

## Planning Board Minutes

August 15, 2017

Present: Chairman Pitney, Vice-Chairman Fletcher, Member Talbot, Member Slosek, Member Pearce, Member Raftery, Member Sauer and Jennifer Carmichael Secretary..

Also at the meeting were: Josh Peyron, Atty. Lori A. Robbins, Craig Okerntrom-Lang(landscape architect), Raynor and Ranne Warner, Mike Kulig of Berkshire Engineering, Doug Collins, David Potter of Green River Design, Shirley Thuley, Peggy Daniels.

Chairman Pitney opened the meeting and asked for a motion to approve the August 1st minutes. Member Slosek moved to approve the minutes and Member Fletcher seconded, the vote was: Chairman Pitney – Yes, Member Fletcher – Yes, Member Pearce – Yes, Member Slosek – Yes, Member Talbot – Yes, the motion carried. Member Raftery and Member Sauer abstained.

Member Pearce read the public hearing notice published in the Berkshire Eagle. Lori Robbins presented the special permit for Rayno and Ranna Warner at 19 Birch Lane. They would like to demolish the existing building and construct a new dwelling. Historic Preservation has approved the demolition. Attorney Robbins had a previous order of conditions, when Haldor Reinholt wanted to build a deck, from Conservation stating the deck could never be enclosed because decks can be enclosed by right, this was recorded. Conservation has issued a certificate of compliance closing out Mr. Reinholt's prior order of conditions, the deck was never built. Lori prepared a release of that deed restriction and conservation has agreed to it. The new cottage will be substantially in the same footprint and no closer to the lake than what is there now though it will be a larger dwelling. Mike Kulig presented the plans, calculations and storm water control measures. Member Fletcher asked if the plans were the same, Mike said there was a revision adding additional parking space, otherwise it was the same. The additional footage to the dwelling is a connector from the house to the garage. An existing stone patio will be taken out and vegetation added, a dry lane pervious patio is proposed. There are no storm water controls on the site and everything runs down and through the property. There will be two rain gardens installed where everything from the driveway and roof will be captured and run through them. They will cover any one-hundred-year storm event. There is town sewer and a private well. Mike read through the LPOD check list; the setback of the existing structure is 57.75 feet from the high-water mark. Member Pearce asked about section 6.4.5 change in land use and adding a patio changes the land use from grass to another pervious surface. Natural vegetation will be maintained on 70% of the property. The proposed work is 20% of the total lot area or 21.6% of the total lot area. Grading will not result in slopes greater than 20%, which was not the case but the plan has been revised and any grading will result in less than 20%. Mike explained 20% is 1 in 5 where as 1 in 3 you can still go sideways with a lawn mower and not tip over. One in five is maintainable as well, the grading is relatively gentle and Craig has a plan for the vegetating any of the slopes. Member Fletcher had a question on the patio and air conditioning units to be installed on the patio. Mr. Warner explained the house would have a relatively flat roof and any condensing unit would be there or in a corner. Mike referred to the use of erosion in sedimentation control with slopes greater than 10% and they have provided that for the whole project. Any stock piles of soil will be tarped or seeded and mulched. Mike asked to include the site will remain protected and in a stable condition throughout construction instead of all work will be concluded in 90 days. Member Fletcher asked if 90 days was not reasonable what would

be. Mike felt from demolition to grass planting would be at least 6 months. They are hoping to begin construction in October and be closed in by May. Conservation asked that the erosion control be designed in a “U” shape. Storm water runoff will not be any more substantial than what exists. The rain gardens will provide all the recharge rates needed all the runoff is directed to the two basins. Member Pitney asked if the rain gardens required any maintenance. Mike explained that any debris that collects in the rain gardens should be cleaned every 2-3 years. No vegetation will be cut within 35 feet of the shoreline, there are several invasive species growing and the proposal is to remove many of them and replace with noninvasive native species. Craig showed the lay out of the plan to remove some of these plants which will happen at the end of the project. He described the trees to be added to the property, meeting several times with Conservation and getting their approval for plantings. Craig went over the landscaping part of the project. Member Pearce asked about the work sequence having the construction completed before the retention basins are put in. The contractor will check on the silt fence if there are any storms. In the findings for the special permit Lori suggested that this application is in compliance with all the provisions of the bylaws and in harmony with its general intent and purpose to conserve the value of land being a modest addition and a nicer newer structure. She went through all the findings and asked that the special permit be granted. Member Fletcher asked the height of the building; the response was it will be approximately 23 feet from the current grade. Member Pitney mentioned conditions to be put into the findings and Member Fletcher gave the conditions: the grading will not be over 20% and rain gardens will be maintained to meet Conservation standards. In the order of conditions from Conservation there is standard language for the maintenance of rain gardens. Member Pearce motioned to approve the special permit for the application of construction at 19 Birch Lane, Member Raftery seconded and the vote was: Chairman Pitney – Yes, Member Fletcher – Yes, Member Pearce – Yes, Member Slosek – Yes, Member Talbot – Yes, Member Raftery – Yes, Member Sauer – Yes, the motion carried.

Member Fletcher needs more time for a special permit review than just a weekend to look everything over. She would like a cutoff date of a reasonable date, which would be a week before the next meeting. After some discussion, it was decided that the special permit timeline takes care of itself but other permit decisions will need to be distributed a week before the next meeting.

Chairman Pitney asked for a motion to adjourn, Member Pearce moved to adjourn and Member Talbot seconded the vote was Chairman Pitney – Yes, Member Fletcher – Yes, Member Pearce – Yes, Member Slosek – Yes, Member Talbot – Yes, Member Raftery – Yes, Member Sauer – Yes, the motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by,

Jennifer Carmichael, Secretary