



Regular Meeting and Public Hearings

Monday, February 6, 2012 at 7:00pm at the John Bauer Senior Center, 17 West St. Paxton, MA

**ATTENDANCE:**

MEMBER	PRESENT (X)	ABSENT (X)
Neil Bagdis	x	
Robert Jacobson	x	
Warren Bock	x	
Henry B. Stidsen, Jr.	x	
Jeffrey Kent	x	

Other Attendees: Jay Pelletz (JP), Anissa Leon (AL), James Regis (JR), James Burgoyne (JB), Gary Shepard (GS), Jim Stone (JS), Fred Goodrich (FG), Robert Tracy (RT), Andrew Stebbins (AS), Paul Robinson (PR), Greg Destasi (GD), Kevin Quinn (KQ), Margaret Pennace (MP), Holly Robert (HR)

(NB) Chair called the meeting to order at 7:02pm.

**Meeting Minutes**

**Motion (WB) seconded (RJ) to accept the minutes of Jan. 9, 2012, vote 4-0 unanimous.**

**Old Business**

**Paxton Ponds – Camille Circle** 5 lot subdivision Definitive Plan (Map14, Lot 35), owners Mutual Builders

All members signed the Mylar plan for the owner, Jay Pelletz, which he will record at the Reg. of Deeds. (NB) In order for any site work to begin, Surety will need to be received first. (JP) I think we are going to do a tri-party agreement, using United Bank.

**Discussion on proposed Large Scale Solar Bylaw.** (NB) I asked Greg Destasi to come to discuss what issues he sees with the proposed bylaw. (GD) I have had several vendors come in about this subject. As I read it, the bylaw deals with 250 kilowatts and above. We already have a policy in place to deal with it. Anything that would come in, we would see how it would fit into the PML system. A large array would probably be about 3 megawatts or larger. PMLD allows up to 1 megawatt. The town is 5 megawatts at peak times. One project would be “one and done”. Also, if you have to construct the entire mechanics in an area, then you kill the economics of the project. We don’t want to make any decisions to impact rate payers. (WB) The largest array in MA will be in Rutland at 6 megawatts. There may be a chance for a second set of arrays and I wanted to make sure that we had regulations in town and to recognize the taxes for personal property. (NB) Warren and Greg will get together to work something out and see if we can go forward with it. All agreed.

**Public Hearing Continuance**

**Spaulding Woods** – 5 lot subdivision Definitive Plan (Map 11, Lot 16), owners Robert Clark and Raymond Daly.

The petitioners did not submit anything new since the December 2011 meeting but probably will for the March 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. A signed continuance is on file expiring on March 12, 2012.

**Public Hearing Continuance**

**JKS Paxton, LLC** – Senior Housing Development at Holden Rd. and Grove St. (Map 18, Lot 105), Site Plan Review and Special Permit for an SRD

(GS) The latest revision has some minor changes. 1. Change to driveway on Grove St. It was shifted about 48 ft. 2. Regarding gate at Holden Rd. access: no gate but will restrict turn out to only right turn, turning left would not be allowed, too dangerous. A sign is proposed for no left turn. (WB) How wide is the entrance? (GS) 20ft. wide and a 15 ft. radius. 3. There will be a silt fence at the recommendation of

the Conservation Comm. 4. A proposed overflow parking area with a gravel top. 5. A widened walkway is now 10 ft. wide to allow for emergency vehicles. 6. Handicap parking is distributed around the building, near ramps but they can park anywhere also. 7. The landscape plan has been submitted with white pines to line the property line of the nearest abutters to building. (HS) White pines are not well taken in Paxton due to the weather. (GS) We can consider a different kind.

(WB) Has the Fire and Police Dept.'s responded or been spoken with? (AL) Yes, I spoke with the Lt. at the Police Dept. and they preferred no gates on the Holden Rd access for obvious safety reasons. (GS) Also, there is not too much flexibility in moving the Holden Rd access. Site distances are worse in other areas. (RJ) If you close the entrance on Holden Rd. you create more congestion on Grove St. (AL) A traffic study was done too. (HS) I just want to add that this project was originally proposed with one entrance.

(GS) The lighting on the posts in the parking area will be decorative fixtures at 12 ft. high. It will be down lighting. (KQ) The lighting breaks down very low on direct abutters. It is considered gentle and will not be over lit. (AL) They will stay on all night for safety reasons and are set to the sun, photoelectric. (NB) If there are issues in the future, can the bulbs be changed to lessen the brightness? (AL) I do not know of the specific manufactures specifications but I will check with them. The courtyard will have no lighting because it is meant for daytime activity. (KQ) Everything has been covered for Stormwater Management issues also.

(NB) I have had discussions with KQ and Chief Conte about possible funding for a new truck for the Fire Dept. It does not affect the approval of this project but it never hurts to ask. Engine 2 is 34 years old and would be the third vehicle to respond. It would help to supply water to supplement the hydrant system. Mutual Aid elongates response time. Our main concern is not for the building but for the safety of the residents and getting them evacuated as safely and quickly as possible. (JR) the enunciator will be updated as to who would need help and/or to shelter in place until help arrives. The Fire Dept. has full control to vertical access. Also, we cannot discriminate as to who can be on the first floor, etc. (AL) Part of the design is the pressure of water. They can add pumps to make sure it meets codes/requirements. (NB) In the future, we can ask for a contribution to the capital fund for a piece of equipment.

(KQ) One issue not mentioned and it isn't required but maybe good to have is fencing on the detention areas. 99% of the time the basins will be dry but another alternative is planting "rosa rugosa". It is thorny but pleasing to look at. (AL) We are open to explore different options for the landscaping plan.

(JK) I suggest the new overflow parking area be paved instead of gravel. (AL) Yes, we will add that feature.

(RT) Concerned with visibility from his house, 34 Holden Road. (JR) Explained that it would be impossible to block the entire project from everyone's view but are willing to work with him if there are still concerns as the project progresses.

(WT) A year after the building is open, we can revisit if a gate is necessary. People may or may not pay attention to the no left turn sign.

**Motion (WB) seconded (RJ) to grant a Special Permit for a Senior Residential Development and to approve the Site Plan Review with conditions as listed below, vote 4-0 unanimous in favor.**

**Conditions:**

- 1. The plans initially submitted and revised are approved by this Decision.**
- 2. Each dwelling for Occupancy will consist of one or more being 62 years of age or older and all additional residents shall be 55 years or older.**
- 3. The SRD shall conform with and remain subject to Paxton Zoning Bylaw 9.3.3.**
- 4. The Special Permit shall lapse following the end of one year from the date of issuance if construction has not started except for good cause.**
- 5. A copy of decision must be filed with the Registry of Deeds.**
- 6. The proposed eight spaces for overflow parking shall be paved.**
- 7. There shall be an only right turn allowed from exiting at the Holden Rd site drive. If in the future, this is ineffective, additional control measures can be installed.**
- 8. A substitute for the proposed white pines with another type of evergreen on the westerly site boundary. Also, planting will be done as to maximize the screening from neighbors on Holden Rd.**

9. **Lighting as submitted is approved. If in the future, if the lighting installed causes excessive glare or light, the applicant agrees to adjust or reduce the lighting.**
10. **The building will be furnished with a code compliant sprinkler system. The applicant shall develop an evacuation plan and elevator control plan.**
11. **Applicant agrees to install fencing or other measures in the event that detention basins hold excessive levels of water for prolonged periods of time.**

**Public Hearing**

Amendments to the Paxton Stormwater Bylaw and Regulations. (NB) This is mainly a bookkeeping issue. The changes are from recommendations from the AG's office after it was originally approved by them. It was not followed through with back then. (HR) I would like to see stronger language. For example, defining the term illicit and adding in forestry alongside agricultural land. (NB) Go through the proposed bylaw and come up with suggestions and we will consider them for the final draft.

**Motion (WB) seconded (HS) to continue the hearing to the next meeting on March 12, 2012.  
Vote 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

Next meeting will be on Monday, March 12, 2012.

**Motion (WB) seconded (HS) to adjourn the meeting at 8:55pm, vote 5-0, unanimous.**

Respectfully submitted,

Sheryl Lombardi