



RECEIVED
NORTON TOWN CLERK
2023 FEB 16 PM 6:52

NORTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES OF July 26, 2022

The Planning Board Meeting of July 26, 2022 was called to order at the Norton Public Library via Hybrid means over ZOOM at 7:15 p.m. by Mr. Timothy Griffin, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Allen Bouley, Mrs. Laura Parker, Mr. Bill Marr, Mr. Wayne Graf, and Mr. Eric Norris. Mr. Jim Artz is remote. Also, in attendance was Administrative Assistant Bryan Carmichael.

Mr. Griffin explains how hybrid meetings work and how they will affect this meeting.

General Business

Mr. Griffin states going forward with plans such as Wading River Estates and other past decisions that the plan and the plan sheet should be in front of the Board.

Bills & Warrants – Verizon bill has been presented and accepted by the Planning Board.

Minutes – May 24, 2022 Planning Board meeting minutes were submitted.

Mr. Bouley motions to approve the May 24, 2022 meeting minutes and is seconded by Mr. Graf. Roll Call; Mr. Norris Yes, Mr. Marr Yes, Mr. Graf Yes, Mrs. Parker Yes, Mr. Bouley Yes, Mr. Artz Yes, and Mr. Griffin Yes.

**ANR ENDORSEMENT-(15756) 38 Barrows Street Applicant: Michael Trowbridge
Owner: Trustee of Paul Helmreich. Continued from July 19, 2022.**

There is no applicant present to speak on the project.

Mrs. Parker asks to confirm that if the ANR gets approved that they could subdivide further if there is no house on the lot. Mr. Griffin states that in theory if it is a lot without dwelling on it, they could be reduced as long as those new lots also met the conforming dimensions. This would be reviewed at a later date as a new application.

Mr. Mar asks how the Planning Board would know that there isn't another lot on Barrows Street that also doesn't have the required frontage as there are no documents that show that. Mr. Griffin agrees that the documentation for that should be given by the applicant. Mrs. Parker asks if contiguous would mean that it would have to touch the existing lot line. Mr. Griffin reads the bylaw and states that it would seem to imply it shares a boundary and on the same street as opposed to across or at an intersection.

Mrs. Parker motions to endorse the ANR and is seconded by Mr. Bouley. Roll Call; Mr. Norris Yes, Mr. Marr Yes, Mr. Graf Yes, Mrs. Parker Yes, Mr. Bouley Yes, Mr. Artz Yes, and Mr. Griffin Yes.

Public Hearing

SP 12737: 280 South Washington Street. Owner ESA P Properties LLC. Applicant Carroll Advertising LLC. Application for a Special Permit for the construction of a 75' foot tall by 48' feet wide digital billboard. Continued from March 22, 2022, April 5, 2022, and May 24, 2022. Applicant is asking for a continuance to August 30, 2022.

Mr. Griffin asks that next time applicant comes in that they are able to have a timeline beyond August 30th. Mr. Bouley asks to confirm that the application has not opened yet and it is confirmed unopened by Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Bouley motions to continue the application to August 30, 2022 and is seconded by Mrs. Parker. Roll Call; Mr. Norris Yes, Mr. Marr Yes, Mr. Graf Yes, Mrs. Parker Yes, Mr. Bouley Yes, Mr. Artz Yes, and Mr. Griffin Yes.

SP 493: 10 Commerce Way. Request to reimburse the remaining balance from the peer review. SP 472: 0 South Washington Street. Request to reimburse the remaining balance from the peer review. SP 466: 46 Commerce Way. Request to reimburse the remaining balance from the peer review. SP 454A: 60 Commerce Way. Request to reimburse the remaining balance from the peer review.

Mr. Jeff O'Neil with Condyne Development is present to speak on the applications. 10 Commerce Way is a proposed addition that has since expired and has not been built. 0 South Washington Street was the Spears Manufacturing building so they have been occupied and they have gone through a certificate of occupancy and a certificate of compliance with the Conservation Commission. 46 Commerce Way is the NOAA building also received its certificate of occupancy and a certificate of compliance is required on that site. 60 Commerce Way is the Ryder Building at the rear of Commerce Way which received both Certificate of Occupancy and Certificate of Compliance from the Conservation Commission. Mr. O'Neil states he would like to close out the peer review accounts.

Mr. Griffin asks if there is any account worth keeping open in case a project was to come back to life. Mr. O'Neil states he sees no reason for the projects to come back since the properties has since been sold since Condyne ownership and the existing permits have expired.

Motion to reimburse the peer review funds for 10 Commerce Way is made by Mr. Bouley and seconded by Mrs. Parker. Roll Call; Mr. Norris Yes, Mr. Marr Yes, Mr. Graf Yes, Mrs. Parker Yes, Mr. Bouley Yes, Mr. Artz Yes, and Mr. Griffin Yes.

Motion to reimburse the peer review funds for 0 South Washington Street is made by Mr. Bouley and seconded by Mrs. Parker. Roll Call; Mr. Norris Yes, Mr. Marr Yes, Mr. Graf Yes, Mrs. Parker Yes, Mr. Bouley Yes, Mr. Artz Yes, and Mr. Griffin Yes.

Motion to reimburse the peer review funds for 46 Commerce Way is made by Mr. Bouley and seconded by Mrs. Parker. Roll Call; Mr. Norris Yes, Mr. Marr Yes, Mr. Graf Yes, Mrs. Parker Yes, Mr. Bouley Yes, Mr. Artz Yes, and Mr. Griffin Yes.

Motion to reimburse the peer review funds for 60 Commerce Way is made by Mr. Bouley and seconded by Mrs. Parker. Roll Call; Mr. Norris Yes, Mr. Marr Yes, Mr. Graf Yes, Mrs. Parker Yes, Mr. Bouley Yes, Mr. Artz Yes, and Mr. Griffin Yes.

Mr. Griffin asks Mr. O'Neil if there could be another process or if this is the standard process. Mr. O'Neil states that this is standard.

DEF 13932 & SP 14704: 0, 126, 128 & 154 Pine Street and 0 Wood Road.

Owner/Applicant: Norton Land Company, LLC. Application for the creation of 44 lots into a residential cluster subdivision. Continued from May 10, 2022, May 24, 2022, June 21, 2022, and June 28, 2022.

Mr. Bob Forbes of Zenith Consulting Engineers states that Horsley Witten has reviewed the Balfour Farms plans and has not had the chance to review the comments made by Horsley Witten at the time of last meeting. The engineering aspects have been updated on the plans but not the traffic or environmental at present. The updated plans have not been submitted back to Horsley Witten and the reason for that is that it can be adjusted if this is something the Planning Board will want. Mr. Forbes states he will give everything to Horsley Witten after the traffic and environmental studies have been updated so it will be one fully updated plan. Mr. Forbes states he had looked into the lot size of the conventional plans as Mr. Marr had asked about it and some of the lots were off by a few hundred feet and they have been adjusted. Mr. Forbes states that Mr. Griffin had asked him to look into parcels A, B, and C. Mr. Forbes states those parcels were made at the interdepartmental meeting to review and was asked to keep a few stormwater basins hanging out onto the open space and had to put those onto a lot. Mr. Forbes has added parcels A, B, and C to adjacent lots not changing any of the open space. Mr. Forbes states that Ms. Claire Hoozeboom had gone to the Conservation Commission for a meeting, prior to the hearing there were additional comments were submitted by Horsley Witten but those comments were not available at the meeting but nothing that can't be dealt with relatively soon. Discussed was the possibility of hooking up the project into the existing sanitary sewer system and were encouraged by the Water and Sewer department to do so and the applicant since the last meeting has decided to tie the subdivision into the existing sanitary sewer system so there will be no subsurface septic systems on the site. Mr. Forbes states that a memo from the Water Department was received stating that adding the lots had the possibility of helping the water quality on Pine Street. Mr. Forbes explains that it is because the sediment that is forming in the pipes is not getting light to move through it but the more the water moves the more the sediment does not settle in the pipes. This is because of the low amount of use of the pipes on Pine Street as stated in the memo that the sediment settles and when the pipes are flushed or the hydrant is used it kicks up the sediment in the pipes. The Fire Department had concerns about some of the roadway geometry and has addressed all the Fire Department concerns with the entrance to the site and exceeded what was asked for. The representative of Horsley Witten, Ms. Janet Bernardo had written that additional test pits had to be done to look at soil conditions and a couple of spots on the site and

how that relates to the stormwater design. Recently the test pits were done that were requested. They are putting together the environmental impact statement that is required which originally had a waiver on it which is still only in draft form. Mr. Forbes states that the traffic engineer is present at this meeting to address traffic concerns. Jeffery Dirk is on the Zoom call from Vanasse who did the review and Mr. Jack Gillon who is the traffic engineer for Horsley Witten and is reviewing the project.

Mrs. Parker asks if Mr. Forbes is planning on looping the water to change direction and alter the flow rate like it is suggested in the Water Department's letter. Mr. Forbes states that there is no intent to make a loop at this time but has been talking with the Water Department.

Mr. Griffin states he wanted to go more deeply into the Water Department letter later in the meeting to have it summarized all at once and asks Mr. Forbes about the ACEC regulations mentioned at the Conservation meeting and how that would have an impact on the project with Conservation. Mr. Forbes states that it is the most important issue for the applicant at this point. Ms. Hoogeboom, the environmental consultant for the applicant states that the update for Conservation and have opened up the public hearing with Conservation and discussed all the comments from Horsley Witten and the main comment was the regulatory compliance of the project wetland fill in an ACEC or Area of Critical Environmental Concern. In the application it was noted that they have peer reviewed a project in the neighboring town that proposed a similar project, a subdivision with fill and ACEC concerns which they consulted with DEP about the project who commented that the regulations generally are applied to allow that fill with the ACEC for any limited project. The supplemental information provided to the Conservation Commission will be sure to include more information there and try to work that out. Mr. Griffin states that this is something that has to be worked out with both the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission. Ms. Hoogeboom states that it is a high priority and will make sure that item is taken care of before they can get too far.

Mr. Marr asks about the Conservation meeting and about doing another wetland study after the spring rains the next year and if that would be completed shortly as Mr. Forbes suggests. Ms. Hoogeboom asks what Mr. Marr is referring to with the spring rains. Mr. Marr explains that there haven't been wetlands review that has been done in the spring but there was one done in the fall with the previous Conservation Commissioner. Mr. Marr continues that when asked about the status of the wetlands after spring rains and Ms. Hoogeboom states that one had not been done and heard the Conservation Commission had wanted one done next spring. Ms. Hoogeboom states that Mr. Marr may be referring to another parcel on Pine Street. Ms. Hoogeboom states that at the meeting she was tasked to return to the site for a wildlife habit evaluation for the BVW impacts. So, she is focused on identifying the features within the proposed wetland crossing and one of the Commission members had asked to look for a potential alternative from Briggs Street and do a wildlife study of the alternative roadway layout and Horsley Witten requested confirmation if there was a stream channel in the wetland where the crossing is. Ms. Hoogeboom had returned to the site to get more information on that and have a response. When the ANRAD was done for the project, it was done in the springtime and that is when they did their vernal pool survey. Mr. Marr states he will look back at the meeting to hear what was said. Ms. Hoogeboom states that they will get in contact with the Conservation

Commissioner to confirm what was said at the meeting. Mr. Griffin states he will try and communicate better with Conservation.

Mr. Marr states that Mr. Forbes wants to tie into the sewer and asks if it would be coming in off of South Washington Street. Mr. Forbes states it is off of Briggs Street and there is being a survey done to locate that sewer and give more information on sewer as there was no intention of tying into it until a week prior. The surveyor was out on site locating the sewer and Mr. Forbes will have updates for it in the next meeting. Mr. Marr states that Briggs Street is not near either sewer street for access and would probably lead to drilling under wetlands. Mr. Forbes states that he is working with the applicant to know more about the sewer and states that there is a possibility that may avoid the drilling under the wetlands. Mr. Forbes states that there is no body of water that runs through the whole site so there may be space to drill. Mr. Forbes states that all of the wetland crossing was done as they were asked to do it by the Conservation Commission as there were originally no wetland crossings until then.

Mrs. Parker asks about the potential sewer tie in on Briggs Street and asks to make sure Mr. Forbes has been in contact with the engineer for the Alternative Transportation Committee to make sure there is no disturbance to the rail trail. Mr. Forbes states he was put in contact and had a back in forth email conversation with the Alternative Transportation Committee so they are aware of what is happening. Mrs. Parker asks if sewer was brought up to them. Mr. Forbes states that the conversation with the Alternative Transportation Committee was prior to the decision for sewer. Mr. Forbes states he'll let them know about the sewer plans and that there will have to be easements for whatever goes up there which may make better walking trails there as everything will be underground.

Mr. Jack Dillon, the traffic engineer working with the applicant speaks on his findings. Mr. Dillon states he was able to read the Horsley Witten peer review which he found helpful and saw nothing out of the ordinary in the review. The average daily traffic on Pine Street is about just over 800 vehicles a day and looked at what the project may generate on the land use code. The average speed was about 29 miles per hour with an 85% percental speed of 34 miles per hour which is what is used for calculating site distance. The capacity calculations of Pine Street intersection were calculated and found the levels of service changed the original noticeable additional delay approved to this project. The next intersection that will be looked at is the intersection at Pine Street and Crane Street which was asked by the peer reviewer.

Mr. Griffin asks if there are any state data sets on the intersection of Crane Street and Pine Street available. Mr. Dillon states that there are no data sets from the state available. Mr. Griffin states that the area is close to a school so it is challenging to get a peak school time traffic study during the summer. Mr. Dillon states he'll go back and see when the count was taken. Mr. Griffin states that the other studies were when school was in session but a follow-up in the summer would be challenging to record. Mr. Dillon states he will try to find a before and after accounts so if he were to do it in August, he could compare the site in August to when school for L. G. Nourse and Wheaton College is in session.

Mr. Dillon states he had looked at the crash data for the area on the Mass DOT website for years prior to Covid and will look at the crashes and compare them to the rate of crashes to see if they

are a high crash location. Mr. Dillon states that Horsley Witten asks that he speak with the Planning Department, the Highway Department, and Mass DOT to see if there is anything missing that would affect a greater area by either being something approved or a bridge being closed. The trip generation report on different editions depending on how they come out and did the trip generation the 10th and will use the land use code that will be shipped off. The trip directional distribution will be done after the new count and will look over the roadway improvements or changes that would affect the traffic and that would affect the directional distribution. The traffic analysis includes the Pine Street and Crane Street intersection. The crash rate will also be compared to the district average and state average. The sightline is a little trickier because of how difficult it is to see and will be laid out within the next week and they're going to be going about they're going to take a look at that will take a look without a site engineer to put that all on plan. They have the roadways going to have those go to the properties are where the sight line would have to look and then a profile to see if the road can be seen from over the driver's seat. Mr. Dillon states that Horsley Witten had asked for the controls of both of the proposed roads that will be put in place. Horsley Witten had asked Mr. Dillon to look into a way to keep the roads maintained for the future either through a homeowner's association or making it into a public street and will work with the town to come to a conclusion.

Mr. Griffin asks if there is anything in place for pedestrian safety as there are no sidewalks on the road. Mr. Dillon states there are no pedestrian sidewalks at present but there is a bike trail from the road currently there. Mr. Griffin states it is relatively walked despite that. Mr. Dillon states he will look into it.

Mr. Marr states that during review of the traffic study the line across the road to count the number of cars was at about 154 Pine Street at the site of one of the proposed streets. Mr. Marr continues stating that the information seems to point that every vehicle coming from Route 123 or Plain Street and travel down Pine Street to go home before 154 Pine Street was not counted and not included in the study. Similarly, people who travel on Crane Street which won't go by 154 Pine Street to Interstate 140 or if they are going to the Taunton Industrial Park are also not counted. Only if they travel the entire street would they be counted for the traffic study. Mr. Dillon states that is true and chose 154 Pine Street to have an understanding of the traffic past the proposed site. Mr. Dillon explains that the reason that when recording the morning peak hours and the evening peak hours which are caught with the machine and Mr. Dillon had sat and kept count of the cars going by at the peak hours in 15-minute increments. The two highest fifteen-minute intervals were put together to get the peak hour. Mr. Dillon states it wasn't counted but was included as the machine itself had collected data at the intersection for the analysis. The manual count had captured the intersection of 154 Pine Street and Plain Street and did that on the analysis. Mr. Dillon restates he didn't capture the whole street at the peak hours but was captured at the intersection of 154 Pine Street and Plain Street. Mr. Marr asks if someone was there counting cars with a clicker. Mr. Dillon confirms that there was. Mr. Marr asks to confirm that the study was done when Wheaton College was not in session and if L. G. Nourse was in session. Mr. Dillon states he knew the Wheaton seniors were gone and wasn't sure if everyone else was gone at the time but it was active when the field work was being done but will look to see if they were in session at the time of the research. Mr. Dillon also states he saw Norton school buses when he was doing his analysis. Mr. Marr states there is an elementary school on Plain Street and will not be open in August.

Mr. Bouley asks how are delivery services taken into account on this type of project. Mr. Dillon states that he uses data provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and will give ITE any new data when made. ITE run the analytics of the site and determine what the trip generation is with the project based on the use. Mr. Dillon states that the large approach is taken which is what is the land use and how much traffic came and went in that area. This includes all trips types and if there are that many studies with that many units there will be a high level of confidence in the refresh analysis on how good the data is. Mr. Bouley asks when all the delivery services come by, they are counted. Mr. Dillon confirms they are counted. Mr. Griffin states that the more Amazon delivery services that come the higher the count for the analysis. Mr. Dillon states that they know trucks go over there but don't know where they are going just that they went by and will an estimation on it as to whether or not they come back. Mr. Dillon explains that Amazon for example for six or seven single family homes a delivery driver will make a route so they only have to go through the area once.

Mr. Jeffery Dirk the managing partner with Vanasse & Associates and serving as the Planning Board's peer review consultant for this project. Mr. Dirk states that Mr. Dillon has gone through the peer review comments which he will provide a response to at a later date. Mr. Dirk states he is looking for additional data collection and analysis. Mr. Dirk states that they have not presented the Planning Board with any recommendations or additional conditions because the Planning Board and Vanasse are not there yet. Mr. Dirk explains that the traffic study provided is not sufficient enough to make recommendations on for the Planning Board to make recommendations or to have an opinion on the adequacy of the infrastructure to accommodate the project. Mr. Dirk states that the project is in-between route 123 and Route 44 so Pine Street is a cut through between those two roadways and the applicant had done a study to the north of the site which is reflective of traffic that is headed towards 123 but there is no study on the intersection to the south which would give the volumes toward Route 44. Mr. Dirk notes as Mr. Marr mentioned the road review is at the project site but the volumes heading to Route 123 or Route 44 or the traffic patterns are not being recorded. The is why you want a record of both sides of a project site so you can capture the full scope of traffic patterns and volumes for it is important to measure both speed and volume of traffic at the project site as a data point. Most importantly is to understand the speed of traffic as it relates to the sight distance measurements. The data points for the site are important but still needed is the data point information on either side of the site as well to see the change in the traffic patterns that happen heading toward those two primary destinations on either side of the site which is why the other intersection is to be added as that is the decision point to the salvage site. The other thing it does is it shows the distribution of traffic which they will need to show how much traffic is going to Route 123 and how much is going to Route 44. The data points are needed to see how the existing traffic are distributing themselves to the north and south of the site and if they are reflective of the existing traffic patterns. Two other points for the project that shouldn't be focused on are the traffic numbers that they've said net increases in traffic as they relate to how much traffic the project is going to generate which needs to be revised for two reasons the first is for delivery drivers and how they affect the trip generation given the current rules for how to incorporate them into the data as new numbers to redo the trip generation with the new edition of how trip generations are to be recorded. The data as the traffic engineer had done assumed attached two units so it is as if someone were looking at duplexes. What has been proposed is single family residential, the

traffic characteristics for attached units are either multi-family attached or duplexes is different than a single-family home. Traffic going to single family homes are much higher averaging nine to ten trips on a daily basis per residential unit development depending on the type can generate somewhere between six-to-seven-unit trips per unit. That one change will change the impacts as they relate to the development which may not be significant delays at intersections but the percent increase in traffic as it relates to the amount of traffic on the roadway will be different than what was seen in the original traffic study. The motor vehicle crash analysis is Mass DOT standards and traditional or typical traffic engineering standards is not only is a number of crashes and the type of crashes not only that but the crash frequency as it relates to the amount of traffic on a roadway. So, if there is a roadway with one crash but has low traffic volumes. The number of crashes to the volume of traffic on the roadway might be relatively high because it would suggest that if the traffic is low, you shouldn't have a significant number of crashes on the roadway. When traffic volume is higher such as a highway with 50,000 drivers a day with 20-30 crashes per year. For Pine Street if the number of vehicles is 800 daily and there are five crashes a year. The frequency of the volume of crashes in relation to the volume of traffic might be disproportionate and what is looked at is not the number of crashes but the crash rate which is calculated by the number of crashes per million vehicles on the roadway. The crash rate is compared to the state average that is published by the Mass DOT. The applicant has quantified the crashes but the frequency of crashes is also needed as it relates to the traffic on the roadway to see if it is disproportionate so they will undertake the calculations that were suggested when the applicant's engineer affirm that they are going to do that crash frequency analysis and then comparing the crash rate to Mass DOT's average will then come back and relates to the roadway. Lastly what they will need is a sightline analysis that is critical no matter the number of units. It needs to be synched with the new access points that they are providing and heard from the applicant's engineer talk about vegetation along the roadways. The amount of clearing for sight lines needs to be provided for vehicles that are driving along Pine Street which needs to be put on the sight plans both on the plan view to see how to increase clear sight and in vertical view for height of visibility and if objects would be blocking the line of sight. Mr. Dirk expects the applicant to make comments on the peer review. There are a few comments relative to the site plans such as the turning analysis for the fire department design vehicle both entering the project site from Pine Street as well as exiting back onto Pine Street as Pine Street is between 23 and 24 feet in width at the project site is located this turning analysis is going to need to demonstrate that the fire truck is able to make the swings and stay within the pavement area. Looking at the slope of the profile of Germain Way what Horsley Witten wants is when they are coming into an intersection both within the site or coming out to Pine Street you want to have a level in your area so you never want a steep grade and then a sudden change in the roadway because you're trying to come down and stop an intersection during the winter time to get a leveling area to get the vehicle down to the stop position and then stop the vehicle and recover if you're sliding the fact the leveling area provides for that but the leveling area is also for sight lines. As you don't want to be on a grade and then pull into the roadway and have to try to accelerate so the applicant's engineer was asked to go back and look at the grades to confirm that they have a leveling area where the slope is no more than two percent for a minimum of 25 feet with an ideal of 50 feet with 25 feet is one car length and 50 feet is two car lengths. In particular looking at both the internal intersections as well as coming out to Pine Street to have that leveling area.

Mr. Griffin states that he thought the grade of the sight had been mentioned by the Fire Department and other departments as well. Mr. Griffin states that additionally there is Wheaton College and the L. G. Nourse school in the area which are currently not in session in terms of methodology to adjust the data to account for that which it would be six weeks until the schools are back in session. Mr. Griffin asks if Mr. Dirk feels that an adjusted rate would be able to accurately factor in the traffic while school is in session. Mr. Dirk states that there is no perfect answer and would normally look at historic traffic counts and would be able to use that as the basis of any adjustment. The issue becomes trying to account for those adjustments it isn't just the volume of traffic it is traffic patterns. If people are using specific roads as cut throughs as a result of congestion and that congestion occurs because of school pick-up or drop-off activities, which the adjustments may not account for it so it is difficult to try and adjust volumes. To the extent that the applicant wants to collect data while the schools are not in session. Methodology and adjusts will be looked at and also the traffic count they perform at the project site. When they measure at their site that will be a data point and then the traffic counts to the north and Plain Street, if the adjustments are not reflective of what is seen in the traffic patterns at those locations which are measured when schools were in session. Then they'll need to be redone so it is something the applicant can proceed with. They will need to need to look at their data and data that is already existing to make sure that the adjustments are reflective of the patterns at the other intersections. If there is no historic data for the traffic with schools that could impact the study then Mr. Dirk recommends, they wait for September to make the traffic study.

Mrs. Parker asks in regards to T5 in his letter that references roadway improvement projects and if it includes just improvements or would it include things such as a sewer project on Elm Street as that would change the traffic patterns of the area in the future. Mr. Dirk states that improvement projects are an overgeneralization as they don't necessarily result in an improvement in capacity. It isn't just roadway improvement projects it is any project that would result in an alteration of traffic volume or trip patterns in the area so if there is a detour that causes traffic patterns or volumes that change. So, it isn't just traffic volume it is changes in traffic patterns as it encompasses anything that alters a capacity, traffic volumes, or trip patterns.

Mr. Griffin states that he will summarize the letter written by the Water Department detailing their opinion on the project. Well One and increased activity at this area are not specifically linked as it is more of a discussion of overall volume. The federal funding coming in is going to well replacements for Well Numbers 4, 5, and 6 which are the largest in Norton. They would look to limit the use of Well One and Well 3 after that point once the well replacements were complete. In Frank Fournier, the Water Commissioner's opinion they feel that some of the water quality issues on Pine Street are linked to irregular flow demands based on the size of the pipe going back twenty years when the strategy was to put in big pipes so they didn't have to take out a small pipe and replace it with a big pipe later but that made excess capacity in those pipes. When there is not enough flow it will settle. In the Water Commissioner's opinion of is it more development in that area would increase flows and potentially improve the water quality. The sewer was discussed in the letter as well. Mr. Griffin offers to go to a Water/Sewer Department hearing and ask the engineers directly.

Mr. Marr states he understands that the goal is to use the federal money to get larger supplies of water for the Town. Mr. Griffin states that it is to replace Wells 4, 5, & 6 which are the largest

wells. Mr. Marr asks what if what the wells they end up replacing isn't larger than the ones they already have. Mr. Marr states that based on the letter Norton will have more water because of the federal money but is it something that should press the one. Mr. Griffin states that is the goal and if there is excess than it can be given to someone else and that the Water Department has looked at groundwater tables. Mr. Bouley states that from past meetings it isn't about finding new water it is replacing the wells, such as the well heads being damaged or a pipe needs to be replaced. Mr. Bouley states the last one that was replaced was close to the existing one so several times the money is used to drill the new well and the new piping units. Mr. Griffin states he would like to have a Water System Design Standard or have a sort of model of what is supposed to be happening with flow that is usually there on a street to help visualize what the ideal pipe system is. Mr. Griffin states that if this is an improvement in water quality than that is something that the Planning Board can look at.

Mrs. Parker notes in the letter written from the Water Department that "the contractor may loop to the water main on Pine Street to Briggs Street which would change the direction of the flow and the flow rate" which is great for Pine Street but Mrs. Parker's concern is would the change in direction cause new issues at the other end of the line for whoever sits there. Mr. Griffin states that are another further question if everything is connected, Mr. Griffin states he is not qualified to answer the question. Mr. Griffin states he will ask the Water Commissioner at one of their meetings.

Mr. Eugene Roberto of 55 Pine Street speaks on his concerns of traffic as he heard the average speed from the traffic engineer was 39 mph and is skeptical on how accurate the average speed is. Mr. Roberto adds Pine Street is a major cut through from Route 123 and a lot of the Industrial Park traffic goes through there. There is also the concern of not just the water quality but the water capacity and currently there is a water ban and Mr. Roberto asks how the development will affect the capacity.

Mr. Bob Butler of 133 Pine Street said he has several concerns and some have been brought up to the Conservation Commission. First, the notice of intent is being looked at as a complete project when it is part of a larger project. This project is on one side of Pine Street when the owner owns more land on the other side of the street. The lots not being used will still impact calculations on the BVW alteration within the ACEC and the applicant stated to the Pine Street abutters that they would like to build 20 more homes on the other side of the street. Mr. Butler continues stating that they would have to build through or over the BVWs and is concerned that this is being done to avoid bringing in the Army Corp of Engineers for the total project. Mr. Griffin states that project segmentation was something that was discussed at Conservation and by the peer reviewer. Mr. Butler states it was and that there is a discrepancy in the number of acres on the parcels, the applicant is stating 105 acres and it is showing 136 acres on the accessor maps and that this is important for the open space calculation which said they have 53.4 acres for open space and the applicant has not stated how much of the open space is non-wetlands. Mr. Butler continues that it is stated in the bylaw for the Cluster subdivision must 35% of the acreage not including wetlands. Mr. Griffin confirms that is the case and states that the applicant hasn't responded to the peer-reviewed comments and writing yet that would confirm. Mr. Butler states he looked at the Mass Habitat of Rare Species map and doesn't see anything on the parcels but there is a portion of land on the parcels that falls under it on the west side of Pine Street and

abuts the pond or brook that is running through the parcels notice of intent which is close to the priority habitat. Mr. Griffin states that they are doing the wildlife review as part of the project. Mr. Butler asks if the wildlife review is in addition to the environmental impact statement or if they are separate. Mr. Butler states he hasn't seen a plan for the West side of Pine Street where Rumford and Wading Rivers flow into the Three Mile River and this is ACEC and if there is a lot of wildlife, Native American historical sites, and if there is any possibility that the Norton Land Preservation Society would be interested in purchasing or acquiring any of the land that has been slated for development. Mr. Griffin states it is something they could evaluate and that some of the land has been for sale for a while. Mr. Butler states that there is preservation land over by the Rumford and Wading Rivers. Mr. Butler asks whether the sewer line will be connected only on Briggs Street. Mr. Griffin states that in his opinion it is too early in the design to tell what they are looking to do with it. Mr. Butler asks what the price is if Pine Street has to hook up to sewer and who would be paying the hook up costs. Mr. Butler continues stating that his home is below street level and is unsure if that is a concern. Mrs. Parker states in the last paragraph of Mr. Fournier's letter it states that there are no plans by the Water/Sewer Department on the table to add sewer to Pine Street. Mr. Butler asks if the traffic study mentioned about Wheaton not being in session and if there was anything mentioned about Pine Street and the Route 123 intersection as it could take several minutes to get out during commuting time and asks if it should be looked at since there look like there are going to be development projects coming up on Pine Street and it will increase the traffic. Mr. Griffin states that one was of the points made by the peer reviewer for traffic was to coordinate with both the Planning and Economic Development as well as Highway and Mass DOT to confirm not only potential roadway impacts but additional development impacts as well. Mr. Butler asks how will construction impact Pine Street's water quality as they install the new water mains with the proposed 44 lots, will there be sediment issues during the construction when they have to rely on Well One. Mr. Butler continues stating that the Water Superintendent stated that the water may improve with increased water demand but that isn't confirmed. Mr. Butler continues stating that the Norton water quality report for 2021 was in violation on PTHMS. Mr. Griffin agrees that there won't be an argument on that point. Mr. Butler states that storm water is a concern as there is a stream or brook that runs under from the east side of Pine Street to Germain Way. It is a constant stream and it actually flows down into a pond and then through a dam and then down to the Three Mile River. Mr. Griffin states that Stormwater being part of the process and that is something the peer reviewer engineers will look at and the applicants can't have more outflow off of the site than they do in a no build condition so they have to be equal to or less than what is the outflow off the site in a storm water event.

Ms. Hooageboom states that the environmental statement is more in response to the Planning Board's requirements for the subdivision application from her understanding. The wildlife habitat evaluation is something requested by the Conservation Commission because of the wetland fill and a wildlife evaluation is required under the wetlands protection act if you exceed any of the thresholds of impacting a resource area and are under the 5000 square foot threshold for impacting ordering vegetative wetlands or BVW. Since they are requesting approval under a limited project and it is within an ACEC the Conservation Commission has the discretion to request the wildlife evaluation and they will do that and evaluate the Wetland Crossing itself and in addition to that the provisions of the limited project application require a level of an alternative analysis. Ms. Hooageboom states that they had provided a certain level of that in the

application but the commission did request further alternatives analysis to be provided with the wildlife habitat evaluation and that'll look at a potential alternative from Briggs Street.

Mr. Peter Berard of 121 Pine Street asks about if there is increased use in the water that it would make the water clearer. Mr. Griffin states it is what the Water Superintendent has stated. Mr. Berard asks if Wells 4, 5, and 6 and if they limit the use of Well One. Mr. Griffin states it will. Mr. Berard states that if Well One then everyone who uses the well it will be black water and the contaminants are going to remain even if they increase the use. Mr. Griffin states that the goal of the Water Commissioner is to expand Wells 4, 5, and 6 as much as possible so there can be as much water running through the filtration system as possible and can't speak for the capacity of Well One. Mr. Berard states that if Well One kicks back on it will be unclean water. Mr. Berard states that in the traffic report it is saying that there will be 22 more cars a day. Mr. Griffin states that the initial traffic report needs to be revised and the 22 cars a day may change. Mr. Berard states that with the 44 houses they should be having more cars than the 22 and there should be more if they proceed with another project. Mr. Berard continues that Route 123 is going to be the area that should be studied for the traffic impact study. Mr. Berard states he would rather not have a traffic light at the intersection. Mr. Griffin states that the traffic study peer reviewer will look at the study and see what improvements are needed.

Ms. Kelly Salvati of 151 Pine Street states she agrees with the statements about the Route 123 intersection not being safe. Ms. Salvati asks about the change in sight lines when they talked about traffic impact does the changes that will be required need to go back to the Conservation Commission for environmental disturbances. Mr. Griffin states that they would be a part of the plans that they would review and approve. Mr. Griffin continues that one of the points was in terms of maintenance and this project is looking to have a homeowner's association or some other group that will be responsible for maintenance for potentially the open space or some other areas which would be specified in the agreement. Ms. Salvati states that in the letter from the Water Superintendent that residents had the opportunity to purchase the land at some point and asks what it meant by that as she feels it was an unnecessary comment. Mr. Griffin states that all the members of the Board have their own thoughts and opinions on all the materials that are being reviewed.

Mr. Casey Loring of 141 Pine Street states that he agrees with the traffic intersection at Route 123 is a problem and should be looked at as well as doing the traffic study again for the schools not being in session and the 22-car addition not sounding right. Mr. Loring states from the Water Superintendent's letter that the old way of thinking was to make the water mains big and that is why they are stagnant. Recently the water mains on Pine Street were just replaced two years ago. Mr. Griffin states he can't speak on what pipes were replaced. Mr. Loring adds that the water mains that were replaced should be size appropriate. Mr. Loring states that the safety for schools is important as well and what any additional developments would mean for the current size of the schools and the staffing of the schools. Mr. Loring states he had watched the previous Conservation Commission meeting and thought the peer reviewer stated that they expected 4600 Square feet of wetland impacts and would exceed the 5000 square feet of work which would trigger additional permits and maybe the Army Corp of Engineers. Mr. Griffin states that everything is reflected on the plans and there isn't just an approval of the plans and trusts that everything happens as it is a lot of peer reviews there are on-site visits for specific aspects of the

plan to verify the erosion controls are in place and those things are followed up on and the Building Commissioner has the authority stop a project if they aren't being followed. Mr. Loring states that currently this project is being applied for a limited project at the Conservation meetings and one of the members of the Conservation Commission had said if there was an additional access possible to get to that tract of land then they wouldn't be able to use the site as a limited project and maybe that one isn't ideal for the project. Mr. Griffin states that the ACDC is something that is not checked then the project doesn't happen and that would require a redesign of everything, but as mentioned the previous Conservation Commissioner had asked them to do that. Mr. Loring states that it will go beyond the Conservation Commission and go through the DEP and wetland protection acts and that both options don't look well that could be at Pine Street.

Ms. Ellen Turner of 145 Pine Street states that there are many pedestrians and cyclists going through Pine Street. Ms. Turner states that with Mr. Butler that there was an endangered species study and that monarch butterflies are an endangered species and if they would be looked at in the species study. Mr. Griffin states he knows they are doing the wildlife review, in terms of the monarch butterfly specifically Massachusetts has a list of endangered species and if the monarch is on the list, then the state will oversee it.

Ms. Susan Berard of 121 Pine Street states she is a walker on the street. Ms. Berard states that they cannot walk in the grass because of poison ivy by the side of the road and potentially adding another 100 cars is dangerous to walk with.

Mr. Roberto suggests for the traffic study there is a speed limit sign on Reservoir Street and on top of it there is a radar that reads speed limits and possibly have that on Pine Street as it makes people more aware of their speeds. Mr. Griffin states some are mobile and some are permanent. Mr. Roberto suggests a permeant sign. Mr. Bouley states those would be suggestions to the peer reviewer. Mr. Griffin agrees and states it would be round 2 or 3 of discussions.

Mr. Griffin asks Mr. Forbes when he would next be available. Mr. Forbes states that a month from now would be good. Mr. Griffin gives the choice of August 16th and August 30th. Mr. Forbes states he would rather have more time and goes with the 30th of August. Mr. Bouley asks when the next Conservation Commission meeting is. Ms. Hooageboom states it is August 8th.

Mr. Bouley makes the motion to continue the hearing to August 30, 2022 and is seconded by Mr. Graf. Roll Call; Mr. Norris Yes, Mr. Marr. Yes, Mr. Graf Yes, Mrs. Parker Yes, Mr. Bouley Yes, Mr. Artz Yes, and Mr. Griffin Yes.

Mr. Bouley asks Mr. Griffin if the Planning Board will try to get Mr. Fournier to come and speak at a Planning Board meeting. Mr. Griffin states he will talk with Mr. Fournier at a Water/Sewer department meeting or will have Mr. Fournier come to a Planning Board meeting.

General Business

Mr. Griffin states that in the peer review for the Pine Street project that the Planning Department will be sending in projects to them that could impact the project. Mr. Griffin asks if Mr.

Carmichael needs help with that as he is the only member in the Planning Department office. Mr. Carmichael states he believes he can handle it. Mr. Bouley states that the other parcel mentioned of Pine Street is going in for an ANRAD. Mr. Marr adds that the ANR for 0 Crane Street is creating lots in Pine Street. Mr. Griffin asks Mr. Carmichael to tell the applicant and the peer reviewer about the projects. Mr. Marr states there have been some test holes dug in between 126 Pine Street and 82 Pine Street.

Adjournment

The motion to adjourn the July 26, 2022 meeting was done by Mr. Bouley and seconded by Mr. Norris. Roll Call; Mr. Norris Yes, Mr. Marr Yes, Mr. Graf Yes, Mrs. Parker Yes, Mr. Bouley Yes, Mr. Artz Yes, and Mr. Griffin Yes. The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 pm.

Minutes prepared and submitted by Bryan Carmichael, Department of Planning and Economic Development Administrative Assistant.

Minutes Approved on: January 17, 2023

Signature


