

ACTON PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC MEETING

DATE November 3, 2011

ROLL CALL – Meeting began at 7 pm

Members present were: Chip Venell – Chairman
 Thomas Cashin – Vice Chairman
 Arthur Kelly
 Robert Smith – 2nd Alternate
 Jessica Donnell
 Yoli Gallagher

Members absent were: Bob Kane – 1st Alternate

Also present were: Kenneth Paul, CEO, Steve Geranian, Warren Seavey, Gavin Maloney and Linda Capristo, Recording Secretary

MINUTES – October 6th, 2011 minutes.- Tom Cashin motioned to accept the October 6th minutes as written, Yoli Gallagher seconded – Unanimous vote.

Code Office – No new business

NEW BUSINESS –

UNFINISHED BUSINESS –Langley Shores Site Walk - Followup

Mr. Venell asked how the site walk on Langley Shores went on October 29. Mr. Cashin said that eleven people turned out for the presentation by Linda Schier, AWWA including Mr. Geranian who lives on Langley Shores. There were four of us Ms. Donnell, Ms. Gallagher, Mr. Smith and myself as well as five residents of the road association including Mr. Geranian. This was a case study on steep slopes and runoff problems pertaining to access roads and individual lots along the road. This area is quite densely developed. There was some good discussion with the folks who were in attendance that were representing the road association. Arnie Murray, who is the spokesperson for the Langley Shores Road Association. He spoke about a solution that Mr. Paul and Joe Anderson of York County Soil and Water worked out for them particularly with the steep slopes or hillside where the road turns and the water ran straight down. They really had some problems with that area and they feel they have a good solution in hand which will be implemented next spring. It was a worthwhile trip and feel we saw some interesting things out there. Mr. Geranian has volunteered as part of the association, and would like to follow along with the stormwater work. Mr. Smith said that one particular lot that they looked at seemed to have a couple curtain drain that went under the road to the lake. He asked what could be done to make the situation better and asked if anyone recalled the situation. Mr. Cashin said it looked like there could be some improvement in that area. Ms. Schier talked about some LID (Low Impact Development) techniques that could have retained the water on site. As Mr. Smith was saying, there seemed to be two perimeter drains along the road and not sure what the plan is. Mr. Cashin said generally, it was indicative of the road situation, abutting lots and the density of development emits the steep slopes and certainly warrants looking further for techniques that can be done down there. It just looked like there was room for improvement. Mr. Kelly asked what the slope is down there and Ms. Donnell said next to the property she thought closet to 20%. Mr. Cashin said they were standing on the road about 75 feet from the lake.

Road elevation compared to lake level was about 10-15 feet. Ms. Donnell didn't think the driveway was that steep although water was running across it.

Proposed Stormwater Management Ordinance – Review Section 2 page 7

Mr. Cashin began by asking the Board if they remember where the citation is of who can create a LID or stormwater plan. He remembers discussing it but can't locate where it was cited. He said it is probably in one of the printed reference materials and will find it again. The Board reviewed section 2 starting with page 7.

Mr. Kelly said that in 2.1 General Requirements, it talks about total overall impervious cover shall not exceed 20% of a site. So if it is a 100 acre site it could cover up to 20 acres of it. Ms. Donnell said one acre and five. Mr. Kelly said maybe there should be an up to amount. Mr. Venell replied he doesn't know but if you are talking about a quarter acre on a lake, they all are going to be built on most of that where is if you have 5 or 10 acres, 20%. Mr. Paul said that 20% is currently in our zoning and has been for years. More than likely you have 10,000 square feet on the water and that's why DEP uses the 20%. Mr. Venell said that this is for lots within the shoreland zone and you won't find acreage like that in shoreland. Mr. Venell said so much of this is already in our zoning. He continued by saying he doesn't really want a separate document/ordinance and should just address what needs to be incorporated into our zoning document. Ms. Donnell asked Mr. Cashin if Wakefield is back on board with us and agrees fundamentally. Mr. Cashin responded yes. Ms. Donnell said she had heard briefly. Mr. Venell said this is just a work in progress and down the road we accept some kind of stormwater ordinance it wouldn't necessarily be the same as Wakefield. If a lot of this is already incorporated in our Zoning Ordinance we would only have to look at what is not in our ordinance. Wakefield has as much or more different areas than Acton does. Mr. Smith asked if they had gone there on way because they saw things differently. Mr. Venell replied they opted out for a little while. Ms. Donnell said they had some changes on there Planning Board. Mr. Venell said it appears as if there was a little bit of a backlash and some thought it would pile on more rules and regulations. They probably wanted to sit back to see how things go before they jumped back in with us. When FBE wrote this ordinance they only sent it to us as cool off for a bit. Apparently now there is a group that is back on board. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Paul the logic behind the 75 foot setback for a river as opposed to the setback for a lake is 100 feet. Mr. Paul stated a great pond is protected 100 feet and rivers are protected at 75 feet. Mr. Venell said it is a State mandate and they are the ones that came up with the numbers; you could probably contact the State Planning Board or the DEP. Ms. Donnell also had a question for Mr. Paul and asked about the first section of the stormwater management ordinance, when they are talking about the 15% use for the breakpoint in deciding the applicable LID techniques rather than 20%. They refer to 20% slope as does our zoning book Do you remember why we (Acton) chose 20% over 15%. Mr. Paul stated that 20% is State regulation for steep slopes. Mr. Venell said apparently the reason they use 15% is because some of the LID techniques are not recommended on slopes greater than 15% but like Mr. Paul said, the State is 20% which means fewer LID techniques you can use. Mr. Cashin discussed the best management practices and the difference between LID Plan and a Stormwater Management Plan.

ADJOURNED – 8:05 pm