requirement of the SRR. (§6.2.1.c “Provision, satisfactory to the Board, shall be made for the proper projection of streets for access to adjoining property which is not yet subdivided.”) **Staff recommends that the Planning Board indicate via a straw poll prior to closing the public hearing whether satisfactory provisions made relative to this requirement have been made.**

Stormwater Regulations

As per revised Subdivision Rules and Regulations, the project must comply with the Stormwater Standards outlined in the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act. The application has been reviewed for compliance with this regulation by the Town’s consulting engineer, Woodard & Curran, in a draft letter report dated April 9, 2009 (please see attached). **Please note that W&C recommends modifying the detention basin to serve as an infiltration basin, due to the inability of the Town to properly maintain the proposed Stormceptor unit.** Staff recommends that any approval be conditioned on this change, and that this change should be reviewed by an engineer. The report the Board has received is a draft; however, staff believes that the final draft would not contain any changes. The Board may wish to accept the draft document as a final draft.

Additional Staff Comments

Staff recommends closing the public hearing, and schedule the decision for April 27th, pending the receipt of revised plans by noon on April 17th.

1. Deeds show different legal owners for parcels—Douglas A King, LLC and Doug King, individual, are separate legal entities. Upon any approval, the applicant should sign the covenant on behalf of himself and his LLC, and furnish documentation indicating that he is a Trustee of the LLC.

As a condition of subdivision approval, staff recommends the following:

Planning & Zoning Board
Meeting Minutes, April 13, 2009

1. Payment, in full, of any outstanding legal or consulting fees.
2. The proposed water quality system should be modified as per the recommendation of the consulting engineer, Woodard & Curran. The design should be reviewed, at the applicant's expense, by the Town's consulting engineer.
3. After installation, a P.E. should certify that the stormwater drainage system, including the paving stones and subgrade, has been installed correctly and is functioning properly.
4. Execution and recording of the Form E covenant. The Applicant shall provide recorded copies of all such properly executed legal documents to the Board.
5. A qualified professional engineer shall be engaged at the Applicant's expense to certify in writing proper installation of:
 - a. All proposed stormwater management infrastructure;
 - b. The subgrade of the roadway where pervious pavers are proposed;
 - c. The pervious pavers, where proposed.
 - d. A report indicating such proper installation, stamped by a P.E., shall be furnished to the Board at the completion of installation of each of the above.
6. No work or clearing shall be done beyond the proposed tree line depicted on the Plan.
7. No foundation permit shall be issued until such time as the following have been completed:
 - a. Installation of all underground utilities
 - b. Installation of roadway subgrade, subbase, base course, and road binder
 - c. Installation of base for street lights and related wiring
 - d. Installation of the complete stormwater management system verified in writing by a Professional Engineer, that the system has been completely built as approved by the Board and is in good working order.
8. An access easement for maintenance of the stormwater drainage system should be granted to the Town along the southern edge of the proposed detention basin, on or near the property line.
9. A final plan set be submitted, including the following revisions:
 - a. A detail should be added to the plans outlining the dimensions or size of stone for the stone check dam or low flow channel to be installed in the detention basin
 - b. A note on the plans should reference the recording information in the covenant
 - c. The easement references above should be shown on the plans
10. Prior to requesting acceptance of the street, the owner shall clean all catch basins, drain pipes, proprietary water quality devices, and basins.
11. Any change to the grading or drainage system of the lots should be approved by the Planning & Zoning Board.

12. No certificates of occupancy shall be issued on any lot until the roadway and all related improvements, with the exception of the top course of pavement, have been constructed according to the approved Plan and lamp posts wired to a minimum of 150 watts are installed at the end of each driveway in the subdivision where it meets the private way. Verification of the proper completion of all work shall be provided by a Registered Professional Engineer.
13. The roof drainage system proposed for each house lot shall be designed by a P.E.
14. The design of the roof recharge systems should be submitted to the board for review and approval.
15. After installation, a P.E. shall make an inspection and submit a report to the Board certifying that the stormwater drainage system, including the roof drainage systems, were properly installed and are operating properly. This submittal should include an as-built plan for the system.
16. Lots created from this subdivision plan should be conveyed subject to a deed restriction that the Grantee assumes obligations to maintain the roof drainage system and recharge trench, approved by Town Counsel, which further requires that any changes to the roof system as shown in the as-built plan be approved by the Board.
17. This Decision shall be binding upon every owner or owners of each of the lots, as shown on the Plan, and the executors, administrators, heirs, successors and assigns of such owners, and the obligations and restrictions herein set forth shall run with the land in full force and effect for the benefit of and enforceable by the Town of Easton. Reference of this approval shall be entered upon the Plan and this Decision shall be recorded at the Bristol County Northern District Registry of Deeds with the Plan and the recording information shall be provided to the Board for its records.
18. If the roadway and appurtenances are not **completed** within 2 years, this approval shall lapse, unless the Board by majority vote grants an extension.

DPW

In conversations with the DPW Director, Wayne Southworth has indicated a preference to see an infiltration basin, accessible by clamshell diggers, to the Stormceptor units, which require a vacuum truck. The Town does not have access to, nor is the Town likely to obtain access to, a vacuum truck in the near future.

The DPW is in favor of the reduced pavement widths in this subdivision as well as future projects due to the overwhelming costs of material and maintenance of roadways once they are accepted by the Town.

Fire Department

Planning & Zoning Board
Meeting Minutes, April 13, 2009

The name Silver Drive is acceptable to the Fire Department. The Fire Chief recommends that the road be posted with a sign saying, “Fire Lane—No Parking,” and recommends waiving the requirement for a fire alarm box.