



Regular Meeting and Public Hearings

Monday, March 12, 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: Holly Robert (HR)

(NB) Chair called the meeting to order at 7:04pm.

Meeting Minutes

Motion (HS) seconded (RJ) to accept the minutes with one correction, of Feb. 6, 2012, vote 4-0 unanimous. Correction is to change, on pg.2 bottom #7, only “left” turn to only “right” turn.

Temp. Acc.Use Apt.

Renewal- 46 Brooks Road, owners Karen Hyson and Heather Larson. All documents and fees have been submitted.

Motion (HS) seconded (RJ) to renew the TAUA for 46 Brooks Road. Vote 4-0 unanimous.

Renewal- 112 Holden Road, owner Luis Yopez. All documents and fee have been submitted.

Motion (WB) seconded (RJ) to renew the TAUA for 112 Brooks Road. Vote 4-0 unanimous.

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 April 9th meeting. A signed continuance is on file expiring on April 30th, 2012.

Public Hearing Continuance

Amendments to the Paxton Stormwater Bylaw and Regulations. (HR) Suggested adding definitions for Storm Water and Storm Water Discharge, an expansion on the definition for Illicit Discharge, an addition of a requirement for an Illicit Discharge Statement, an addition of a requirement relating to methodology for delineation of wetlands on plans and an addition of an exemption for timber harvesting. (WB) What is Sec. 40-46 referring to in Ch.132 MGL? (HR) Cutting plans.

(RJ) What is the correct way for Storm Water? Is it Storm Water or Stormwater? All agreed to use it as two words to be consistent. (HR) Carol Riches had responded to me namely about the Illicit Discharge additions. An engineer working for the town advised us to cover the minimum requirements for the bylaw for now until a new MS4 permit is finalized. Also, an Illicit Discharge and Detention Bylaw may be forthcoming in the future once the new permit is introduced. (NB) I suggest we go with the suggestions from Carol R. and the addition of the forestry exemption.

Motion (RJ) seconded (HS) to accept the modifications to the Storm Water Bylaw and Regulations listed as:

- 1. Add definitions of Storm Water (as two words), Storm Water Discharge and Illicit Discharge.**
- 2. Add requirement relating to the methodology for delineation of wetlands on plans to the Regulations only.**
- 3. Add Exemption for timber harvesting to the Bylaw only.**
- 4. All other changes recommended by the Attorney General's office and Town Administrator.**

Vote 4-0 unanimous in favor.

New Business

Discussion on Suomi St. lots, 61, 71 and 75 Suomi St. Currently for sale and bank owned. Questions have been asked of the TSC recently as to the buildableness of the lots. An ANR from 2007 was shown to the board. SL was asked to check with Assessors office if lot #4 (61 Suomi) is considered buildable. It only has 50 ft. of frontage. The other two lots are fine.

(In further research after the meeting, lot #4 (61 Suomi) is buildable and meets all zoning requirements. See PZB 4.4.7 Rear Lots, Assessors office was notified.)

Discussion on Lots 1 and 2 on Davis Hill Rd., Clark and Mott, owners. Recently, site work has taken place on these lots and the wetland delineations have had to be redone. They have gone before the Conservation Comm. for this. Does the ANR become invalid since nothing has been built on the sites yet? (NB) Will take a copy of the plan to Kevin Quinn to discuss with him.

Old Business

Solar Bylaw discussion. (WB) Greg Destasi and I have discussed this completely and he agrees that a bylaw is needed. He explained how the system in Paxton works, one way in not out. Power can come in but it cannot be sent out if there is excess from a solar array. A system that would not be connected to the grid in Paxton would be a different issue, which is the reason for the bylaw, to allow the town to have a say in what comes in to town. Greg also mentioned that the lines in Paxton are not good enough to handle a large output of power. The system wasn't designed for it. The solar applicant would have to run lines to wherever would connect to them, most likely out of town, Worcester possibly. The cost would make this highly unlikely. (NB) We should move forward on this if possible so we will do what is needed for the next meeting to get this bylaw on the town warrant.

Next meeting will be on Monday, April 9, 2012.

Motion (RJ) seconded (WB) to adjourn the meeting at 8:11pm, vote 4-0, unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheryl Lombardi