

PLANNING BOARD



19 WASHINGTON STREET
SHERBORN, MASSACHUSETTS 01770

MINUTES March 23, 2011

Members present: Robin Perera; John Stevens; Eric Johnson; Sue Spence; Tom Urmston; Gino Carlucci, Town Planner

Absent: John Higley

Others present: Peter Liffiton, Kitty Sturgis, Anne Bekebrede, Frank Hess, Jonathan Dowse, Susan Tyler, Elliot Taylor

The meeting came to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Sherborn Town Hall, Room 204A.

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR PINE HILL ACCESS ROAD

Mr. Urmston noted that tonight's review by the Board was to examine the proposals for the access road in terms of details and design features, and not to make comment on the financial feasibility of the proposal options for the town.

Frank Hess presented plans for four options for the proposed road:

- A gravel road
- A paved road with a cut-through of the current bus circle
- A paved road with added parking
- A paved road with added parking, lights, and sidewalk

He stated that there was potential for 16 firms to bid on the project.

Mr. Urmston asked if the gravel road was a real option, and Mr. Dowse said that it was not—that the town did not have the proper equipment to maintain a gravel road. Mr. Stevens asked if it would be possible to plow a dirt road; Mr. Dowse replied that it would, but that there would be problems with things like drainage. He noted that all the options include a retention basin, but that the most basic plan has only a run-off swale.

Mr. Carlucci stated that 230-240' of frontage on Eliot Street would be cleared for a retention basin of 130' x 150' with a chain link fence and trees for camouflage, and the basin would be 8' deep.

Lighting: While discussing the lighting shown on the plans for the option that would install lighting, Mr. Carlucci noted that there was no detail on the lighting fixture, but only on the bases of the lights. Also,

relevant to the lighting, Mr. Hess stated that the conduit for the lighting would go back to the school and that the switch would be either manual or on a timer. Mr. Urmston asked if there would be any amelioration of glare from the lights for neighbors who live nearby; Mr. Carlucci recommended “cut-off lenses,” and Mr. Johnson stated that he would encourage use of LEDs.

Sidewalk: Mr. Urmston asked what use would be made of the proposed sidewalk: if students had to leave the property, could they take sidewalks to the Town Garage, and could people leaving an event use sidewalks to return to their cars? Mr. Dowse said that the sidewalk on the plans is an extension of an existing sidewalk, so it could be used as part of a “walking loop.” Mr. Johnson stated that it appeared to him that the sidewalk would be included only in the most expensive option. Elliot Taylor said that he thought it would be negligent to build a road without a sidewalk.

Landscaping: Mr. Johnson asked if there would be compensatory plantings for all the trees that would need to come down for the project, and Mr. Hess stated that there would.

Traffic: Mr. Urmston asked if the road is designed to be “one-way.” Mr. Dowse stated that in an emergency, the road is wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic.

Approval of options: Mr. Urmston asked Mr. Hess if he had to forego some aspect of the project for cost reasons, what that would be. Mr. Hess stated that it would be the lighting and the sidewalk. Ms. Bekebrede stated that she is supporting the most basic option that is not a gravel road for financial reasons. Mr. Hess stated that he would like the Board to approve all options as feasible so that the choice of option could be decided at Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Stevens asked if the Traffic Safety Commission approved of the project; Susan Tyler stated that while she could not speak officially for the Commission, she felt that the members of that Commission did personally support the proposal as a one-way street. Mr. Urmston and Mr. Johnson were in agreement that the gravel road option did not make sense as it breaks the Planning Board’s rule that all driveways in excess of 500’ must be paved.

Mr. Urmston stated that the Board would write up a decision, and sign off on it at the next meeting, April 13.

RE-CAP OF SOS MEETING

Mr. Urmston gave a brief re-cap of the SOS (Save Our Sherborn) meeting that he had attended, noting that a major thrust of the meeting was that the town has much ahead of it in unfunded liabilities and needs to greatly increase revenue over the coming years; the challenge is to find/develop sources for the needed funding without major increases on local property taxes.

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING ON ZONING ARTICLES FOR ANNUAL TOWN MEETING (9:15 PM)

Draft Warrant 2001, As of March 3, 2011, 11:10 AM (Document referenced: 1)

Draft Recommendations on Planning Board Zoning Articles (Document referenced: 2)

Articles for 2011 ATM Warrant

The Board approved the language of the following Warrant Articles:

Article 13 – Solar overlay district (photovoltaic installation at the landfill). Adds a new section to by-law 5.10.

Article 14 – Authorizes the Selectmen to enter into a lease of up to 30 years for the photovoltaic installation at the landfill.

Article 16 – Amends by-law section 3.4 relating to agriculture, horticulture and floriculture.

Article 17 (submitted at the request of the Building Inspector) – Amends the wording of by-law sections 1.3 (Basic Requirements), 5.4 (Material Removal), and 7.0 (Procedure and Coordination).

Article 19 – Adds a new Chapter, 25, to the bylaws relating to stormwater management.

Article 20 – Adds a new Chapter, 26, “Stretch Energy Code,” for the purpose of regulating the design and construction of buildings for the effective use of energy.

Articles 21 and 22 – Amends General Bylaws, Chapter 22, to include non-criminal disposition penalties for violations of rules and regulations, and adds penalties for violations of the Driveway Bylaw and Stormwater Management Bylaw (if Articles relating to those bylaws have passed at ATM).

The Board also discussed *Article 15*, relating to minimum parking requirements in the town (by-law section 5.1.1). Mr. Stevens expressed the same reservations that he has had in the past to this Article. Mr. Urmston asked Mr. Carlucci to mention Mr. Stevens’ objections as a minority position on the Article.

The Public Hearing was closed at 9:30 p.m.

OTHER

Mr. Carlucci stated that the Energy Committee is working hard to finish the final step to apply for Sherborn to become a Green Community.

MINUTES

Mr. Johnson moved, and Mr. Stevens seconded, a motion to accept as amended the Minutes of the March 9 meeting. The motion passed 3 – 0.

Ms. Perera moved, and Mr. Johnson seconded, a motion to accept the Minutes of the March 2 meeting. The motion passed 4 – 0.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m. The next meeting will be on April 13, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary D. Wolff, Clerk
Planning Board

DOCUMENTS REFERENCED DURING THE MEETING

1. Document: *Draft Warrant 2001, As of March 3, 2011, 11:10 AM*
Location: Office of the Town Planner
2. Document: *Draft Recommendations on Planning Board Zoning Articles*
Location: Office of the Town Planner