

**Office of
Kingston Planning Board**
Town House
26 Evergreen Street
Kingston, Massachusetts 02364

**PLANNING BOARD September 28, 2009
Planning Board Meeting Minutes**

Members Present: Dave Gavigan, Dennis Randall, Tom Bouchard, Ron Gleason , Mike Ruprecht, Susan Boyer and Tom Bott, Town Planner

7:05 p.m. – Meeting Opened

The board reviewed the minutes of July 13, 2009

Motion: Ron Gleason to approve minutes as amended of July 13, 2009

Second: David Gavigan

Vote: 5-0-0

The board reviewed the minutes of August 17, 2009

Motion: David Gavigan to approve minutes as amended of August 17, 2009

Second: Ron Gleason

Vote: 4-0-0

The board reviewed the minutes of September 14, 2009

Motion: Ron Gleason to approve minutes as amended of July 14, 2009

Second: David Gavigan

Vote 5-0-0

7:15 p.m. – Amendments to Kingston Smart Growth Design Standards & Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land

Motion: David Gavigan to approve extension to November 26, 2009 at 7:05 p.m.

Second: Mike Ruprecht

Vote: 5-0-0

7:20 pm – 40R Smart Growth Site Plan Hearing 1021 Kingston’s Place (Geisinger)

Motion: Ron Gleason to dispense with the reading of the notice

Second: Dennis Randall

Voted 5-0-0

David Eastridge, Lindsay Wilson, Lloyd Geisinger, and Stephen Smith (consultant) were present as representatives of 1021 Kingston’s Place. Stephen Smith addresses the board regarding the study of ground water investigation and modeling. They looked at 3 models and their impact of increasing the flow of water to Smelt Brook. They studied 5 installed wells and checked 111 other wells to find the flow of water from the development. They found that the water under the 40R flows to the NE not toward smelt pond. They looked at the impact of well, irrigation & treated waste water and added storm water to this to establish the expected increase flow to Smelt Brook. They then looked at the Option A, B, & C for the placement of the holding ponds in the development and which will add the most additional flow to Smelt Brook. Option A was the best location to accomplish this, fit the site plan, had minimal environmental impact and may not require irrigation to accomplish the 100,000 gallon increase they were looking for.

Discussion was opened to questions by the Chairman, Tom Bouchard.

Dennis Randall queried if Option A is passive and if Options B & C would require pumping. He would prefer a passive system if possible. David Eastridge said that there would be pumping from irrigation if they needed to use it.

Mike Ruprecht queried if there would be any detriment downstream. David Eastridge indicated that the flow of Smelt Brook decreases and didn't expect any problems downstream.

Tom Bott, Town Planner read a letter from David Eck that was sent to the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Eck expressed concern that during construction there would be more water in the Smelt Brook and the effect on his property.

Ron Gleason queried if Option A would be a structure you could see. David Eastridge said no it will be below ground.

Dennis Randall queried if there was any response to David Eck's letter. David Eastridge indicated that the property in question was more than one mile away. Indicated that it would not effect the area Mr. Eck is concerned about. During the earth removal application work they will not be sending any water to Smelt Brook.

Dennis Randall queried that by adding 113,000 gallons a day to Smelt Brook what would the increase be to the current flow of Smelt Brook. Dave Eastridge felt it would add about a fourth of an inch to the current flow. Tom Bott indicated that there would not be a pipe leading from the holding pond to Smelt Brook that was being discussed but that it was the flow of water to the land around Smelt Brook.

Ann Bingham queried if the flow of water from Kingston Place would go to the Bay rather than Smelt Brook. Stephen Smith said it would go to Smelt Brook. Ms. Bingham asked for more clarification on the Model results. She was provided with a better explanation of the Models by David Eastridge. Ms. Bingham queried the distance from Option A to Smelt Brook and what the separation to the Brook is. Dave Eastridge indicated the distance was 500 feet and a 10/15 foot separation.

Pine DuBois queried what established the 100,000 gallon goal of increase flow to Smelt Brook. Lloyd Geisinger indicated that this was established as a goal during the initial discussion regarding adding water to Smelt Brook. The decision was to add a holding pond to accomplish this. They based their study on the dry season and they would be unable to add more than 100,000 gallons a day. At that time the treatment plant will add to the water flow. Ms. DuBois asks if they had a report. David Eastridge responded they did not have a report but would be happy to provide a summary.

Maureen Thomas, conservation commission queried what years they used to calculate their models. Stephen Smith said they compared with Plymouth using USGA wells using 20 to 30 USGA years and averages. Ms. Thomas asked about the current state of Smelt Brook, is the brook currently stressed and also wondered where the 100,000 gallon criteria came from. Tom Bouchard said he knows from living in Kingston for so long that Smelt Brook as definitely been impacted during the years.

Ann Bingham queried where well 86 is located. Ms. DuBois showed it on the map and indicated that between that well and the neighboring well, approximately 1 million is being pumped.

Dennis Randall queried if any of this added water will add to the nitrogen load in Smelt Brook. Dave Eastridge indicated that it will meet DEP discharge requirement. He will have to get back to them with a definitive answer.

Lindsay Wilson indicated that they would like to get together with Tom Bott to go over issues and come to an understanding and consensus.

Motion: Dennis Randall to continue the hearing until October 19th at 7:20.

Second: Ron Gleason

Voted: 5-0-0

8:30 p.m. – Discussion on Continuation of 40R Smart Growth Site Hearing Plan 1021 Kingston's Place (Geisinger)

Motion: Ron Gleason to change the hearing date to October 15th at 7:20

Second: Dennis Randall

Voted: 5-0-0

Dennis Randall requested that 1021 Kingston Place provide a written hydrology report to the Board and peer reviewer. The board agreed.

8:40 p.m. – Kennedy Donovan Center

Rick Borstein, Chief Operating Office of the Kennedy Donovan Center provided an explanation of the organization. It is a non-profit providing human service for children and their families. It has been in business for 25 years. The hours of operation are 8:30 am to 5:30 pm. It has a staff of 6 to 8 people. The majority of the business is held in the client's family home. They have group sessions at the facilities one or two times a day. He then introduced the architect for the facility, Nancy Allyson.

Nancy Allyson presented drawings of the plans for the facilities. She explained how they planned to address some of the issues. They are situating the facility so that headlights would not impact the neighbors and where it does they will be putting up fencing or planting large shrubbery. They are looking at finding parking lot lights that are shorter than typical. The building is going to be 4500 sq ft.

Discussion was opened to questions by Tom Bouchard, Chairman.

Ron Gleason queried if the parking lot poles/post would be more residential in style. Ms. Allyson said they were looking for lights that were shorter than typical. Mr. Gleason also queried if there was a basement. Ms. Allyson stated there was not.

Tom Bouchard queried what the height of the building would be. Ms. Allyson indicated it would be 36 feet high. Mr. Bouchard questioned whether it needs to be this high. Ms. Allyson said that there was a need for storing files and where there was no basement they were looking to use the 3rd floor for storage.

Dennis Randall expressed concern that if the building was to be that large, he was concerned about the flat surfaces on the building and roof. Mr. Randall suggested adding dormers and other trim to help the facility fit in better with the residential homes around it.

Mark Casey, Surveyor, then talked about the water issues regarding this development. He indicated the land has high ground water but met with DEP requirements. He will submit plans. Mr. Casey discussed how far the wetlands were to the development. He indicated that by the

GSI website it is located to the rear of the property and is 150 feet back. There will be no activity in the buffer. He discussed the granite rounding on the street and if required they can do it. The snow storage on the property will be on Crescent Street and the back of the site. They received a letter from the Fire Chief indicating the plans meet with requirements. Talked about the fact there will be a right turn only on Crescent Street and they could make the exit on Smith a right turn as well. After tonight discussion revisions to the site plan will be made and presented to the Board and Review Engineer.

Discussion was opened to questions by the Tom Bouchard, Chairman.

Ron Gleason queried the width of the driveway on Crescent Street. Mr. Casey indicated it was 18 feet. Mr. Gleason wanted to know what would happen to the site if only egress was on Crescent Street. He is concerned about the level of use on Smith Lane. Mr. Casey indicates that there would be low impact to level of service to Smith Lane as the most of the business is offsite.

Tom Bouchard asked what kind of impact would there be if there was a left hand turn on Smith Lane. He is concerned that if there was only a right hand turn on Smith Lane this may make people egress on Crescent and then turn around. Mr. Casey indicated that this was offered only as an alternative. Mr. Randall and Mr. Ruprecht indicated that they also feel that a left hand turn on Smith Lane would be better.

David Gavigan questioned where they are moving from. Mr. Borstein indicated they were moving from Plymouth where he rents. It is more cost effective to the business to own the facility. Mr. Gavigan queried how much bigger is this facility to what they currently use is. Mr. Borstein indicated it was 1000 sq ft.

Mike Ruprecht asked if they had talked with neighbors/abutters. Mr. Borstein said they held an informal meeting with neighbors/abutters. Queries and concerns were explained to the abutters. Mr. Ruprecht also expressed concern about what will be the future use of the property should they sell or move. Mr. Casey indicated that it must be sold to another non-profit or the zoning will need to be changed.

Ron Gleason asked if it is a wood frame building and will it have sprinklers. Ms. Allyson indicated it would be fully sprinklered.

Tom Bouchard asked if any technicals have been sent to Seacoast Engineer. Mr. Casey said he was waiting for this meeting.

Motion: Dennis Randall to continue the hearing until October 15th at 7:25

Second: Ron Gleason

Voted: 5-0-0

8:45 p.m. – Site Plan for South shore Medical Center Tarkiln Lane (Sullivan)

Moved: Mike Ruprecht to continue hearing until November 9th at 7:05

Second: Dennis Randall

Vote: 5-0-0

8:50 p.m. – Planning Board representative to the OCPC

Tom Bott explained that the meetings are held during the day around 12 or 1. Will move forward as the meetings are during the day and no one is currently able to make it.

8:45 p.m. – Tree Farm Landing frontage discussion

Tom Bott explained that with the removal of the Gould property the subdivision no longer met the 500 foot frontage requirement for the subdivision. The decision to allow the right of way to be moved over 5 or 6 feet was acceptable but the subdivision still needs to have the required 500 feet in order to develop the site.

Dennis Randall inquired as to what the amount of frontage would be after the change. Mr. Bott indicated it would be 200 feet one side of the right of way and 86 feet on the other.

Attorney James Creed, representing the developer was present. He indicated he was there only for information purposes. He asked for a written report by the Town Planner which was provided to him.

Tom Bouchard indicated his opinion was the developer need to get the frontage. This is a requirement for all subdivisions otherwise it needs to go to the zoning board for a variance.

Mr & Mrs Gould were present and didn't understand why the frontage issue was not considered with the last vote.

9:35 – The board adjourned

Submitted By Meredith Hunt