



Regular Meeting

Monday, March 13, 2006

ATTENDANCE:

| MEMBER | PRESENT(x) | ABSENT(X) |
|-----------------------|------------|-----------|
| Neil Bagdis | x | |
| Julie Jacobson | | X |
| David L. Bennett | x | |
| Henry B. Stidsen, Jr. | x | |
| Pamela Vasil | X | |

Other Attendees: Mike Putnam, Doris Soderman, Bob Duby, Mike Maljanian, Steve Siter, Melissa McKeon, Paul Schold, Joann Schold, Paul Robinson, Jay Gallant, Lois Breault-Melican, Denis Melican, Daniel A Gehrlich, Anita C. Fenton.

The Water Commissioners met with the Planning Board to discuss the Water Supply and Distribution System Study for Paxton, MA., prior to the meeting.

Neil Bagdis, the Chairperson, called the Planning Board meeting to order at 7.35 p.m. The February 13, 2006 minutes were approved on a motion by D.B. and 2nd by P.V. (4-0).

ANR : Petitioner Bob Duby
O Central Avenue (Map 30, Lot 149

Mr. Duby resubmitted his new plan. N.B. stated the way the plan is submitted it could be interpreted as there is adequate frontage because of Central Avenue in addition to the frontage on Davidson Road. What was the intention of Central Avenue? When it comes across Davidson and goes between parcel A and the Barretts' home was it intended to go further? Mrs. Duby confirmed it was not. D.B. read through the frontage lot Zoning Bylaw. N.B. had spoken to Rick Trifero who felt that it met the 200 ft frontage whichever way you looked at it. The Board felt this was a new application and the fee was paid by Mr. Duby. D.B. moved for approval, H.S. 2nd. (4-0).

ANR : Petitioner Steven and Ansley Siter
0 and 488 Marshall Street (Map 6, Lot 4 and Map 7, Lots 5, 6 and 6A)

After much discussion regarding the different lots, there were some concerns especially with Lot 5 as it says it is not a building lot. The Zoning Board gave them a variance before and then granted Mike Maljanian another 6 month extension. Lot 4 should specifically say that is not to be considered a building lot and is to be combined with Lot 1 and 1A. We also require the R Factor to be reflected on the map. Lots 2 and 3 are going to remain separate lots. The Board also requires the upland requirement.

The Board decided to take no action at this point and Mr. Siter submitted a letter requesting a continuation to the next Planning Board Meeting.

ANR : Petitioner Steve Balcewicz
65 Suomi Street (Map 12, Lot 11):2-Lot ANR Subdivision

Proposal is to cut out a house lot to sell. Steve confirmed that they meet the frontage requirement as well as the upland requirement. The R Factor is shown on the map. In answer to the concerns from the Conservation Commission, S.B. confirmed that there are wetlands throughout the site but they do meet the upland requirement and the wetlands do not affect the frontage and access to the lot.

D.B moved for approval, P.V. 2nd, all in favor (4-0).

Proposed Senior Residential Development : Paul and JoAnn Schold
0 Marshall Street (Map 21, Lot 2)

Looking at developing a Senior Residential Development which abuts the Kettlebrook golf course. They need to designate this particular area an overlay district to provide for that type of development. They are not asking the PB to endorse it but are asking for their support of this type of article put forth for the next Town Meeting.

Norman Hill of Land Planning.- the Schold's came before the PB previously with a frontage lot plan for residential homes. Norman then gave an overview of the area in question. Having a golf course makes it very inviting for retirees.

A preliminary concept sketch was done where they did a study and looked at the wetlands and the open space requirements and it shows about 7 acres of open space. They want to give the PB a feel where it is located and the proximity of the golf course. 44 unit density. Town water, which the PB felt would be an issue for fire protection. There will be a common septic system with on-site treatment. Projected usage under 10,000 gallons per day which equates to approximately 220 gallons per unit per day.

A reserve fund would need to be set up for maintenance of the septic.

D.B. felt there are a few hurdles to name a few : Water
Septic
Density

They also need to look at the provisions for affordable housing. For every SRD 20 % must be affordable. The question of the qualifying age of 62 was also mentioned.

The Association would plow their own roads and maintain etc.

Mike Putnam, Superintendent DPW, water is biggest issue. Creates pressure/volume situations.

The PB does not have answers to questions that will come from the floor of the Town Meeting. We can say we have had discussions but nothing has come before the Board. First step is to do the overlay district. If the SRD is not allowed then you can go back to the single family homes plan, which consists of 23 units. Deadline for warrant for Town Meeting is April 10th, 2006 and the Town Meeting will be held on May 1st, 2006. 2/3rd vote at Town Meeting will enable the change of age from 62 to 55.

Paxton Historic District's Preliminary Study Report for proposed district

Anita Fenton advised that the Paxton Historic Committee is having a Public Hearing on March 27th, 2006 and are handing out flyers to the Town informing the residents of their intention. Flyer attached giving the purpose of creating a Historic District, an overview of which properties are contained in the Historic District, the reason for the Properties being selected, the benefits, the process, who will make up the Historic District Commission and how will the members be chosen, as well as the future of the historic district when it comes to the expansion of or creating a new district.

Demolition vs renovation. If you create this district and put the John Bauer Center in what would happen? Demolition of a building in a Historic District is prohibitive to the Commission unless it is considered to be a safety issue then the Building Inspector can readily say this building is unsafe and it can be demolished regardless of what the Historic Commission says. The other way there could be the possibility of demolition is if it cost prohibitive to bring it to a state level and that would then be a certificate of hardship. The Commission believes it is very important to preserve the ties that bind the residents to Paxton.

N.B. asked the question as a Committee how they feel about the John Bauer Center. They feel it could be rehabilitated. There are several brick/mortar grants; the main one being the Massachusetts Preservation Project Fund. The grants are 50 % matching grants. N.B. felt that it isn't necessarily the best use of Town Funds. The Board feels that it would possibly be cheaper to demolish and rebuild. The Commission could get a grant to allow for a feasibility study to see how much money would be required to either demolish or rebuild certain buildings included in the Historic District. The Planning Board had concerns regarding the safety issue of some of the buildings. The Commission reminded the PB that they will not receive grants for new buildings, only for the renovation of the old. It was also mentioned that if the buildings are preserved they don't have to still be for their original intention.

The Historic Commission is looking for the support and endorsement of the Planning Board. As a member of the Planning Board N.B. felt that if you could obtain the grants and the matching funds then it could go forward.

Each person on the Commission is nominated by each of the Boards.

D.B. has concerns with the John Bauer Center and asked if the District could be done without the building. The Commission disagreed at this point.

The next meeting of the Planning Board is to be held April 10th, 2006.

Meeting was adjourned at 9.23 p.m. by a motion from H.S. and 2nd by D.B.
Approval was unanimous (3-0).

Respectfully submitted,

Tracey Coetzee